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Emergency Operations Plan
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## FEMA
Federal Emergency Management Agency

## FERC
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

## FHWA
Federal Highway Administration

## FIRM
Flood Insurance Rate Map

## FLAME
Federal Land Assistance Management and Enhancement

## Forebay
El Dorado Forebay Reservoir

## FR
Forest Resource

## FRAP
Fire and Resources Assessment Program

## FTA
Federal Transit Administration

## g
Percentage of Gravity

## GAMA
Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment

## General Permit
Statewide General Construction Stormwater Discharge Permit

## GHG
Greenhouse Gases

## GIS
Geographic Information System

## gpm
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## GWP
Global Warming Potential
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Hazardous Air Pollutants

## HCM
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## LD
Lowest Dose
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### Abbreviations
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**LHMP**  
Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

**Lmax**  
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Level of Service
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**MBTA**  
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**MCV**  
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**MG**  
Million Gallons

**mgd**  
Million Gallons Per Day

**MLD**  
Most Likely Descendants

**MM**  
Mitigation Measure

**MMRP**  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

**MMT CO₂e**  
Million Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalents

**mpg**  
Miles Per Gallon

**MTP/SCS**  
Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

**MW**  
Megawatt

**N₂O**  
Nitrous Oxide

**NAHC**  
Native American Heritage Commission

**NASIS**  
National Soil Information System

**NCIC**  
North Central Information Center

**NFIP**  
National Flood Insurance Program

**NHPA**  
National Historic Preservation Act

**NI**  
No Impact

**NIMS**  
National Incident Management System

**NMFS**  
National Marine Fisheries Service

**NOA**  
Naturally Occurring Asbestos

**NOAA**  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

**NOC**  
Notice of Completion

**NOI**  
Notice of Intent

**NOP**  
Notice of Preparation

**NOP/IS**  
Notice of Preparation/Initial Study

**NOₓ**  
Nitrogen Oxides

**NPDES**  
National Pollution Discharge Elimination System

**NPPA**  
Native Plant Protection Act

**NR**  
Natural Resource

**NRCS**  
Natural Resources Conservation Service
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWI</td>
<td>National Wetland Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>Operations and Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHWM</td>
<td>Ordinary High Water Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWMP</td>
<td>Oak Woodlands Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>Priority Conservation Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC</td>
<td>Perfluorocarbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>Pacific Gas and Electric Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Particulate Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter-Cologne</td>
<td>Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>Peak Particle Velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVC</td>
<td>Polyvinyl Chloride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSD</td>
<td>Qualified SWPPP Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCNM</td>
<td>Roadway Construction Noise Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>Reactive organic gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPF</td>
<td>Registered Professional Forester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTIP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</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>SACOG</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Second Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCADA</td>
<td>Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Plan</td>
<td>Climate Change Scoping Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDWA</td>
<td>Safe Drinking Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMS</td>
<td>California Standardized Emergency Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF₆</td>
<td>Sulfur Hexafluoride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
<td>Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>State Responsibility Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Species of Special Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB or Water Board</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Toxic Air Contaminant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THP</td>
<td>Timber Harvesting Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Timberland Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPZ</td>
<td>Timber Production Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update</td>
<td>First Update to the Scoping Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Main Ditch Piping Project or Project</td>
<td>Upper Main Ditch Piping Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Program</td>
<td>Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 50</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWMP</td>
<td>Urban Water Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWMP Act</td>
<td>Urban Water Management Planning Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Board or SWRCB</td>
<td>California State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR</td>
<td>Waste Discharge Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTP</td>
<td>Water Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSG&amp;E</td>
<td>Western States Gas &amp; Electric Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

ES.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE UPPER MAIN DITCH PROJECT

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Public Resources Code [PRC] 21000 et seq., 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 15000 et seq.) the El Dorado Irrigation District (District) is considering the potential environmental consequences of piping the water supply that is currently conveyed through the Upper Main Ditch (Photo ES-1) in Pollock Pines, California (Figure ES-1). Piping of the Upper Main Ditch aligns with the District’s mission statement and achieves the District’s water and energy conservation efficiency goals, protects the water quality of the District’s raw water supply, and reduces the District’s system-wide operational and maintenance costs in an environmentally and fiscally responsible manner.

Photo ES-1 The Upper Main Ditch

The Upper Main Ditch is the upper section of the District’s Main Ditch raw water delivery system (also known as the “El Dorado Ditch”). The Main Ditch system, built in the late 1800s for mining and irrigation purposes. Today, the Upper Main Ditch (or the “ditch”) is an open and unlined earthen conveyance facility that delivers a maximum of 15,080 acre-feet of raw water supplies annually from the El Dorado Forebay Reservoir (Forebay) to the District’s Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant (WTP) where it is then treated and distributed throughout the District’s public drinking water system. The uncovered and unlined characteristics of the Upper Main Ditch result in substantial water losses due to seepage and evapotranspiration, as well as potential contamination from run-off from adjacent lands and other inputs.

The District proposes the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project (Project) which involves the conversion of the Upper Main Ditch from its current open conveyance status to a secure raw water buried transmission pipeline. The Project would help meet the water conservation and water supply reliability goals of the District, as well as the state mandate to reduce per capita urban water usage by 20 percent by the year 2020 (also known as the “20 x 2020” mandate), by eliminating the current water losses from the open ditch. Based upon the most recent demands the Project would result in an estimated average water savings of up to 1,800 acre-feet annually and result in a reduced demand on other District water supplies. The District is considering this Project as part of an overall strategy to meet these goals and improve service to its customers by reducing water losses and improving water quality entering the WTP from the existing unlined and uncovered ditch.

Additionally, an interim benefit of the Project would be an increase in the generation of hydroelectric power resulting from a decrease in water losses from the ditch (i.e. more water left in the raw water system means more power can be generated) until consumptive demands increase to the point where the conserved water is needed for future District customers.

The Project would also provide water quality benefits. Due to the Upper Main Ditch passing through rural residential areas that are adjacent to homes and backyards, the potential for contamination and water quality degradation from
humans and animals is high. Previous water quality analysis of the Upper Main Ditch conducted by the District has identified increases in such contaminants as total coliform, E. Coli, and turbidity as the water travels through the earthen ditch downstream from the Forebay Reservoir to the WTP (Domenichelli and Associates 2017; HydroScience 2016).
ES.1.1 THE UPPER MAIN DITCH PIPING PROJECT

The Upper Main Ditch Piping Project (Project) discussed below is described in further detail in Chapter 2.0 and potential environmental impacts are evaluated in Chapter 3.0 of this Environmental Impact Report (EIR). As a result of public input received during the scoping process (CEQA Guidelines Section 15201), the District has developed alternatives to piping the ditch in place (referred to as the proposed Project). The Project alternatives considered within this EIR include the proposed Project, the Blair Road Alternative, and the Combined Alternative as described below and collectively referred to as the Project or Upper Main Ditch Project (shown on Figure ES-2). While CEQA and its implementing regulations (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d]) only require an EIR to include sufficient information about each alternative to allow a meaningful analysis, the District has elected to evaluate the alternatives at a level equal to that conducted for the proposed Project to provide full consideration and disclosure of potential environmental impacts. The proposed Project and alternatives considered are as follows:

ES.1.2.1 The Proposed Project

The proposed Project involves piping of the Upper Main Ditch from Forebay Reservoir to the inlet to the Reservoir 1 WTP (See Figure ES-1 and Section 2.6 of the Project Description for more details). The proposed Project includes installation of approximately 15,400 linear feet of buried 42-inch pipe. The alignment would occur within the existing ditch alignment and would include components such as tying into the outlet pipe downstream of the Forebay Reservoir Valve House and improvements to the inlet facility at the WTP. By piping the ditch, the proposed Project would reduce water losses and water contamination potential, improve overall water quality, and reduce the treatment levels needed at the Reservoir 1 WTP. Various other proposed Project components include obtaining temporary and permanent easements, tree removal along the ditch corridor, pipeline grading and compaction, and placement of appurtenances such as isolation valves, blow-offs, air relief valves and manways along the pipeline. Construction related activities would occur over 12-months (approximately 30 weeks), spread over two construction seasons, during the annual ditch outage that typically occurs each fall and winter.

ES.1.2.1 Blair Road Alternative

The Blair Road Alternative would have an alignment in which portions of the pipe are within the existing ditch alignment, other portions traverse cross-country terrain, and the majority of the pipeline would be located within the Blair Road public right-of-way. The Blair Road Alternative would follow the existing ditch alignment for 1,500 feet, an additional 2,600 feet through cross-country terrain, and approximately 8,200 feet within Blair Road and has a total length of 12,300 feet (See Figure ES-1 and Section 2.7.2.1 of the Project Description for more details). The Blair Road Alternative components that would be the same as the proposed Project include construction of the tie-in downstream of the Forebay Reservoir Valve House as well as improvements to the inlet facility at the WTP. Components of the Blair Road Alternative that would be similar to the proposed Project include the placement of appurtenances along the pipeline, tree removal, and potential access roads and staging areas. The portions of the Blair Road Alternative that would differ from the proposed Project include pipeline grading and compaction, construction related traffic, the extent and location of temporary and permanent easements, and slight differences to construction equipment needed for saw cutting, asphalt removal, structural backfill, road repair, pavement/slurry placement, centerline restriping, and traffic control within portions of Blair Road.
ES.1.2.2 Combined Alternative

The Combined Alternative would have components similar to the proposed Project and the Blair Road Alternative, along with additional cross-country sections. The Combined Alternative would have an alignment in which portions of the pipe are within the existing ditch alignment, other portions traverse cross-country terrain, and other portions are located within the Blair Road public right-of-way. Starting at the Forebay Valve House, the Combined Alternative alignment follows the Blair Road Alternative going cross-country approximately 400-feet then following Blair Road for approximately 3,200-feet. Once the Combined Alternative is west of Apple Creek Court the alignment heads south traveling cross-country approximately 700-feet until it meets the existing ditch. From there the Combined Alternative follows the proposed Project alignment for approximately 2,200 feet before cutting cross-country for approximately 800-feet and rejoining the existing ditch for another 2,400-feet. It is in this segment where the existing ditch crosses under Blair Road that the Combined Alternative would follow the Blair Road Alternative again as it goes cross-country out of the ditch to Reservoir 1 WTP for approximately 2,200-feet (See Figure ES-1 and Section 2.7.2.2 of the Project Description for more details). Due to the similarities of the Combined Alternative footprint with the proposed Project and the Blair Road Alternative, the distinct analysis for the Combined Alternative related to the cross-country portions of the alignment that differ from the other alignments is discussed in each resource chapter of the EIR under the Combined Alternative, while the analysis for those portions of the Combined Alternative that overlap with either the proposed Project or the Blair Road Alternative is covered in the discussion of the other alignments.

ES.1.2.3 No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative includes the existing conditions and reasonably-foreseeable future conditions that would exist if the proposed Project was not approved and/or implemented. Under the No Project Alternative, the District would continue to use the Upper Main Ditch to convey raw water supply from Forebay to the WTP. The environmental impacts identified as resulting from the proposed Project in Sections 3.1 through 3.14 would not occur. Furthermore, implementation of the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the proposed Project objectives, as outlined in Section 2.5, and may result in other environmental impacts as also discussed in Chapter 3.0.
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ES.1.2 RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

In accordance with CEQA, a responsible agency is a public agency, other than the Lead Agency, that has responsibility to carry out or approve a project (PRC Section 21069). A trustee agency is a State agency that has jurisdiction by law over natural resources that are held in trust for the people of the State of California (PRC Section 21070).

The following public or State agencies may serve as responsible and/or trustee agencies for the Project:

- California Air Resources Board (CARB);
- El Dorado Air Quality Management District (AQMD);
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB);
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW);
- California State Water Resources Control Board – Division of Drinking Water (DDW); and
- Office of Historic Preservation (OHP).

ES.1.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY/ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The following have been identified as potential areas of controversy raised by the public over the proposed Project:

- Potential impacts to biological resources (including tree removal and loss of riparian habitat) due to the piping of flows carried in the ditch (Discussed in Section 3.4, Biological Resources).
- Potential impacts to recreational activities along the ditch (Discussed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics and in Section 3.13, Recreation).
- Potential impacts to the historic nature of the ditch (Discussed in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources).
- Potential impacts to the aesthetic nature of the Project site due to tree removal and changes in water flows within the ditch (Discussed in Section 3.1, Aesthetics).
- Potential impacts to an increased fire risk due to loss of open flows in the ditch (Discussed in Section 3.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials and Section 3.11, Public Services).
- Potential impacts to groundwater and utilities, such as drinking water wells (Discussed in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality).

ES.1.4 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1 summarizes the potential environmental effects of the Project, the recommended mitigation measures, if applicable, and the level of significance after mitigation. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, if the Project is approved as proposed, any impact noted in the summary as “significant” after mitigation would require the adoption of
a statement of overriding considerations. As shown in Table ES-1, development of the Project with mitigation measures would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts. Therefore, a statement of overriding considerations would not be required.

Additionally, CEQA requires public agencies to establish a monitoring and reporting program for the purpose of ensuring compliance with those mitigation measures adopted as conditions of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant environmental impacts identified in an EIR. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), incorporating the mitigation measures set forth in this document, would be adopted at the time of certification of the Final EIR.
# Table ES-1  Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Blair Road Alternative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Combined Alternative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-1: The Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-1: The Project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR-1: The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR-2: The Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR-3: The Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR-4: The Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4 Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **BIO-1**: The Project would not 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. | LTS/M | LTS/M | NI | • MM BIO-1: Pre-Construction Botanical Surveys  
• MM BIO-2: Pre-Construction Environmental Awareness Training  
• MM BIO-3: Reduce the Spread and Introduction of Invasive Noxious Weeds  
• MM BIO-4: Avoid Disturbance to Nesting Raptors and other Nesting Migratory Birds  
• MM BIO-5: Avoid Disturbance to Roosting Bat Species |
| **BIO-2**: The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. | LTS/M | LTS/M | LTS/M | NI | • MM BIO-6: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Oak Trees and Oak Woodlands |
| **BIO-3**: The Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. | LTS/M | LTS/M | LTS/M | NI | • MM BIO-6: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Oak Trees and Oak Woodlands |
| **BIO-4**: The Project would not 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. | NI | LTS/M | LTS/M | NI | • MM BIO-7: Exclusionary Fencing for Sensitive Resources |
## Environmental Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Finding Proposed Project</th>
<th>Blair Road Alternative</th>
<th>Combined Alternative</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO-5: The Project would not 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>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resource</th>
<th>Finding Proposed Project</th>
<th>Blair Road Alternative</th>
<th>Combined Alternative</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUL-1: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>MM CUL-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL-2: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>MM CUL-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL-3: The Project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>MM CUL-2: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Finding Proposed Project</th>
<th>Blair Road Alternative</th>
<th>Combined Alternative</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEO-1: The Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>MM GEO-1: Prepare and Implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO-2: The Project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, or potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Blair Road Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.7 Greenhouse Gasses</strong></td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG-1: The Project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG-2: The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-1: The Project would not 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-2: The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-3: The Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality</strong></td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD-1: The Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Blair Road Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD-2: The Project would not 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>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD-3: The Project would not 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 or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD-4: The Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **None Required**
- **MM GEO-1: Prepare and Implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan**
- **MM HYD-1: Avoid/Minimize Potential Impacts from Construction Material Release**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Blair Road Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.10 Noise</strong></td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOS-1: The Project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies nor would the project result in a non-exempt substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOS-2: The Project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.11 Public Services</strong></td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB-1: The Project would not 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: Fire protection; Police protection; or Schools.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.12 Recreation</strong></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC-1: The Project would not have the potential to affect current or future recreational activities.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Executive Summary
June 2018

### Environmental Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Blair Road Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC-2: The Project would not 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.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation and Traffic

| TRA-1: The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, considering 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. | LTS | LTS/M | LTS/M | NI | MM TRA-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan |
| TRA-2: The Project would not 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. | LTS | LTS/M | LTS/M | NI | MM TRA-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan |
| TRA-3: The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). | LTS/M | LTS/M | LTS/M | NI | MM TRA-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Blair Road Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA-4: The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA-5: The Project would not 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>LTS</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.14 Utilities and Service Systems

| UTL-1: The Project would not require or result in the construction of new water, wastewater treatment, or new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. | NI | NI | NI | NI | • None Required |
| UTL-2: The Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources or identify if new or expanded entitlements would be needed. | LTS | LTS | LTS | NI | • None Required |

**Key:**  
LTS = Less than Significant  
LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation  
NI = No Impact  
MM = Mitigation Measure
El Dorado Irrigation District Upper Main Ditch Piping Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report
Chapter 1.0 Introduction

June 2018
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT INTRODUCTION

The Upper Main Ditch is the upper section of the El Dorado Irrigation District’s (the District) Main Ditch raw water delivery system (also known as the “El Dorado Ditch”). The Main Ditch system was built in the late 1800s to supply water for mining and irrigation purposes. Today, the Upper Main Ditch (or the “ditch”) is an open and unlined earthen conveyance facility that annually delivers up to a maximum of 15,080 acre-feet of raw water supplies from the El Dorado Forebay Reservoir (Forebay) to the District’s Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant (WTP) where it is then treated and distributed throughout the District’s public drinking water system. The uncovered and unlined characteristics of the Upper Main Ditch result in substantial water losses due to seepage and evapotranspiration, as well as potential contamination from run-off from adjacent lands and other inputs.

The District proposes the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project (Project) which involves the conversion of the Upper Main Ditch from its current open conveyance status to a secure raw water buried transmission pipeline. The Project would help meet the water conservation and water supply reliability goals of the District, as well as the state mandate to reduce per capita urban water usage by 20 percent by the year 2020 (also known as the “20 x 2020” mandate), by eliminating the current water losses from the open ditch. The District is considering this Project as part of an overall strategy to meet these goals and improve service to its customers by reducing water losses, reducing operations and maintenance costs, and improving water quality entering the WTP from the existing unlined and uncovered ditch.

As a result of public input received during the scoping process (CEQA Guidelines Section 15201), the District has developed alternatives to piping the ditch in place (referred to as the proposed Project). The Project alternatives considered within this EIR include the proposed Project, the Blair Road Alternative, and the Combined Alternative collectively referred to as the Project or Upper Main Ditch Project. While CEQA and its implementing regulations (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d]) only require an EIR to include sufficient information about each alternative to allow a meaningful analysis, the District has elected to evaluate the alternatives at a level equal to that conducted for the proposed Project to provide full consideration and disclosure of potential environmental impacts.

1.2 THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires public agencies to identify, disclose, and consider the potential environmental impacts of proposed discretionary actions that the agencies are considering for approval. A project that may have a significant impact on the environment cannot be approved unless the Lead Agency makes the approval contingent upon the implementation of mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that impact to the fullest extent feasible. When a project may have significant environmental impacts, the Lead Agency must prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) before it considers whether to approve the project.

The District, as the Lead Agency for the Project, has prepared this Draft EIR for public review and comment per the requirements of Article 7, Sections 15080 to 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines, which describes the EIR process, as well as other requirements set forth in the regulations. As discussed below, the Draft EIR will be available for review and comment by public agencies and the general public for a period of 45 days. Prior to considering the Project, the District will prepare a Final EIR that includes the Draft EIR, the comments received on the Draft EIR, written
responses to those comments, a list of the commenter, and any revisions made to the Draft EIR in response to the comments per Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines. As required under Section 15090, prior to considering the approval of the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project, the District Board of Directors will certify that the information contained in the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; that the Board reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR before making a decision; and that the Final EIR reflects the District’s independent judgment and analysis.

1.2.1 CEQA Purpose and Authority

This Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines Title 14 California Code of Regulations Chapter 3 Section 15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that State and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before taking action on those projects (California Public Resources Code [PRC] 21000 et seq.).

The purpose of this Draft EIR is to analyze the environmental impacts of the Project, while describing ways to reduce or avoid these potential impacts. Additionally, this Draft EIR identifies alternatives to the proposed Project that would meet the Project objectives while reducing one or more potential environmental impacts.

CEQA requires that each public agency mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects of projects it approves or implements whenever feasible. An EIR is an informational document used in State, regional, and local planning and decision-making processes to disclose potential environmental effects. The purpose of the EIR is not to recommend approval or denial of a project. However, the public agency’s decision whether to approve or to deny the Project must take into consideration the information provided by the EIR.

When considering a project, the public agency may approve the project even if it would result in significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts so long as the EIR discloses the project’s environmental effects, including:

- Significant effects;
- Those that cannot be avoided;
- Growth inducing effects;
- Effects found not to be significant; and
- Cumulative impacts.

CEQA provides that a lead agency that intends to approve a project with significant and unavoidable effects must identify the “[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations...” that make infeasible particular mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR. In addition, the lead agency in such a case must identify the benefits of the Project that outweigh the significant effects on the environment (Statement of Overriding Considerations, California Public Resources Code Section 21081).
This Draft EIR describes and evaluates the potential impacts associated with the Project. Additional resource-specific studies, such as air quality, biological resources, and cultural resources, as well as others, have been prepared for this Draft EIR to provide detailed information about the Project's potential impacts on the environment. The mitigation measures identified in this Draft EIR are designed to include enough detail and specificity to ensure that they would be effectively carried out to avoid or reduce any of the Project's potentially significant adverse impacts to a level that is not significant.

1.2.2 Lead Agency Determination

As the public agency undertaking the Project, the District is designated as the Lead Agency for the Project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15367 defines the Lead Agency as “...the public agency, which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.” Other public agencies may use this document in their decision making or permit processes related to the Project.

This Draft EIR was prepared for the District by Stantec Consulting Services Inc., an environmental consultant. Prior to public review, this Draft EIR was extensively reviewed and evaluated by District staff and, as such, this Draft EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the District staff. A list of report preparation personnel is provided in Section 7.0 of this Draft EIR.

1.2.3 Draft EIR Scoping Process

1.2.3.1 Notice of Preparation

CEQA does not require formal hearings at any stage of the environmental review process (CEQA Guidelines Section 15202[a]). However, it does encourage “wide public involvement, formal and informal, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15201).

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the District distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft EIR for the Project on June 17, 2015, which included an Initial Study (IS) providing an initial assessment of the potential for the Project to have an effect on the environment and gave the public an opportunity to provide comment on the scope of the analysis that should be included in this Draft EIR (EID 2015). A public scoping meeting was held on June 29, 2015 and the public scoping comment period closed on July 16, 2015. The comments received by the District on the NOP/IS were considered in the preparation of this Draft EIR. The scope of this Draft EIR includes the potential environmental impacts identified in the NOP/IS, as well as any issues raised by agencies and the public in response to the NOP/IS. Copies of the NOP/IS, and comments received during the NOP/IS comment period are contained in Appendix A of this Draft EIR.

1.2.3.2 Scope of the Draft EIR

The analysis included in Chapter 3.0 focuses on the specific environmental resource topics that require further evaluation to determine if they have a potential impact. The findings of the IS as well as comments received during the scoping process were taken into consideration in development of this Draft EIR. Potential impacts and thresholds of significance were established based on comments received, a comparison with the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist, and resource-specific policy guidance and available scientific information. Resource sections evaluated and determined to have no significant impact as a part of the NOP/IS that received no additional public comment, are
determined to have no significant impact and are not considered for further evaluation within this EIR. These resource areas are disclosed below in the Environmental Issues Determined Not to Be Significant section. Resource areas identified to have potential impact from the NOP/IS and scoping process or during subsequent scientific study are summarized below in the Effects Determined to be Potentially Significant section and further evaluated for their potential to result in significant impacts within Chapter 3.0.

Environmental Issues Determined Not To Be Significant

Pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of the potential effects on the physical environment is focused on those impacts that may be significant or potentially significant. CEQA allows a Lead Agency to limit the details of discussion of the environmental effects that are not considered potentially significant. (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.2[a] and 15128). CEQA requires that the discussion of any significant effects on the environment be limited to substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in physical conditions that exist within the affected area, as defined in PRC Section 21060.5 (Statutory definition of "environment").

Effects determined to be insignificant or unlikely to occur need not be discussed further in the Draft EIR unless the Lead Agency subsequently receives information inconsistent with the finding (CEQA Guidelines Section 15143).

As part of the NOP and Initial Study scoping process, it was determined that implementation of the Project would result in no impact or less than significant environmental impacts (without mitigation) related to the resource categories listed below. Analysis supporting the conclusions for these resource areas is included in Appendix A as part of the NOP and Initial Study. The following environmental resources areas are not discussed at further length in this Draft EIR:

**Land Use and Planning:** The Project would be located within public and District rights-of-way as well as 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. The Project would not require a change in zoning, nor would it conflict with the El Dorado County General Plan (EDCGP 2015). Additionally, there are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in the area. Therefore, no impacts to land use or planning would occur and this issue is not discussed further in this Draft EIR.

**Mineral Resources:** 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 (EDCGP 2015). Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur and this issue is not discussed further.

**Population and Housing:** The Project would be located within private and District rights-of-way and 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. Therefore, no impacts to population and housing would occur and this issue is not discussed further.
Effects Determined To Be Potentially Significant

The NOP/Initial Study and Scoping process found the following resource areas may contain potentially significant environmental issues that would require further analysis in the EIR. In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the following resources areas are evaluated in this Draft EIR:

- Aesthetics (AES)
- Agricultural and Forest Resources (AG)
- Air Quality (AQ)
- Biological Resources (BIO)
- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources (CUL)
- Geology and Soils (GEO)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG)
- HAZards and Hazardous Materials (HAZ)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (HYD)
- Noise (NOS)
- Public Services (PUB)
- Recreation (REC)
- Transportation and Traffic (TRA)
- Utilities and Services Systems (UTL)

1.2.4 Previously Prepared Environmental Documents

The District has been planning for the rehabilitation of the Upper Main Ditch for many years, with the planning effort accelerated in 2011. The NOP/IS for the Project was released for public comment on June 17, 2015. Additional technical studies were completed as part of the preparatory work for the Project and used, where applicable to support the technical basis and analysis presented in this Draft EIR. Technical documents considered in preparation of the Draft EIR are included in Appendices B and C and are listed as follows:

- Upper Main Ditch Piping Project – Initial Study, El Dorado Irrigation District (June 17, 2015);
- Jurisdictional (Wetland) Determination, US Army Corps of Engineers- Sacramento District (January 24, 2014);
- California Red-Legged Frog Site Habitat Assessment for Main Ditch Project, AECOM (June 2013);
- California Red-Legged Frog Protocol Survey Report for the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project, AECOM (October 2016)
- Preliminary Wetland Delineation Report for El Dorado Irrigation District’s Main Ditch- Forebay to Reservoir 1 Project, EN2 Resources, Inc. (November 9, 2012);
- Cultural Resources Study for El Dorado Irrigation District’s Lower Main Canal Piping Project, Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc (April 2018);
- Upper Main Ditch Piping Basis of Design Report, Domenichelli and Associates, (July 24, 2014);
- FINAL Upper Main Ditch BODR Updates Technical Memorandum, Domenichelli and Associates, (January 29, 2016); and
- Upper Main Ditch Alignment Alternatives, Domenichelli and Associates (March 9, 2018);
1.2.5 Review of the Draft EIR

Upon completion of this Draft EIR, the District will file a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Office of Planning and Research along with a Notice of Availability to begin the public review period (PRC Section 21161). Concurrent with the NOC, this Draft EIR will be distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding cities, and interested parties, including those requesting a copy of the Draft EIR in accordance with PRC 21092(b)(3).

The Notice of Availability will be posted and published in accordance with noticing requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15087. During the public review period, the Draft EIR, including the technical appendices, will be available for review at the following locations:

1. El Dorado Irrigation District, 2890 Mosquito Road, Placerville, California
2. El Dorado Irrigation District website
3. El Dorado County Recorder-Clerk Placerville Office, 360 Fair Lane, Placerville, California
4. Placerville Main Public Library, 345 Fair Lane, Placerville, California
5. Pollock Pines Public Library, 6210 Pony Express Trail, Pollock Pines, California
6. Pollock Pines – Camino Community Center, 2675 Sanders Drive, Pollock Pines, California

Agencies, organizations, and interested parties have the opportunity to comment on this Draft EIR during the 45-day public review period. Written comments concerning the Draft EIR for the Project should be directed to the District at the following address by the close of the comment period. Please include the commenter’s full name and address.
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El Dorado Irrigation District
Attn: Dan Corcoran
Environmental and Water Resources Manager
2890 Mosquito Road
Placerville, CA 95667
Email: dcorcoran@eid.org.

The public comment period will be identified in the Notice of Availability, which will be available on the District’s website identified above.

1.2.5.1 Effectively Commenting on the EIR

Readers are invited to review and comment on the adequacy and completeness of this Draft EIR, particularly in describing the potential impacts of the Project, the level of severity, the mitigation measures being proposed to reduce or avoid those impacts, and the Project alternatives being considered.

In this regard, CEQA defines “significant effect on the environment” as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the Project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise and objects of historic or aesthetic significance (CEQA Guidelines section 15382).

“Mitigation” includes actions that would avoid the impact altogether, minimize the impact, rectify by repairing, rehabilitating or restoring the impacted environment, reducing the impact over time or compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments (CEQA Guidelines section 15370).

The most effective comments are those that focus on the adequacy and completeness of the environmental analysis and that are supported by factual evidence. Comments that focus on whether the Project should be approved or denied are not comments on the adequacy of this Draft EIR.

1.2.6 Final EIR

Upon completion of the public review period, the District will review the comments received and will prepare written responses to environmental issues raised pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15088 and, if necessary, will make any related revisions to the Draft EIR. Comments received and the responses to comments will be included as part of the record for consideration of the Project. Responses will be incorporated into the Final EIR available for public review and provided to any commenting public agencies at least 10 days prior to certification of the EIR (CEQA Guidelines 15088(b)). The general process for the preparation and certification of an EIR is described under Section 15096 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The Final EIR will be considered by the District Board of Directors prior determining whether to approve the Project, as per Section 15090 of the CEQA Guidelines. Specifically, the District Board of Directors must certify that:
• The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
• The Final EIR was presented to the Board, and that the Board reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the Project; and
• The Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the District Board of Directors.

Following certification of the Final EIR, the District may then consider approval of the Project as described in Section 15092 of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that a public agency shall not decide to approve or carry out a project for which an EIR was prepared unless either: (1) the Project as approved will not have a significant effect on the environment, or (2) the agency has eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects where feasible and made a determination that any remaining significant effects found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to overriding considerations.

If the Project is approved, Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the District to adopt findings describing how each of the significant impacts identified in the EIR is being mitigated. The findings will describe the reasons why significant unavoidable impacts, if any, cannot be mitigated. The findings will also describe the District’s findings with respect to the Project alternatives that were analyzed in the EIR.

If the District decides to approve the Project, or any alternative to the Project, despite a finding that it will have significant and unavoidable impacts, the District will also adopt a statement of overriding considerations describing the benefits of the Project that in the District’s judgment outweigh its significant environmental impacts, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines. Finally, the District will adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP), as required under Sections 15096 (g) and 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines, which describes how it will ensure the mitigation measures being required of the Project will be carried out.

1.3 PERMITS REQUIRED

The following permits may be required for one or more of the Project alternatives:

• Section 404 Clean Water Act Permit
• Section 401 Clean Water Act Water Quality Certification
• Section 1602 California Department of Fish and Wildlife Streambed Alteration Agreement
• State Water Resources Control Board Construction General Permit
• Regional Water Quality Control Board Waste Discharge Requirement
• El Dorado County Encroachment Permit
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1.4 ABBREVIATIONS (INTRODUCTION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMRP</td>
<td>Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC</td>
<td>Notice of Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB or Water Board</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTP</td>
<td>Water Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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