

# Calaveras County Draft General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report

## Errata Sheet #1 June 2019

**Note:** All changes to the Draft EIR proposed as part of the Final EIR have been shown in a red font color, with new text double underlined and deleted text ~~struck through~~. In some instances, the Final EIR included new text to the Draft EIR showing revisions to policies or implementation measures (IMs) of the Draft General Plan as mitigation measure(s). Such changes were shown in blue font color.

All changes to the Final EIR text proposed as part of this Errata are highlighted. In addition, Errata changes to policies and IMs that were already changed as part of the Final EIR are shown in a green font color, with new text double underlined and deleted text ~~struck through~~.

As a result of Planning Commission-initiated changes, pages 2-239 and 3-6 of the Final EIR are hereby amended as follows:

With the exception of a slight increase in 2014, the amount of farmland in the County has remained relatively consistent between 2012 and 2015, as shown below in Table 4.2-2. It should be noted that according to the USDA, between 2004 and 2012, approximately 59,839 acres of farmland and approximately 23,756 acres of rangeland were put out of production due to a one year drop in 2008. In 2015, farmland comprised approximately 32 percent of the total land in Calaveras County.

The above revisions are for clarification purposes only, and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of Planning Commission-initiated changes, page 3-3 of the Final EIR is hereby revised as follows:

### 4.1 Aesthetics

Based on staff-initiated changes, page 4.1-1 of the Draft EIR is hereby revised as follows:

The following setting information provides an overview of the existing visual condition of visual resources within Calaveras County.

The above revisions are for clarification purposes only, and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of Planning Commission-initiated changes to an IM referenced in the Draft EIR, page 3-10 of the Final EIR is hereby revised as follows:

It should be noted that the California Forest Practice Act allows local county governments to proposed special timber harvesting rules, as necessary, to address needs specific to the county. The State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection has the authority to accept or reject such special rules.

As a result of Planning Commission-initiated changes, page 4.2-21 of the Draft EIR is hereby revised as follows:

IM RP-1D	Significance Criteria for Resource Production Land Conversions – Establish a consistent methodology for evaluating the potential significance of agricultural land conversions to non-agricultural uses pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for use in conjunction with evaluating impacts to resource production lands. In the interim, the County will utilize the Calaveras County Agricultural Coalition Resource Production Lands Mitigation Program Guidelines, prepared November 8, 2019 <u>(see Appendix A of the Draft General Plan).</u>
----------	--

The above revisions are for clarification purposes only, and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Based on Planning Commission-initiated changes, page 3-15 of the Final EIR is hereby revised as follows to include additional changes to the text of the Draft EIR:

In response to public comments received on the Draft EIR, Tables 4.4-2 and 4.4-3 on pages 4.4-18 and 4.4-19, respectively, of the Draft EIR, are hereby revised as presented below, along with the text immediately preceding the tables. Rather than include the entirety of Tables 4.4-2 and 4.4-3 with revisions shown where appropriate, only the rows that have been revised or added are presented:

### **Special-Status Species**

Calaveras County is known to may support 1824 species of special-status plants (Table 4.4-2) and 1424 special-status wildlife species (Table 4.4-3); such species have the potential to occur, as defined above. The Special-Status Species known with the potential to occur in Calaveras County are presented in Table 4.4-2 and Table 4.4-3 below.

The above revisions are for clarification purposes only, and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of Planning Commission-initiated changes, the bottom of page 3-11 of the Final EIR is hereby amended as follows:

<sup>8</sup> California Air Resources Board. *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* [pg. 1 to 32]. April 2005.

Page 4.3-23 of the Draft EIR is hereby revised as follows:

The CCAPCD guidelines provides standard mitigation measures that may be applied to projects found to exceed district mass emissions thresholds. The standard mitigation measures are divided into several categories as presented below:

The above revisions are for clarification purposes only, and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of Planning Commission-initiated changes, page 3-17 of the Final EIR is hereby revised as follows:

Page 4.4-27 of the Draft EIR is hereby revised as follows:

Through the passage of SB 1334, which enacted Public Resources Code (PRC) 21083.4, the potential conversion of oak woodland is subject to CEQA review and findings, and significant impacts are to be mitigated. ~~All 58 counties in California are required to adopt oak woodlands management plans and ordinances that require a discretionary permit for oak woodland conversions and set a minimum mitigation standard.~~ PRC 21083.4 offers a “menu” of mitigation options. Typically, significant impacts to oaks or oak woodland requires replacement tree mitigation at a ~~five to one ratio (i.e., five oak trees are planted for every removed oak tree) ratio determined at the discretion of the County Planning Department based on the species tree species impacted.~~ Mitigation related to tree replacement may only account for up to half of the mitigation requirements. Further mitigation would be required to constitute complete mitigation, and would be selected from one of the possibilities listed below. For projects located within an existing urbanized area, Urban Reserve Line, Urban Services Line, or within a city’s sphere of influence as approved by a Local Agency Formation Commission, mitigation could be reduced to one to one. Mitigation options in PRC 21083.4 include:

- ~~• A monetary contribution to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund for the purpose of purchasing oak woodlands conservation easements;~~
- ~~• Onsite mitigation which requires the dedication in perpetuity of a conservation easement on mitigation lands that are contiguous with the project and that will provide for a biologically functional oak woodland community;~~
- ~~• Offsite mitigation which requires the permanent preservation of oak woodland habitat of equivalent biological value. Those mitigation lands shall be purchased in fee or by a conservation easement and conserved in perpetuity; and~~
- ~~• Monitoring and replacement of dead and diseased trees would be required. The planting mitigation alternative may be used in conjunction with the other mitigation alternatives. If the CDFW establishes a mitigation bank, the mitigation bank could be used to fulfill the offsite mitigation requirements of an oak woodlands conversion project, but no landowner may be compelled to use the mitigation bank. The oak woodlands management plan or county ordinance may exempt the following activities:~~
  - ~~○ Affordable housing projects for low and very low income (as defined HCD) located within an existing urbanized area, Urban Reserve Line, Urban Services Line, or within a city’s sphere of influence as approved by LAFCO.~~

- ~~○ The conversion of three acres or less of oak woodlands. A person or other legal entity may not use this exemption more than once in a five year period;~~
- ~~○ The harvesting of fuelwood for (non-commercial) use on the parcel from which it is harvested;~~
- ~~○ An approved Natural Community Conservation Plan or approved subarea plan within an approved Natural Community Conservation Plan that includes oaks as a covered species;~~
- ~~○ The removal of dead and diseased trees that pose significant risks to life, property, or to healthy trees; and~~
- ~~○ Projects within oak woodlands in which no oak trees greater than five inches in diameter at breast height are to be removed or projects that do not encroach upon the dripline of oak trees greater than five inches at breast height.~~

(1) Conserve oak woodlands, through the use of conservation easements.

(2) (A) Plant an appropriate number of trees, including maintaining plantings and replacing dead or diseased trees.

(B) The requirement to maintain trees pursuant to this paragraph terminates seven years after the trees are planted.

(3) Contribute funds to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund, as established under subdivision (a) of Section 1363 of the Fish and Game Code, for the purpose of purchasing oak woodlands conservation easements, as specified under paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of that section and the guidelines and criteria of the Wildlife Conservation Board. A project applicant that contributes funds under this paragraph shall not receive a grant from the Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund as part of the mitigation for the project.

(4) Other mitigation measures developed by the county.

The above revisions add specific statute language and are for clarification purposes only. The revisions do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of Planning Commission-initiated changes, the top of page 3-22 of the Final EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Based on Planning Commission-initiated changes, page 4.4-40 of the Draft EIR is hereby revised as follows:

**4.4-3 Have a substantial adverse effect on oak woodlands. Based on the analysis below, even with mitigation, the impact is *significant and unavoidable*.**

Oak woodlands are scattered throughout the County; oak trees are part of the foothill woodland and valley oak woodland communities. Oak woodlands are considered by the State of California to be high quality wildlife habitats. ~~PRC 21083.4 requires the protection of oak woodland and requires all 58 California counties to adopt oak woodlands management plans and ordinances that require a discretionary permit for~~

~~oak woodland conversions and to establish a minimum mitigation standard.~~

Additionally, PRC 21083.4 requires a county to determine whether a project within its jurisdiction may result in a conversion of oak woodlands that will have a significant effect on the environment. If a county determines that there may be a significant effect to oak woodlands, the county shall require one or more oak woodlands mitigation alternatives to mitigate the significant effect of the conversion of oak woodlands. These mitigation alternatives can include recordation of conservation easements, implementation of oak tree planting plans, and/or contribution of funds to an Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund.

The above revisions are for clarification purposes only, and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of Planning Commission-initiated changes, page 3-26 of the Final EIR is hereby revised as follows:

#### **4.5 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources**

Based on staff-initiated changes, page 4.5-6 of the Draft EIR is hereby revised as follows:

~~In Calaveras County, the old Mi Wuk villages that are known to anthropologists were clustered along the Mokelumne, Calaveras, and Stanislaus River drainages.~~ Traditional Mi-Wuk houses reportedly were made of thatching, tule matting, or slabs of bark over a conical framework of poles (Levy 1978:408). Other important structure types were the sweat lodge and the dance house, both of which are still in use today. Sweathouses are used mainly by men for health and purification, while the semi-subterranean dance houses were used as an assembly hall and for important ceremonies. Remains of some of the large structures have been found at archaeological sites in the central Sierra foothills.

The above revisions are for clarification purposes only, and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of Planning Commission-initiated changes, page 3-30 of the Final EIR is hereby revised as follows:

#### **4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality**

Based on staff-initiated changes, page 4.8-3 of the Draft EIR is hereby revised as follows:

The Mokelumne River runs in three forks (North, Middle, and South) from the Sierra Nevada Mountains in Alpine County. Snowmelt serves as the primary source of water for the Mokelumne River. An area of approximately 660 square miles is drained by the Mokelumne River, which flows southwest, with the forks all joining near ~~Glencoe-Lodi, then turns northwest to end in the Sacramento River delta lands,~~ and finally empties into the San Joaquin River approximately 20 miles north of Stockton. The Mokelumne River forms the County's northern boundary with neighboring Amador County, and was considered the division between the southern and northern mining districts during the Gold Rush. The river passes

through several reservoirs in the County, including Salt Springs Reservoir, Pardee Reservoir, and Camanche Reservoir.

The above revision is for clarification purposes only, and does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.