

Calaveras County Draft General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report

Errata Sheet #2 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**. 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**.

During Planning Commission Hearings, the Planning Commission directed staff to make changes to policies and implementation measures referenced in the Draft and Final EIR. The revisions to the policies and implementation measures presented in the following section of this Errata are shown in order as they appear in the Draft General Plan. The Planning Commission changes to policies and implementation measures referenced in the EIR in are presented below.

Pages 2-251 and 3-66 of the Final EIR are hereby revised as follows:

4.5-1(d) *IM LU-4 A of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:*

IM LU-4A *A Community Design Guidelines – **After soliciting input from the community. Adopt community design guidelines or standards for communities identified by the Board of Supervisors, applicable to both ministerial and discretionary projects, which reflect the character of the individual community, including historic design standards for communities with concentrations of historic buildings, and without establishing a design review committee. Design guidelines or standards shall be implemented only after approval by the Board of Supervisors.***

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

Pages 2-13, 3-34, 3-70 of the Final EIR are hereby revised as follows:

4.13-2 *Policy C 2.2 in the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:*

Policy C 2.2 *Road impacts created by new development shall not reduce the minimum level of service (LOS) below D for roadways and intersections in Community Areas (as indicated on the General Plan Land Use Diagram – Figure LU-1) **and in the City of Angels Camp** or below LOS C on County-maintained roadways outside of Community Areas, **and the***

~~City of Angels Camp. The County shall allow for the following exceptions on County maintained roadways and on Caltrans maintained roadways, except as specified below; except as specified below where LOS D is acceptable.~~ assuming that roadway safety is addressed consistent with Policy CIR 2.1.

1. SR 26 from the San Joaquin County line to Silver Rapids Road ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
2. SR 4 from Vallecito Road to Kurt Drive ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
3. SR 4 from Lakemont Drive to Henry Drive ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
4. SR 4 from Henry Drive to Sierra Parkway ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
5. SR 12 from SR 26 to SR 49 ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
6. SR 49 from Pool Station Road to Gold Oak Road ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
7. SR 49 from Gold Oak Road to Mountain Ranch Road ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
8. SR 49 from Dog Town Road to SR 4 (W) ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
9. SR 49 from SR 4 (W) to Murphy's Grade Road ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
- ~~10. SR 49 from Stanislaus Avenue to Mark Twain Road ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~~~
- ~~11. SR 49 from Mark Twain Road to Bret Harte Road ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~~~
12. SR 49 from Bret Harte Road to SR 4 (S) Vallecito Road ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~
13. SR 49 from SR 4 (S) Vallecito Road the southern City of Angels limits to Tuolumne County Line ~~LOS D is acceptable to the County.~~

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

Pages 2-19, 3-11, and 3-42 of the Final EIR are hereby revised as follows:

~~4.2-1(b) IM RP-1A of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:~~

~~IM RP-1A County Code Amendments – Amend the County Code to:~~

- ~~• Incorporate guidelines and standards for the development and maintenance of setbacks or other measures designed to minimize conflicts between activities conducted on Resource Production Lands and the encroachment of incompatible uses.~~

- Establish minimum parcel size standards for new lots to be created adjacent to Resource Production Lands.
- Incorporate guidelines for residential development on Resource Production Lands.
- Expand the types of agricultural tourism and other compatible non-traditional activities allowed on Resource Production Lands to enhance their economic viability.
- Require a 300 foot to 500 foot buffer (on lands within the development area) from the boundary of an adjacent agricultural use. If such a buffer is deemed infeasible by the County, require a combination of a lesser buffer, tall fencing, and tree plantings along the boundary (on lands within the development area) to limit adverse effects related to noise, dust, trespass, and pesticide/herbicide overspray. Such a proposal must be submitted to supported by the Agriculture Advisory Committee, and the County Agricultural Commissioner, or other recognized authority for comment.

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

Pages 2-4, 3-10, and 3-40 of the Final EIR are hereby revised as follows:

4.2-1(a) IM RP-E of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:

~~IM RP 1E — Mitigation for Resource Production Land Agricultural Land Conversions — Establish mitigation alternatives for the conversion of resource production land to nonresource production uses. In addition, the County shall establish mitigation program guidelines for conversion of agricultural lands, regardless of General Plan land use designations. The mitigation program guidelines shall provide for mitigation of agricultural land conversion at a 1:1 ratio, either by direct acquisition of a conservation easement or an alternative method of mitigation, including, but not limited to, purchase of banked mitigation credits. For the purpose of mitigation, “agricultural land” shall be defined as follows:~~

- ~~If the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) has published official mapping data for Calaveras County, 1:1 mitigation shall be provided for Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide~~

~~Importance, as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) land inventory and monitoring criteria, as modified for California.~~

- ~~• Consistent with Public Resource Code Section 21060.1(b), in areas of the County where FMMP official mapping data is not available, 1:1 mitigation shall be provided for land that meets the requirements of “prime agricultural land” as defined in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subdivision (c) of Section 51201 of the Government Code.~~

~~In the interim, the County will utilize the Calaveras County Agricultural Coalition Resource Production Lands Mitigation Program Guidelines, prepared November 8, 2011 (Appendix B).~~

RP-1E Farmland Mapping – Obtain official mapping data for Calaveras County from the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, if and when available. To the extent that the mapping data shows Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance exists, require mitigation for any conversion of such land to nonagricultural purposes.

RP-1F Mitigation for Resource Production Land Conversions – Establish mitigation program guidelines for the conversion of land designated Resource Production on the General Plan Land Use Map to another non-resource production land use. The guidelines shall include, at a minimum, the following alternatives:

- Acquisition of a conservation easement located within Calaveras County at a 1:1 ratio
- Purchase of banked mitigation credits for use by a land bank operating in Calaveras County for use within the county
- Payment into a fund to restore, enhance and improve Resource Production designated land. The fund would be managed by the County Agricultural Department. Use of the fund would be determined by the Board of Supervisors with input from the Agriculture Department, the Calaveras County Resource Conservation District, the University of California Cooperative Extension Office, and the Agricultural Advisory Committee.
- Other mitigation measures developed and/or approved by the County.

The content of Implementation Measure RP-1E has been separated into two Implementation Measures: RP-1E and RP-1F. All remaining references to RP-1E in the EIR text are hereby assumed to refer to both Implementation Measures RP-1E and RP-1F. The above revision is for clarification purposes only, and does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Pages 2-289, 3-18, and 3-47 of the Final EIR are hereby revised as follows:

4.4-1(c) Policy COS-3.2 of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:

Policy COS 3.2 ~~Avoid impacts to habitats that support special-status and sensitive biological resources to the extent practicable, and, where avoidance is impracticable, mitigate impacts consistent with state and federal policies. To the extent practicable a~~ ~~Avoid impacts to habitats that are known to support state or federally listed species.~~ Where impacts cannot be avoided, compensate for these mitigate impacts in accordance with resource agency (CDFW and/or USFWS) protocols/policies for the listed species.

~~For project sites that support suitable breeding or dispersal habitats for listed species, in the absence of focused surveys proving absence, mitigation is warranted. For applicants that choose not to mitigate or compensate for impacts to such habitat based on the assumption that the habitat is suitable breeding or dispersal habitats for listed species, the County shall require project specific site surveys conducted per resource agency guidance for the FESA/CESA species in question by a permitted biologist. If such surveys are conducted with applicable resource agency concurrence and prove absence, do not produce detections, then mitigation requirements may be diminished or not be required by the County.~~

~~When appropriate, mitigation for impacts to CESA/FESA listed species and/or their habitats may be accomplished via CDFW and/or USFWS approval for the applicant to purchase species compensation credits from an agency approved conservation bank. For mitigation that includes avoidance on project sites or that provides offsite mitigation land preservation that will be protected in a conservation easement, a qualified biologist shall be required to develop a long term maintenance and management plan, and a Property Analysis Record (PAR) or PAR Like Endowment Spreadsheet Analyses for any onsite species avoidance area, and/or for either on or offsite mitigation preserves established to compen for a project's effects on CESA/FESA listed species.~~

The second and third paragraphs of above Policy COS 3.2 have been removed and added into the revised Implementation Measure COS-4H as follows.

The Final EIR is hereby revised to reflect the following changes to pages 2-15 and 4.4-34 of the Draft EIR:

IM COS-4H ~~The County shall require development that is subject to a discretionary entitlement and subject to environmental review under CEQA to evaluate potential impacts to biological resources and to minimize, avoid and/or mitigate significant impacts to the following special status species or as otherwise required by State or Federal law:~~

- ~~Threatened and endangered plant and animal species listed by the Federal Endangered Species Act.~~
- ~~Rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species listed by the California Endangered Species Act.~~
- ~~Other special status species including, but not limited to:~~
 - ~~A. Federal candidate species for listing under the FESA;~~
 - ~~B. State candidate species for listing under the CESA;~~
 - ~~C. California Fully Protected Species (protected pursuant to Fish and Game Code);~~
 - ~~D. California Species of Special Concern (CEQA Guideline §15382);~~
 - ~~E. Plant species listed by the California Native Plant Society as Ranks 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B (CEQA Guideline §15382);~~
 - ~~F. Nesting birds (protected pursuant to California Fish and Game Codes §§3503, 3503.5, 3511, and 3513 which prohibit the “take, possession, or destruction of birds, their nests or eggs.”);~~
 - ~~G. Birds of prey. All raptors (that is, hawks, eagles, owls) their nests, eggs, and young are protected under California Fish and Game Code (§3503.5);~~
 - ~~H. Birds protected pursuant to the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act;~~
 - ~~I. Bald eagles and golden eagles as protected pursuant to the federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d) and California Fish and Game Code (Section 3503.5).~~

~~For development that is subject to a discretionary entitlement and subject to environmental review under the CEQA, require project applicants to enlist the services of a qualified biologist and to minimize, avoid and/or mitigate significant impacts to the following special-status species or as otherwise required by State or Federal law:~~

- ~~Threatened and endangered plant and animal species listed by the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA).~~
- ~~Rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species listed by the California Endangered Species Act (CESA).~~
- ~~Other special-status species including, but not limited to:~~
 - ~~o Federal candidate species for listing under the FESA;~~
 - ~~o State candidate species for listing under the CESA;~~

- o California Fully Protected Species (protected pursuant to Fish and Game Code);*
- o California Species of Special Concern (protected pursuant to CEQA Guideline §15382); Calaveras County Conservation & Open Space Element – June 27, 2019 Page-COS 20*
- o Plant species listed by the California Native Plant Society as Ranks 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B (protected pursuant to CEQA Guideline §15382);*
- o Nesting birds (protected pursuant to California Fish and Game Codes §§3503, 3503.5, 3511, and 3513 which prohibit the “take, possession, or destruction of birds, their nests or eggs.”);*
- o Birds of prey. All raptors (that is, hawks, eagles, owls) their nests, eggs, and young are protected under California Fish and Game Code (§3503.5);*
- o Birds protected pursuant to the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act;*
- o Bald eagles and golden eagles as protected pursuant to the federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d) and California Fish and Game Code (Section 3503.5).*

Mitigation for impacts to special status species and/or their habitats may be accomplished by purchasing species compensation credits from an agency-approved conservation bank with CDFW and/or USFWS approval. For mitigation that includes avoidance on project sites or offsite mitigation preserves established to compensate for a project’s effects on CESA/FESA listed species, a qualified biologist shall be required to develop a long-term maintenance and management plan, and a Property Analysis Record (PAR) or PAR-Like Endowment Spreadsheet Analyses for any onsite species avoidance area.

COS 3.2 has been modified and incorporated into Implementation Measure COS-4H, as shown above. The above revision was made in order to address the issue of special-status species in an Implementation Measure rather than a policy and does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Pages 2-293 and 3-22 of the Final EIR are hereby revised as follows:

4.4-3(a) The following new policy shall be added to the Draft General Plan:

Policy COS 3.8—The County shall require development that is subject to a discretionary entitlement and subject to CEQA review to evaluate potential impacts to oak woodlands using the methodologies identified below and shall

~~require avoidance, preservation, and/or mitigation for potentially significant and significant impacts. Measures that shall be implemented include:~~

- ~~• Enlist the services of a qualified biologist, botanist, Registered Professional Forester, or arborist to survey the property in question for oak woodlands;~~
- ~~• To assess impacts On properties with a development footprint smaller than 10 acres the oak trees shall be counted and their diameter at breast height (DBH) determined; the number of trees that will be impacted shall be determined. On properties greater than 10 acres the acreage of contiguous oak woodland (based upon canopy cover) shall be calculated and the acreage of impact shall be quantified. Additionally, This may be completed by the qualified biologist, botanist, Registered Professional Forester, or arborist shall map the dripline (canopy) of the oak woodland using a global positioning system (GPS) technology in the field, or in the lab working from current aerial photographs;~~
- ~~• The dripline/canopy of the oak woodlands that are to be preserved shall be shown on all site development plans, grading plans, and/or engineering drawings so that all contractors are aware that this community is sensitive, protected, and must be avoided by project plans to the extent practicable.~~
- ~~• On properties less than 10 five acres, mitigation requirements shall include that removed oak trees to be removed shall be replaced at a mitigation ratio determined at the discretion of the County Planning Department. This ratio will be based on the species of oak removed. For example, for oak species that are common in the county, such as interior live oak (*Quercus wislizenii*), mitigation ratios may be lower than for less common oak species such as blue oaks (*Quercus douglasii*), valley oak (*Quercus lobata*) or black oaks (*Quercus kelloggii*). Ratios shall vary from 1:1 to as high as 3:1 at the discretion of the County Planning Department staff, and mitigation tree sizes shall vary between 5 gallon pots to 15 gallon box trees, depending on the size of the trees removed/impacted.~~
- ~~• On properties greater than between five and 10 acres, preservation requirements would include that a minimum of 30-20 percent of existing oak~~

~~woodland canopy shall be preserved. Tree replacement mitigation shall be as prescribed above for project site's smaller than 10 acres in size or as recommended in the following bullet point at the discretion of Calaveras County, unless it is demonstrated to the County that such preservation would prevent feasible development of a parcel. In addition, tree replacement mitigation shall be as prescribed above for properties that are less than five acres.~~

- ~~On properties between five and 10 acres where on site protection of 20 percent of existing oak woodland canopy is infeasible, and/or where tree replacement mitigation is infeasible, mitigation shall include one or more of the following measures: (1) A monetary contribution commensurate with the acreage of impacts to oak woodland shall be paid to the State's Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund for the purpose of purchasing oak woodland conservation easements as close to the project site as possible, and if feasible, within Calaveras County; (2) a combination of on site and off site planting as close to the project site as possible, and if feasible, within Calaveras County at a tree replacement ratio as described for properties that are less than five acres or above; or, (3) mitigation through oak woodland preservation at an acreage commensurate with the acreage of impacted oak woodland via recordation of a conservation easement that facilitates the perpetual protection of oak woodland. A management plan and Property Analysis Record (PAR), or PAR Like Endowment Spreadsheet Analyses shall be completed for any site intended for protection of oak woodland to ensure adequate in perpetuity management.~~
- ~~On parcels greater than 10 acres, preservation requirements would include that a minimum where on site protection of 30 percent of existing oak woodland canopy and replacement are infeasible, mitigation for project impacts to oak woodlands can include: a monetary contribution to the State's Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund for the purpose of purchasing oak woodland conservation easements, onsite planting mitigation compensation, or a combination of onsite and offsite planting, or mitigation through oak woodland preservation via recordation of a conservation easement that facilitates the perpetual protection of oak woodland, shall be~~

~~preserved. In addition, mitigation shall include one or more of the following measures: (1) A monetary contribution commensurate with the acreage of impacts to oak woodland shall be paid to the State's Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund for the purpose of purchasing oak woodland conservation easements as close to the project site as possible, and if feasible, within Calaveras County; (2) a combination of onsite and offsite planting as close to the project site as possible, and if feasible, within Calaveras County at a tree replacement ratio as described for properties that are less than 5 acres above; or, (3) mitigation through oak woodland preservation at an acreage that is commensurate with the acreage of impacted oak woodland via recordation of a conservation easement that facilitates the perpetual protection of oak woodland. A management plan and Property Analysis Record (PAR), or PAR-Like Endowment Spreadsheet Analyses shall be completed for any site intended for protection of oak woodland to ensure adequate in perpetuity management.~~

The above policy COS 3.8 has been removed from the EIR and added into revised Implementation Measure COS-4D on pages 2-296, 3-24, and 3-62 of the Final EIR. The revisions are as follows:

4.4-3(b) *Implementation Measure COS-4D of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:*

IM COS-4D Oak Woodlands. Develop a mitigation program in addition to the mitigation measures provided in the Oak Woodlands Preservation Act of 2014,¹⁸ where the County determines a project will have a significant effect on oak woodlands, to facilitate the environmental review process relative to mitigating significant direct and cumulative impacts to oak woodlands in conjunction with discretionary project approval and address pre-development removal of oaks. Develop local mitigation measures pursuant to PRC §21083.4(b)(4) in addition to the mitigation measures provided in Public Resources Code Section 21083.4(b)(1-3) to facilitate the environmental review process relative to mitigating significant direct and cumulative impacts to oak woodlands in conjunction with

discretionary project approval and address pre-development removal of oaks.

In the interim, require development that is subject to a discretionary entitlement and subject to CEQA review to enlist the services of a qualified professional (meaning a qualified biologist, botanist, arborist, or Registered Professional Forester) to survey the property in question for oak woodlands and to recommend options for avoidance and/or mitigation consistent with the provisions of RPC 21083.4 if potentially significant impacts to oak woodlands are identified. If a potentially significant impact to oak woodlands is identified, the following shall apply:

- The oak woodland on the project site shall be mapped and the extent of woodland canopy proposed to be removed as a result of the proposed project shall be identified.
- If avoidance is utilized for all or part of the mitigation, the oak woodland to be avoided by the project shall be protected by identifying the dripline of the oak woodland canopy to be preserved on all construction plans and by implementation of best management practices or other measures recommended by the qualified professional to prevent damage to the woodland to be preserved.
- Mitigation consistent with the provisions of PRC 21083.4, other than avoidance, shall be applied at a ratio of 1:1 to 2:1. The ration and the type(s) of mitigation chosen shall be informed by the recommendations of the qualified professional with respect to providing similar habitat functions and values as the woodland habitat removed as part of the project.
- If mitigation consisting of replacement planting, transplanting and/or identification of off-site mitigation through acquisition of a conservation easement is utilized, it shall be applied based on the recommendations of the qualified professional that the replacement habitat will provide similar habitat

functions and values as the woodland habitat removed as a part of the project, and to the extent feasible, mitigation shall take place in Calaveras County.

The above revision reflects the shifting of language from Policy COS 3.8 to Implementation Measure COS-4D. The revisions do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

The Final EIR is hereby revised to reflect that Policy COS 4.2 has been deleted on pages 2-10 and 4.3-36 of the Draft EIR, and shown as Implementation Measure COS-5I as follows:

4.3-2(a) ~~Policy IM COS 4.2~~ of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:

~~Policy IM COS 4.2~~ 5I ~~New development shall separate and/or buffer sensitive receptors from harmful air emission sources. Where feasible, buffer distances shall be maintained in compliance with the CARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook or as directed by the CCAPCD. Where buffer distances cannot be feasibly maintained per the CARB's guidance, and a proposed project may result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, the County shall require the preparation of a Health Risk Assessment for the proposed project. Such Health Risk Assessments shall be conducted in compliance conformance with guidance from the CCAPCD's Guidelines for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts of Land Use Projects as well as the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. The Health Risk Assessment shall include, in the event of a potential health risk where necessary, recommendations to reduce potential health risks to sensitive receptors which shall include, through including, but not limited to, the following:~~

- Buffer requirements;
- The installation of air filtration devices;
- Restrictions on the hours of operations of sources of TACs; and/or
- The implementation best available control technologies.

The County shall require that the recommendations from the Health Risk Assessment are implemented, as applicable, to ensure that sensitive receptors are not subject to to minimize the substantial health risk effects related to harmful air emission sources to sensitive receptors. (IM COS-5A)

The above revision moves the requirements of Policy COS 4.2 to Implementation Measure COS-5J. The above revision does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Policy COS 4.9 on pages 2-323, 3-14, and 3-44 of the Final EIR is hereby revised to reference Implementation Measure COS-5G as follows:

4.3-1(a) *The following new policy shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

~~Policy~~ ~~IM~~ ~~COS~~ ~~4.9~~ ~~5G~~ The County shall continue to support Cooperate with the CCAPCD to implement emissions reductions programs such as the Carl Moyer Program, and find methods of incentivizing the replacement or retrofit of small emissions sources throughout the County, such as the replacement of existing wood stoves with EPA Phase II certified appliances, and the installation of new replacement engines or technologies to reduce emission from off-road and on-road engines within the County.

The above revision moves the requirements of Policy COS 4.9 to Implementation measure COS-5G. The above revision does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Policy COS 4.10 on pages 2-324, 3-14, and 3-44 of the Final EIR is hereby revised to reference Implementation Measure COS-5H as follows:

4.3-1(b) *The following new policy shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

~~Policy~~ ~~IM~~ ~~COS~~ ~~4.10~~ ~~5H~~ Should proposed developments within the County be anticipated to result in potential significant impacts related to the emission of criteria air pollutants, the County shall consider imposing require the applicable mitigation measures provided in the CCAPCD's Guidelines for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts of Land Use Projects to the extent feasible.

The above revision was made to utilize mitigation from Policy COS 4.10 and move the requirements to Implementation Measure COS-5H. The above revision does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Policy COS 4.11 on page 2-324 of the Final EIR is hereby revised to reference Implementation Measure COS-5J as follows:

4.3-3(b) *The following new policy shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

~~Policy~~ ~~IM~~ ~~COS~~ ~~4.11~~ ~~5J~~ All construction, grading, quarrying, and surface mining operations within the County shall be required to consider comply with asbestos emissions regulations per adhere to asbestos emissions per CCAPCD Rule 906 –

Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure, and the California Air Resources Board's Final Regulation Order 2002-07-29 Asbestos ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations.

The above revision was made to utilize mitigation from Policy COS 4.11 and move the requirements to Implementation Measure COS-5J. The above revision does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Policy COS 4.12 has been revised on pages 2-12 and 4.3-38 of the Draft EIR, and shown in Implementation Measure COS-5K, as follows:

4.3-3 *The following new policy shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

~~Policy~~IM COS 4.125K *For development that is subject to a discretionary entitlement and subject to environmental review under the CEQA, Anew development shall separate and/or buffer sensitive receptors from sources of objectionable odors that would adversely affect a substantial number of people odiferous — compounds. Should new developments be anticipated to result in the emission of odiferous — compounds objectionable odors in proximity to existing or proposed sensitive receptors, the new source of odors shall be required to implement the best available control technologies or other measures to reduce the potential exposure of future sensitive receptors to odors. Additionally, if a proposed project includes placement of new sensitive receptors in proximity to existing sources of odors, the proposed project applicant shall be required to formally notify future sensitive receptors provide notice of the likelihood of exposure to substantial odors.*

The above revision moves policy to an Implementation Measure and provides clarification. The change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Policy COS 4.14 has been revised on pages 2-14 and 4.3-43 of the Draft EIR, and shown in Implementation Measure COS-5L as follows:

4.3-4(d) *The following new policy shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

~~Policy~~IM COS 4.145L *The County shall Investigate the potential use of woody biomass generated through forest management, such as thinning and defensible space clearing, for the generation of renewable energy.*

The above revision moves policy to an Implementation Measure and provides clarification. The change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to Policy COS 6.6, pages 2-47 and 4.12-132 of the Draft EIR have been revised and reflected in the Final EIR as follows:

4.12-10(a) *The following new policy shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

Policy COS 6.6 *The County shall Ceonsider the environmental sensitivity as well as the efficacy of the sites chosen for new recreation facilities. Whenever possible feasible, sites that are less environmentally sensitive will result in the least environmental impacts shall be selected for placement of new recreation facilities.*

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

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 2C, pages 2-10 and 4.3-35 of the Draft EIR have been revised, as follows:

4.3-1(c) *IM COS-2C of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:*

IM COS-2C *Air Quality Regulations re Prescribed Burning. Support modification of air quality regulations to accommodate the increased use of prescribed burning and other disposal methods on public and private lands where such activity would not pose a threat to nearby sensitive receptors or regional air quality.*

The above revision was made by the Planning Commission as the additional language could be infeasible due to fire safety concerns if control burns are not permitted; however, the change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 4J, pages 2-316, 3-20, and 3-50 of the Final EIR have been revised, as follows:

4.4-1(b) *The following new implementation measure shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

IM COS-4J *At the County's discretion, dDevelopment that is subject to a discretionary entitlement and subject to CEQA review shall be required to evaluate potential impacts to sensitive and significant communities using the methodologies identified below and shall require mitigation for potentially significant and significant impacts.*

- *Enlist the services of a qualified biologist or botanist to survey the property in question for sensitive and*

~~significant~~ plant communities including riparian woodland and lone chaparral;

- If any sensitive ~~or significant~~ plant community is identified on the proposed property, the qualified biologist or botanist shall map the dripline (canopy) and/or extent of the rare plant community using global positioning system (GPS) technology;
- The dripline/canopy and/or sensitive plant communities that are to be preserved shall be shown on all site development plans, grading plans, and/or engineering drawings so that all contractors are aware that this community is sensitive ~~protected, and must be avoided by project plans to the extent practicable and as such, impacts must be minimized by project plans to the extent possible, feasible.~~ Riparian drip line impacts require additional scrutiny and may require additional permitting from the CDFW pursuant to Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code.
- Mitigation for project impacts on the sensitive habitat ~~can~~ ~~may~~ include onsite planting mitigation compensation, or offsite mitigation through preservation via recordation of a conservation easement that facilitates the perpetual protection of similar habitat types as those that are impacted, consistent with COS-3.6, as necessary to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The above revision moves policy to an Implementation Measure and provides clarification. The change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 4K, pages 2-293, 3-21, and 3-52 of the Final EIR have been revised as follows:

4.4-2(b) *The following new implementation measure shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

IM COS-~~4K~~ 4L Support efforts to eradicate invasive species and encourage practices that reduce their spread (IM COS ~~4G~~). This can be completed by:

- Require new developments to submit landscape plans that are comprised of mostly native California plant species and avoid landscaping with invasive plant species. Such plans would be subject to the review and approval of the County Planning Department.
- On properties proposed for development or redevelopment that have been identified by a qualified botanist to support those invasive plant species that are identified on the California Invasive Plant Council inventory as having a ranking of "high" invasiveness (or in the case of the plant, stinkwort, which has a "moderate" ranking), removal efforts should be undertaken. The best means to remove the invasive species

~~(for example, hand removal or the use of herbicides) would be determined on a property by property basis by the contracted botanist/qualified biologist/restoration ecologist.~~

- ~~• To the maximum extent practicable, mechanical means (hand, tools, vehicles, appropriate animals, such as the short term use of domestic goats) shall be utilized to remove and control invasive weeds. If this is not possible, herbicides may be utilized. Use of herbicides must be undertaken by a licensed herbicide applicator.~~

~~For any discretionary permit that will be required for a property that has been identified on any resource map as supporting waters (creeks, rivers, streams, tributaries) and/or wetlands (for example, ponds, marshes, vernal pools), or that constitutes an open space or natural lands conversion, the County will require the land owner/project applicant to contract with a qualified wetlands scientist or biologist to evaluate if the project could result in the fill or hydrologic disruption of waters of the U.S./State (which includes wetlands) onsite or offsite. If a preliminary evaluation determines that a proposed project could adversely affect waters of the U.S./State, then a qualified wetlands scientist or biologist should delineate the extent of regulated waters in accordance with the federal and state policies. The project shall comply with the applicable requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board permitting requirements, Streambed Alteration Agreement requirements of California Fish and Game Code Section 1602, and other State and Federal laws.~~

~~Mitigation measures required by these resource agencies shall be conditions of project approval enforceable by Calaveras County.~~

The above revision moves policy to an implementation measure and provides clarification. The change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 4L, pages 2-322, 3-18, and 3-62 of the Final EIR have been revised as follows:

4.4-5(b) *The following new implementation measure shall be added to the Draft General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element:*

~~IM COS-4L 4M~~ ~~The County shall~~ For development subject to a discretionary entitlement and environmental review under CEQA, work with applicants to encourage preservation—preserve or enhancement—of upland habitat for wildlife species to the maximum extent feasible on parcels slated for development containing suitable habitat (e.g. areas used for foraging, breeding, dispersal, etc.). Habitat preservation and enhancement shall be encouraged throughout the County in a way

that promotes regional connectivity of open space habitats. The County shall work with applicants to encourage design development to be compatible with wildlife movement. Mitigation measures may include installing wildlife friendly fencing or lighting to minimize interference with wildlife movement. Creek corridors should shall be preserved in undeveloped open spaces or under conservation easements as creek corridors provide linear wildlife corridors through the County. Similarly, If open spaces are to be preserved within developed areas, they should shall have connectivity to/with other dedicated or undevelopable open space lands to the extent possiblefeasible.

The above revision moves policy to an Implementation Measure and provides clarification. The change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 4M, pages 2-315, 3-21, and 3-54 of the Final EIR have been revised, as follows:

4.4-2(c) The following new implementation measure shall be added to the Draft General Plan:

~~IM COS-4M 4N~~ The County shall ~~Adopt~~ an ordinance or resolution conserving riparian corridors. In the interim, lake pond, river, and perennial stream corridor habitat shall be conserved through retention of undisturbed buffers with building setback and the requirement to avoid any barrier to wildlife movement along the water corridor. Within Community Areas as identified on the Land Use Map, new development shall ensure that buffers of a minimum width of 75' from the centerline of the stream or river are left undisturbed along stream corridors. Outside of Community Areas, buffers of a minimum width of 100' from lake or pond or from the centerline of the stream or river shall be left undisturbed. The width of the buffer may be reduced based on a recommendation from a qualified biologist that the reduced width will provide a comparable wildlife movement corridor. for development that is subject to a discretionary entitlement and environmental review under CEQA, buffer areas shall be established along rivers, streams, and intervening lakes and ponds, based on the recommendation of a qualified biologist to avoid any barrier to wildlife movement along the water corridor. The County shall adopt the feasible recommendations of the biologist.

The revision of Implementation Measure COS-4M changes the lettering and requires a qualified biologist set the buffer standards. The change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 4N, pages 2-315, 3-26, and 3-64 of the Final EIR have been revised, as follows:

4.4-5(d) The following new IM shall be added to the Draft General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element as follows:

IM COS-~~4N4O~~ Provide information to the public regarding significant wildlife corridors. In areas of the County where a significant wildlife corridor has been identified (e.g., a deer migration corridor, a federally or state listed amphibian migration route), the County and applicants for discretionary projects other parties proposing improvements in these areas identified by CDFW as significant migration corridors, shall prepare and submit any improvement plans that must be approved by the County. Those plans must show showing properly sized and constructed wildlife passage culverts or other under or over crossing plans that will provide safe passageways over or under constructed, improved or modified roadways. In significant wildlife corridors areas, when feasible possible, fencing will be used to direct animals to these under crossings or other roadway crossings. Safety signage may also be utilized to alert drivers to specific areas used by mule deer and other large wildlife for roadway crossings.

The above revision changes the lettering to an Implementation Measure and provides clarification; however, the change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 4O, pages 2-37, 3-19, and 3-49 of the Final EIR have been revised. The revision is hereby as follows:

4.4-1(d) The following new implementation measure shall be added to the Draft General Plan:

IM COS-~~4O4P~~ Prior to the removal of potential bat roosting sites. For development subject to a discretionary entitlement and environmental review under CEQA, a pre-project survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine which bat species are using the site. Should special-status bat species be found present on-site, feasible mitigation shall be required, such as installing exclusionary devices at the instruction of a qualified biologist and/or construction of replacement roost structures, including bat houses, other structures, or crevices incorporated into bridge design shall be required prior to the removal of potential bat roosting sites. Replacement roost structures should be monitored to document bat use.

The above revision changes the lettering to an Implementation Measure and provides clarification. The change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 4P, pages 2-321, 3-26, and 3-65 of the Final EIR have been revised, as follows:

~~4.4-5(e) The following new IM shall be added to the Draft General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element:~~

~~IM COS 4P Development with the potential to dredge or fill material into, or otherwise impact, wetlands or waters of the U.S. shall apply for appropriate permitting from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Where direct or indirect impacts such as grading, fill, or hydrologic disturbance may affect wetlands, aquatic impact minimization measures shall be applied to minimize any potential impacts, consistent with applicable U.S. Army Corps of Engineers requirements.~~

Implementation Measure COS 4P has been removed from the Final EIR as the measure was deemed unnecessary given that the measure requirements are already required by federal law.

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 5B, pages 2-12, 3-15, and 3-45 of the Final EIR have been revised. The revision is hereby as follows:

4.3-4(b) IM COS-5B of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:

IM COS-5B GHG Baseline for Calaveras County. Undertake a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory to establish baseline levels of GHGs generated from all major emission sources in the County, including those in the City of Angels Camp, consistent with the requirements of Assembly Bill 32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) and SB 32, Endeavor to complete the inventory by December 31, 2020.

The above revision provides a timeframe, and does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Pages 2-381, 3-15, and 3-45 of the Final EIR are hereby revised as follows:

4.3-4(c) IM COS-5C of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:

IM COS-5C GHG Reduction Plan. Develop a GHG reduction plan outlining the strategies, goals, and actions for contributing to the overall reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions consistent with AB 32 and SB 32 by 2021. The GHG Reduction Plan shall incorporate measures from the Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans document produced by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (2009), as applicable. The GHG reduction plan shall:

- Establish a forecast of what the GHG emissions would be for all of Calaveras County in 2030 if only the current GHG measures continued in force;
- Calculate what reduction from the forecast would be needed to comply with AB 32 and SB

32's statewide performance standard of 40% below 1990 emission levels;

- Add whatever additional GHG measures are necessary to accomplish reductions of GHG emissions as of 2030 from all sectors within the county to no more than that amount;
- Cooperate with the City of Angels Camp, other public agencies, the business community, the agriculture community, community groups, and other stakeholders in reaching this goal

Additional revisions have been made to Implementation Measure COS-5C to include additional provisions that address AB 32 and SB 32. The change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure COS 5F, pages 2-15 and 4.3-43 of the Draft EIR are hereby revised and included in the Final EIR as follows:

4.3-4(e) *The following new implementation measure shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

~~IM COS-5F *Modify the County's development standards and zoning ordinance to provide incentives for providing infrastructure that supports alternative fueled vehicles, such as electric vehicle charging stations, natural gas fueling capabilities, and biodiesel. Evaluate proposed discretionary developments subject to CEQA evaluation to determine whether they will emit criteria air pollutants, including greenhouse gasses, exceeding CCAPCD's standards.*~~

The above revision the shifting of implementation measures pursuant to Planning Commission changes. The change does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

Implementation Measure N-1E, changes to IM N-1E on pages 2-40, 4.10-25, and 4.10-27 of the Draft EIR are hereby added to the Final EIR with revisions as follows:

4.10-2 *Implementation Measure N-1E shall be revised as follows:*

IM N-1E Acoustic Analysis – When an acoustic analysis is required for a development project the analysis shall be prepared by a qualified professional and include the following:

- *Ambient noise level measurements of existing conditions;*
- *Anticipated noise levels generated by the project;*
- *Recommend measures to achieve compliance with ensure noise levels do not exceed the noise standards set forth in Tables Noise 1 and 2;*
- *Estimate of noise levels after the mitigation measures have been implemented; and*
- *Noise monitoring program.*

The above revision restores the original implementation measure language; however, the revision does not affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

As a result of a change to policy S 1.7, changes to S 1.7 on pages 2-44 and 4.12-98 of the Draft EIR are hereby added to the Final EIR with revisions as follows:

4.12-2(b) *Policy S1.7 of the Draft General Plan shall be revised as follows:*

Policy S 1.7 Locate new essential public facilities, utilities, and services away from identified hazard areas. ~~The County shall consider the environmental sensitivity as well as the efficacy of the sites chosen for new fire protection facilities. Whenever possible~~ Where ~~feasible and equivalently useful~~, sites that are less environmentally sensitive shall be selected for development of new fire protection facilities. ~~and, where feasible, existing facilities shall be upgraded to increase the efficacy of fire protection new facilities.~~

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

As a result of a change to policy PF 1.8, pages 2-45 and 4.12-106 of the Draft EIR are hereby added to the Final EIR with revisions as follows:

4.12-4(b) *The following new policy shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

~~Policy PF 1.8~~ ~~The County shall~~ ~~e~~Consider the environmental sensitivity as well as the efficacy of the sites chosen for installation of new public facilities. Whenever ~~possible~~ ~~feasible and equivalently useful~~, sites that are less environmentally sensitive shall be selected for placement of new public facilities.

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

As a result of a change to policy PF 2.11, pages 2-46 and 4.12-113 of the Draft EIR have been revised. The revision shall be shown in the revisions to text section of the Final EIR. The revision is hereby as follows:

4.12-5 *The following new policy shall be added to the Draft General Plan:*

~~Policy PF 2.11~~ ~~The County shall~~ ~~e~~Consider the environmental sensitivity, as well as the efficacy of the sites chosen, for construction of new or expanded water conveyance infrastructure. Whenever ~~possible~~ ~~feasible and equivalently useful~~, sites that are less environmentally sensitive shall be selected for placement of new water ~~conveyance~~ infrastructure.

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

As a result of a change to Implementation Measure PF-4D, pages 2-48, 3-32 and 3-68 of the Final EIR are hereby revised as follows:

IM PF-4D

Emergency Communications. Install facilities that create or enhance voice and data communications between law enforcement and emergency service providers and between emergency responders and the public. The County shall consider the environmental sensitivity as well as the efficacy of the sites chosen for installation of new emergency communications facilities. Whenever ~~possible, feasible and equivalently useful~~, sites that are less environmentally sensitive shall be selected for placement of new emergency communications facilities.

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