EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TITLE/SUBJECT: Certification of the Final Master Environmental Impact Report and approval of the proposed Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan

Board Action:

April 5, 2004: The EID Board of Directors approved funding and award of Professional Services Contract to Foothill Associates in for preparation of Master Plan and EIR for the Sly Park Recreation Area.

January 8 and February 26, 2007: The EID Board of Directors received project updates for the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan and Master Environmental Impact Report.

March 12, 2007: The EID Board of Directors held a public comment meeting on the proposed Master Plan and Draft Master Environmental Impact Report.

Board Policy/Administrative Regulations:

BP10010.1 – The District is committed to the health and safety of visitors and District employees at all EID recreation facilities and to the protection of District recreation properties.

In order for the EID Board of Directors to approve the proposed Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan, the Board must certify an Environmental Impact Report in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), CEQA Guidelines, and the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) Procedures to Implement CEQA.

Summary of Issue:

Ownership and responsibility for the Sly Park Unit were transferred from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) to EID in December 2003. Reclamation's 1969 master plan for the Sly Park Unit was updated in 1976 with the *Sly Park Updated General Recreation Development Plan*, which has long outlived its relevance and usefulness. Reclamation's plan does not identify the level of maintenance required for the types and intensities of existing and future park uses, and facilities identified in that plan have largely been developed. Over time, the lack of modern planning and adequate fiscal resources has resulted in a consistent degradation of Sly Park's environmental quality, camping experiences, and public safety. A new master plan is needed to ensure that the park is developed, redeveloped, maintained and managed in a way that promotes compatibility of land uses, environmental protection, recreation opportunities that meet evolving demands, and public safety.

In April 2004, the Board recognized the environmental and facility issues facing Sly Park and approved preparation of a new master plan. The new proposed master plan was prepared in close

consultation with EID Departments of Recreation and Environmental Compliance and Water Policy with involvement from EID Departments of Facilities Management, Finance and Management Services, and Strategic Management and Communication. In addition to this internal coordination and consultations with all responsible agencies, the master plan reflects issues and concerns identified by the public through a series of public meetings, as listed below:

- June 8 and 9, 2004 – public workshops
- June 22 and 23, 2004 – public workshops
- August 11, 2004 – public design charette
- March 12, 2007 – public comment meeting on proposed Master Plan and Draft Master EIR

Master Plan Overview
The resulting Master Plan is intended to serve as a blueprint to guide development, redevelopment, maintenance and management of the park over the next 20 years. It includes design standards, a forest management plan, a market analysis, and a financing plan, and would be implemented in phases as facility needs arise and as financial resources are available. There is no obligation to construct a particular component of the project.

The following is a summary of the primary components of the proposed Master Plan:

Three Year Phasing Plan
Improve existing campsites
- Campsite design
- Access
- Water service
- Road improvements
- Rehabilitate vegetation
- Shoreline protection
- Creek protection

New campsites for new markets
- Primitive Area
- Cabins/yurts
- Tent platforms

New/improved trails
New parking lots
- Bumpy Meadows
- Marina

Lake Drive access improvements
Increased staffing

Five Year Phasing Plan
Move kiosk further from Sly Park Road
Scout Hill Improvements

Miwok Trailhead improvements
Campsite improvements
Dog park
Retreat and Event Center
New mountain bike trail
Maintenance improvements

- Proactive
- Annual maintenance work plan
- Volunteer maintenance events
- Trail maintenance plan

Emergency Preparedness Plan
Law Enforcement improvements

Ten Year Phasing Plan
New shop/maintenance yard improvements
Campsite improvements
New campsites
Pilot cabins
Road improvements
Primitive campsites

Over Ten Year Phasing Plan
New Visitor Center and Headquarters
Additional Scout Hill improvements
Sugarloaf Fine Arts Camp
Retreat and Event Center cabins/toilet

Staffing

The Draft Master Plan indicates that the Sly Park Recreation Area requires eight additional full time personnel. Staff recommends that two full time positions be funded within the 3-year phasing plan: 1) Maintenance Worker; 2) Combination of three recommended positions (Volunteer Coordinator, Events Coordinator, and Grants Writer) into one position, which would be expanded as needed.

Other Agency Approvals
Timber harvest plan aspects of the project must be approved by the California Department of Forestry, the new marina parking lot component must be approved by the California Department of Boating and Waterways prior to authorizing funding, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation must approve the Bumpy Meadows parking lot component prior to authorizing funding.

Since Sly Park is now owned by EID and because the Master Plan is a recreation plan rather than a water supply project, the Master Plan is subject to the land use authority of El Dorado County. Therefore, the Master Plan requires approval from El Dorado County. As such, staff has worked

extensively with the County since 2004 in the development of the Master Plan and EIR. On February 14, 2007 staff submitted an application for zoning change general plan amendment and special use permit. On March 21, 2007 staff received notice from the County that the application was deemed complete. The next step in the process is a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting that will be scheduled by the County. Following the TAC meeting, the project will be presented to the County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for consideration. Staff hopes to complete this process by June so that the EID Board of Directors may consider construction contracts for the grant-funded projects by July, provided the EID Board approves the Master Plan.

Staff Analysis/Evaluation:

The proposed Master Plan includes both environmental restoration and recreation development components. Most components are designed to control erosion, protect cultural resources, improve habitat, protect water quality, increase definition and visual qualities of campgrounds, improve traffic and pedestrian circulation, and provide more diversity in recreational opportunities. These types of components have either positive environmental effects or represent impacts that are less than significant or easily mitigated.

Other components involve construction of new facilities or redevelopment of existing facilities. Most of these components are within areas that have been previously disturbed. The Sugarloaf facility, which is the main proposed facility not located in a previously disturbed area, would be located in an area that could result in the loss of approximately 500 trees. However the proposed location is not adjacent to Jenkinson Lake or near other facilities. With mitigation, the impacts associated with the Sugarloaf facility and other new construction can be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.

The one component of the Master Plan that cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant is the new Marina Parking Lot. The proposed site is located on the east side of Marina Road north of the existing marina and marina parking lot. About 180 trees would be removed and the area between Marina Road and Jenkinson Lake would be graded. A single line of trees would remain along the lake shore. Following construction, additional vegetation would be planted that would eventually provide additional screening from the lake. Proposed mitigation measures would reduce the visual impact, but implementation of the mitigation would not reduce the visual impact to less than significant. The new marina parking lot component of the Master Plan is proposed to help meet parking demands during the peak boating season, when overflow parking illegally occurs along Marina Drive. This constricts the width of the road, which prevents full emergency access and creates traffic problems. Comments received during the public comment period and at the public comment meeting on the Draft Master EIR indicate that the new marina parking lot component is controversial.

Alternatives Consideration
Five alternatives are identified below that provide for approval of the Master Plan. There are alternatives to the proposed parking lot (Alternative 1) that would resolve existing parking issues along Marina Road. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 below provide for approval of the Master Plan at

lesser levels of environmental impact by either eliminating the new parking lot component altogether, by moving the lot further away from the lake, and/or reducing the number of spaces. Each alternative would set a maximum number of boats on the lake at any one time consistent with the available parking supplies to avoid illegal parking along Marina Drive. However, only the proposed parking lot (Alternative 1) meets California Department of Boating and Waterways standards and provides superior parking design and circulation. Thus, the proposed parking lot is the only grant fundable alternative.

The Final Master EIR identifies Alternative 2 (the proposed Master Plan without the new marina parking lot) as the environmentally superior alternative. If the Board finds that based on substantial evidence in the record that none of the proposed project alternatives are feasible based on social, economic, technological, legal and/or other reasons, it may approve the proposed project with the significant environmental effects. To approve the Master Plan as proposed, the Board must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, included in the attached resolution.

Staff is requesting that the Board adopt the attached resolution certifying the Final Master EIR, adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Plan, making Findings of Fact, making a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and approving the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan.

Board Decisions/Options:

Option 1: Adopt the Resolution of the Board of Directors of El Dorado Irrigation District to:

- Certify the Final Master Environmental Impact Report
- Adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Plan
- Make Findings of Fact
- Make a Statement of Overriding Considerations
- Approve the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan

Option 2: Same as Option 1, except:

- Approve the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan without the New Marina Parking Lot (Alternative 2 as described in the Final Master EIR)

Option 3: Same as Option 1, except:

- Approve the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan with the 20 space design for the New Marina Parking Lot (Alternative 3 as described in the Final Master EIR)

Option 4: Same as Option 1, except:

- Approve the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan with the 10 space design for the New Marina Parking Lot (Alternative 4 as described in the Final Master EIR)

Option 5: Take no action on the Final Master EIR or the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan

Staff/General Manager's Recommendation:

Option 1: Adopt the Resolution of the Board of Directors of El Dorado Irrigation District to:

- Certify the Final Master Environmental Impact Report
- Adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Plan
- Make Findings of Fact
- Make a Statement of Overriding Considerations
- Approve the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan

Attachments:

- Proposed Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan
- Draft Master EIR
- Final Master EIR
- Resolution of the Board of Directors of El Dorado Irrigation District

Don Pearson
Recreation Director

Chich Goss
Assistant Recreation Director

Daniel Corcoran
Environmental Review Manager
Environmental Compliance and Water Policy

David Witter
Director of Environmental Compliance and Water Policy

Ane D. Deister
General Manager

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
CERTIFYING THE FINAL MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT,
ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN,
MAKING FINDINGS OF FACT, MAKING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING
CONSIDERATIONS, AND APPROVING THE
SLY PARK RECREATION AREA MASTER PLAN

WHEREAS, on August 5, 2002, the EID Board of Directors approved a Memorandum of Agreement between the United States of America, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation and El Dorado Irrigation District (MOA) to implement the transfer of the Sly Park Unit from the United States to EID ownership; and

WHEREAS, the pre-existing Sly Park Updated General Recreation Development Plan prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1976 is no longer a useful master planning tool because of its age and the recent land transfer from the Bureau to EID; and

WHEREAS, the development of the proposed master plan would be consistent with EID's Mission Statement of providing high quality recreation services in an environmentally and fiscally responsible manner; and

WHEREAS, on June 8, 9, 22, and 23, 2004, EID held public scoping workshops to solicit public input on issues to be addressed by the proposed Master Plan and Draft Master Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR); and

WHEREAS, on August 11, 2004, EID held a design charette to solicit public input regarding design parameters of the proposed Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, on September 30, 2004, EID released an Initial Study and Notice of Preparation for the project for a 30-day review period; and

WHEREAS, EID prepared a Draft EIR to address the potentially significant impacts of the project; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR was released on January 17, 2007 for a 45-day public review period; and

WHEREAS, on March 12, 2007, EID held a public meeting to take public comment on the contents of the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan Final Master Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2004102011) (the Final EIR), consisting of the Draft EIR, revisions to the Draft EIR, a list of persons and agencies commenting on the Draft EIR, comments on the Draft EIR, responses to potentially significant environmental issues raised in those comments, and a Mitigation Monitoring Plan, has been prepared pursuant to CEQA (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) to analyze the environmental effects of the project; and

WHEREAS, on April 9, 2007, the EID Board of Directors considered a Final Master EIR (Final EIR) on the project; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors held a public hearing on April 9, 2007 to receive public testimony and take action on the project; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT that:

1. The Board of Directors hereby certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and adopts the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations attached hereto as Exhibit A.
2. The Final EIR was presented to the Board of Directors, and the Board has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the project.
3. The Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of EID.
4. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in the Final EIR is hereby adopted to ensure implementation of feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR.
5. The Board has considered several alternatives to the Project as proposed, and concluded based on substantial evidence in the record that none of the proposed project alternatives are feasible based on the consideration of social, economic, legal, technological, and other reasons, as discussed herein.
6. The Board approves the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan.

7. Documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based shall be in the custody of the Clerk to the Board at EID Headquarters.
8. A Notice of Determination shall be filed immediately after approval of the project.

The foregoing Resolution was introduced at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT, held on the 9th of April 2007, by Director , who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Director , and a poll vote taken which stood as follows:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

The motion having a majority of votes "Aye", the resolution was declared to have been adopted, and it was so ordered.

_____

President, Board of Directors of
EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

ATTEST:

_____

Clerk to the Board

(SEAL)

I, the undersigned, Clerk to the Board of the EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT hereby certify that the foregoing resolution is a full, true and correct copy of a Resolution of the Board of Directors of the EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT entered into and adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors held on the 9th day of April, 2007.

_____

Clerk to the Board
EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

EXHIBIT A

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL BY MITIGATION MEASURES INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT

The Final Master EIR indicates that the following significant impacts of the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan (SPRA Master Plan) are reduced to a "less than significant" level by the mitigation measures described:

Land Use and Planning

Impact LU-1: Modifications to the existing facilities and implementation of the SPRA Master Plan would require discretionary approval by the County of El Dorado. As such, the proposed facilities and uses would be required to be consistent with the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. Implementation of the SPRA Master Plan and development of individual SPRA Master Plan components would result in inconsistency with the El Dorado County General Plan as currently proposed. However, approval of a general plan amendment (a change from Natural Resource to Tourist Recreational land use designation), a rezone (a change from Residential Agricultural to Recreational Facilities zoning districts) and a special use permit would allow for the implementation of Master Plan elements in a manner consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance (see Sections 4.1.4.7 and 4.1.4.8 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure LU-1*:** An application for a General Plan amendment and rezone to Recreational Facilities shall be submitted to the El Dorado County Planning Services for review and approval. No development shall be permitted to commence until such time as the general plan amendment and rezone has been approved by the County of El Dorado.

***Mitigation Measure LU-2*:** Before adoption of the SPRA Master Plan by the EID Board of Directors, an application for a special use permit shall be submitted to the El Dorado County Planning Services for review and approval. No development shall be permitted to commence until such time as the special use permit has been issued by the County of El Dorado.

Agriculture

Impact AG-1: Development of individual components proposed under the SPRA Master Plan would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to agricultural and timber lands. Pursuant to the adopted County Interim Interpretive Guidelines for El Dorado County General Plan Policies 8.1.3.2 and 8.4.1.2, non-compatible land uses proposed on project area parcels would be required to provide for a setback of 200 feet when adjacent to parcels located within the Timberland Preserve and Residential Agricultural zoning districts (see Table 4.2–1. of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure AG-1*:** A minimum 200-foot setback from parcel boundaries shall be maintained for the project footprint where abutting land identified by the County of El Dorado as located within the Timberland Preserve Zoning District. The requirements for the 200-foot setback may be reduced or waived for individual project components, if approved by the County Agricultural Commissioner or the Director of Development Services.

***Mitigation Measure AG-2*:** On project parcels 10 acres or larger in area, agriculturally incompatible uses shall be set back a minimum of 200 feet from any adjacent parcel that is agriculturally zoned, unless the requirement for the 200-foot setback is reduced or waived by the County Agricultural Commissioner or the Director of Development Services.

Aesthetics

Impact AES-1: The Scout/Youth camp is in an area that was rated Class III/IV, allowing for a higher degree of modification to the visual character. This is primarily because of the existing character of the landscape and the fact that the area is not very visible from most areas of SPRA. Because of the size of the Mess Hall and the number of Yurts proposed, this project would have the potential to significantly affect the views of the nearby residents, unless proper mitigation measures are implemented to screen these structures and help them to blend into the natural landscape (see Table 4.3–4 of the Draft Master EIR)

Improvements at Jenkinson Camp are unlikely to be visible from sensitive receptors because of screening by vegetation.

Improvements at Chimney may be visible from adjacent campsites, from the Chimney day-use area, and from the Lake and would have the potential to significantly affect the visual quality, unless mitigation is incorporated.

The proposed cabins at the Retreat and Event Center would have the potential to be visible from adjacent group camps, the Marina area, the south shore trail, and the north shore campgrounds west of the narrows. These cabins could have significant aesthetic impacts if mitigation is not incorporated.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure AES-1*:** Use colors for structures that are compatible with the natural landscape.

***Mitigation Measure AES-2*:** Avoid removal of existing trees. Adjust locations of facilities as practicable to minimize impacts to existing vegetation. Use retaining walls where feasible to protect existing trees from cut/fill within the drip-line. Where removal of trees is necessary, replant with fast growing, native species suitable to site conditions. Develop a Mitigation Monitoring Plan to ensure survival of plantings.

***Mitigation Measure AES-3*:** If existing vegetation is insufficient to screen improvements from potentially sensitive receptors, plant additional vegetation sufficient to provide a visual screen. Use both trees and shrubs to create a layered visual barrier.

Impact AES-2: The Master Plan design criteria specify that the "design and placement of facilities ...be subordinate to the natural landscape setting and consistent with the existing character of the Park" and that colors and finishes should "complement the shades and tones of the environment" and "appear natural and consistent with the environment." If these criteria are applied to construction of restrooms, permanent site aesthetics impacts would be less than significant (see Table 4.3–4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Impacts to site aesthetics would be significant if trees are removed or large areas of soil are disturbed. Avoiding large trees and locating facilities where grading is minimized would reduce these impacts below a level of significance.

Visual impacts because of construction could be significant if conducted during peak SPRA usage times. For construction of facilities in general, off-season times should be preferred over peak-season times, and weekdays over weekends.

Shower/laundry facilities only have the ability to potentially affect views internal to a campground. Because of their limited size, they would not influence vista views. As with restrooms, if the design guidelines are followed, shower/laundry facilities should not affect the aesthetics of SPRA to a greater extent than the existing restroom facilities. These types of facilities fit with a visitor's expectations of a campground, and provided that they are "consistent with the existing character of the Park," would not result in a significant visual impact.

Impacts to site aesthetics could be significant if trees are removed or large areas of soil are disturbed. Avoiding large trees and locating facilities where grading is minimized would reduce these impacts below a level of significance.

Visual impacts because of construction could be significant if conducted during peak SPRA usage times. For construction of facilities in general, off-season times should be preferred over peak-season times, and weekdays over weekends.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure AES-2*:** See above.

***Mitigation Measure AES-4*:** Site facilities to minimize the need for extensive site grading. Avoid steep cut and fill banks that will have difficulty revegetating. Plant cut-and-fill banks to aid in revegetation. Use retaining walls where necessary to retain soil and minimize cut/fill banks. Consider the use of planting pockets or stepped walls with vegetation planted between tiers for retaining walls that cannot easily be screened by planting at the base of the wall.

***Mitigation Measure AES-5*:** Where feasible, conduct construction at times when it will not have significant impacts on SPRA visitors: off-season is preferable to peak-season, and weekdays are preferable to weekends.

Impact AES-3: New parking areas would have the potential for impacting aesthetics of SPRA in several ways:

- Creating large expanses of paved, graveled or packed-dirt surfaces;
- Centralizing cars which may result in increased glare during the day and increased light pollution at night;
- Removing trees;
- Creating unsightly cut/fill banks;
- Disturbing soil and vegetation during construction; and
- Storing and operating heavy equipment in a natural area.

These impacts would generally be considered localized to the area immediately adjacent to the construction site. It is unlikely that the development of new parking areas would affect vista-views, but impacts would none-the-less be considered potentially significant if mitigation is not incorporated (see Table 4.3–4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures AES-2, AES-4, and AES-5*:** See above.

***Mitigation Measure AES-6*:** Where feasible, use naturally colored pavements or additives. Incorporate planting islands into parking lots help preserve existing trees, plant new trees and break up large expanses of pavement.

***Mitigation Measure AES-7*:** Maintain plantings around parking areas to reduce glare and light impacts.

***Mitigation Measure AES-8*:** Minimize soil and vegetation disturbance during construction. Replant disturbed areas as soon after construction is completed as feasible.

Impact AES-5: Campground road alignments would generally result in improved site aesthetics because the purpose of these alignments are to reduce erosion and vegetation disturbance, improve grades, and better accommodate two-way traffic. In some areas, retaining walls may be required to accommodate cut/fill slopes. In those cases, some level of mitigation would be required to reduce the visual impact of the retaining walls (see Table 4.3–4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Additionally, realigning the roads would require heavy equipment for construction and paving. This construction would be planned to minimize impacts.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures AES-2, AES-4, AES-5, and AES-8*:** See above.

Impact AES-6: These facilities are located at the entrance, away from the lake and screened by trees from any sensitive viewsheds. Visibility by potentially sensitive receptors would be negligible; however, the Visitor Center would potentially be seen by all visitors who enter the Park. If the design guidelines in the Master Plan are implemented, it would result in a visual improvement, rather than an impact.

Temporary impacts because of construction could be significant, and construction would be done off-season or away from peak visitation times (see Table 4.3–4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure AES-5*:** See above.

Impact AES-7: The Sugarloaf Fine Arts Camp is within several of the viewsheds identified as potentially sensitive in this study; however, because of intervening trees, parking structures or facilities are unlikely to be seen from sensitive viewpoints. Tree canopy modifications are likely to be noticed as holes in the canopy, so removal of existing trees should be avoided wherever possible. Where removal of trees over six inches DBH is necessary, additional trees should be planted to replace those removed. The facility parking lot, sports courts, and amphitheater are likely to have the largest impact on the canopy. The parking lot is on the opposite side of the ridge from potentially sensitive viewers, so it is less likely to create a noticeable hole than the other elements (see Table 4.3–4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures AES-2, AES-3, AES-6, and AES-8*:** See above.

Impact AES-8: Stabilization of Lake Drive between Chimney and Hazel Creek camps would require relocation of the road and construction of a retaining wall upslope of the road. At this time, it is not known how large the retaining wall would be; however, it would be visible from the Lake and South Shore trail, as well as to travelers on Lake Drive, and would require mitigation to reduce visual impacts to a less than significant level (see Table 4.3–4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Additionally, construction would be coordinated to reduce the visual impact of heavy equipment and disturbed areas on visitors.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures AES-4, AES-5, and AES-8*:** See above.

Air Quality

Impact AQ-1: Air Quality Impacts resulting from implementation of the project are categorized as follows:

1. Short-term impacts related to construction activities; and

2. Long-term impacts from the use of facilities, including additional vehicle trips from new visitors to SPRA because of the operation of new facilities.

The individual components proposed as part of SPRA include a variety of recreational facility, educational, road and access, and natural resource protection and restoration improvements. Many of these improvements would require little or no mechanized construction activity. Components that are expected to require grading and building include facilities at the Sugarloaf Fine Arts Center, the Retreat and Event Center, the Scout/Youth Group Camp upgrade, and the Marina Parking Lot expansion. Road widening, paving, and alignment improvements would occur throughout SPRA. However, all components would be constructed in phases as funding allows.

The largest area to be disturbed from any single project at one time is expected to be less than two acres. The longest road widening and/or paving is at any single time is expected to be less than one-half mile. Among the cabins, yurts, and event buildings, the largest solid walled building to be constructed is expected to be approximately 15,000 square feet. It is anticipated that the maximum daily additional vehicle trips to SPRA generated by the Master Plan components, including the Sugarloaf Fine Arts Camp, the Retreat and Event Center, and the Scout/Youth Group Camp upgrade would be approximately 1,310 daily trips if all three of these event areas would be used at full capacity on the same day. However, on many days, one or more of these activity centers may not be utilized or would not be at full capacity (see Section 4.5.4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure AQ-1*:** Construction activities will limit the amount of actively disturbed ground areas to no more than 6 acres on any single day.

***Mitigation Measure AQ-2*:** The construction contractor(s) shall maintain equipment in tune per manufacturer specifications. The construction contractor(s) shall use catalytic converters on gasoline-powered equipment. The construction contractor(s) shall not leave inactive construction equipment idling for prolonged periods (i.e., more than 5 minutes).

Noise

Impact Noise-1: Construction of a covered pavilion and duplex cabins at the Retreat and Event Center, and the construction of two mess halls, cabins, and yurts at the Scout/Youth Group Camp would involve a larger amount of equipment although these components would be built over a period of years and in different phases. The construction of SPRA improvements such as additional parking, campground access roads, visitor center, main group campground, and the Fine Arts Center would result in potentially significant impacts to noise during construction (see Table 4.6–5. of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure Noise-1*:** Construction of potentially significant Master Plan components shall occur only during the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekends, and between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on federally recognized holidays.

Biological Resources

Impact BIO-1: Although special-status species surveys were conducted, special-status plant species and suitable habitat may occur in the vicinity of campsite construction. Therefore, the construction of new campsites at Dogwood Camp within mixed conifer and chaparral habitat may potentially affect special-status plant species and/or habitat (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR and Table 2.3-1 of the Final Master EIR).

Construction of ten new primitive campsites may result in indirect impacts to waters of the U.S. (Jenkinson Lake). Construction of primitive campsites is not expected to directly affect Jenkinson Lake because work is occurring above the ordinary high-water mark (OHWM); however indirect impacts have a potential to occur from construction runoff. Indirect impacts to the water quality of Jenkinson Lake would be temporary and would be expected to last the duration of construction activities.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-5*:** Construction of SPRA Master Plan elements may indirectly affect unnamed tributaries, creeks, or Jenkinson Lake from runoff during construction. If indirect impacts have the potential to occur during construction activities, additional

measures may be required to maintain water quality standards of the waterways. If a 404 permit is required for the SPRA Master Plan, water quality concerns during construction shall be addressed in a required Section 401 water quality certification by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required for the entire SPRA Master Plan project. SWPPPs are required in issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction discharge permit by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction is standard in most SWPPPs and water quality certifications. Examples of BMPs include stockpiling of debris away from regulated wetlands and waterways; immediate removal of debris piles from the site during the rainy season; use of silt fencing and construction fencing around regulated waterways; and use of drip pans under work vehicles and containment of fuel waste throughout the site during construction.

Mitigation Measure BIO-17: Additional rare plant surveys shall be performed before implementing specific components under the SPRA Master Plan, focusing on the specific area of proposed disturbance during the appropriate season for detecting the species. Areas subject to surveys shall be concentrated within areas proposed for new Park facility developments including but not limited to the Sugarloaf Fine Arts Center and the Black Oak Equestrian Center. Special attention shall be given to Pleasant Valley mariposa lily, which has a high likelihood of occurrence on the north side of SPRA.

CDFG recommends a sufficient number of visits spaced throughout the blooming period of all special-status plant species to accurately determine their presence or absences of special-status plant species (CDFG 2000c). Generally, the blooming period to cover all target plant species identified in Table 1.1 1 covers February through October. Field surveys performed during June and July 2004 adequately covered the mid-blooming range of target plant species; however additional surveys are recommended before and after these months to catch early- and late-blooming target plant species. A minimum of two additional surveys are recommended, one during late-winter and spring months and one to cover early fall months.

If special-status species are found, plant locations shall be described and mapped and the project shall be designed to avoid impacts to the extent practicable. A mitigation plan developed from consultation with CDFG and CNPS shall be prepared. The plan should detail the various mitigation approaches to ensure minimal impacts to special-status plants species. Examples of mitigation include avoidance of the resource, salvage of plant materials where possible, acquisition of credits at an approved mitigation bank, or acquisition and preservation of property that supports these species. Preservation management strategies shall be developed in consultation with the appropriate resource agencies. For example, populations may be avoided and fenced if found where proposed trails or camping facilities are to be placed. Vegetation rehabilitation activities currently proposed under the SPRA Master Plan may be sufficient mitigation although consultation resource agencies shall be conducted to define an appropriate mitigation plan. If no special-status plant species are observed, no further mitigation would be required.

Impact BIO-2: Construction of camping structures at Scout/Youth Group Camp may result in indirect impacts to Carpenter Creek, a potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Work will not occur directly within the creek corridor therefore only indirect impacts from construction runoff are possible. Indirect impacts to the water quality of Carpenter Creek would be temporary and would be expected to last the duration of construction activities. Also, no impacts to any riparian habitat are anticipated to occur along Carpenter Creek under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR and Table 2.3-1 of the Final Master EIR).

Trees will be avoided to the extent practical in the construction of camp structures; however tree removal may occur for the proper location of some structures. Also, trees planned for removal under these components may be used as a bat roost site and therefore, impacts to bat roost sites or removal of bat roost trees could occur during tree removal. Construction of campground structures has the potential to affect active raptor nests, and/or remove potential raptor nest trees. Bald eagles are known to use an area as a wintering perch site in the vicinity of the proposed events center (near Mormon Emigrant Trail) (Merriam Green Associates Environmental Consultants 1995). Sharp-shinned hawk, osprey, northern goshawk, and California spotted owl are also present within SPRA and a potential nest could be removed during tree removal under the prescribed Master Plan components.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-5 and BIO-17*:** See above.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-14*:** Construction activities are not expected to occur during the rainy season; however, nesting territories of other raptor species could be established during winter months that could be disturbed by construction activities during that time. Specifically, resident owl species are known to initiate nest building and breeding during early winter months. For this reason, pre-construction nesting raptor surveys shall be performed within SPRA. Based on the final grading plans for specific SPRA Master Plan components, any trees that are planned for removal shall be surveyed for the presence of active raptor nests. A pre-construction raptor survey is recommended to determine the activity status of any identified raptor nests within SPRA including a 500-foot buffer from construction activities, if construction of any new facilities is expected to occur during the typical nesting season (February-September). The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days before the start of construction activities. If more than 30 days lapse between the survey and the start of construction, an additional survey shall be performed. If the nests are found and considered to be active, construction activities shall not occur within 500 feet of the nests until the young have fledged and the appropriate resource agencies (USFS, USFWS, or CDFG) shall be consulted. If

construction activities are proposed to occur during the non-breeding season (October-January), a survey is not required and no further studies are necessary. As discussed in BIO-10 through BIO-12, in order to avoid impacts to northern goshawk, bald eagle, California spotted owl, and other nesting raptors during their typical breeding seasons, construction activities should not occur from February through September.

Avoidance measures for reducing impacts to nesting raptor species and potential nest trees have been incorporated into the SPRA Master Plan as a design guideline to the maximum extent feasible. For example, during campground re-configuration construction activities, no trees with a DBH of 6 inches or greater shall be removed; raptors are not likely to nest within trees less than 6 inches DBH. Ongoing recreational activities are not expected to have a significant affect on nesting raptors, as any raptors nesting in areas of recreational use will have become habituated to human activity.

Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Before the removal of any trees or structures within SPRA, a clearance survey shall be performed to determine the presence of bat roosts. The final grading plans for each individual project shall determine the trees and structures to be removed which shall be subject to the pre-construction survey. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist familiar with the identification of bat species and roosting sign. If special-status roosting bats are found during the pre-construction survey, CDFG or the USFWS should be consulted regarding measures to minimize impacts to roosting bats during construction. No trees or Park facility structures shall be removed that is used as by roosting bats. If special-status bats are not found during the pre-construction survey, no mitigation measures should be necessary for special-status bats.

Mitigation Measure BIO-18: The following measures are designed to protect existing trees and minimize impacts during construction activities.

A) To protect the root zone, drift fencing (or similar protective barrier approved by El Dorado County) a minimum of 4 feet tall, shall be installed at least two feet outside the drip line of each protected tree. A circle with a radius measurement from the trunk of the tree to the tip of its longest limb shall constitute the drip line protection area for preserved trees and shall establish the Critical Root Zone (CRZ) of the tree. The drift fencing shall not be moved once installed.

   Removal of tree branches and/or roots shall be minimized to the extent practical and shall be in compliance with the 2001 "American National Standard for Tree Care Operations – Tree, Shrub, and Other Woody Plant Maintenance-Standard Practices (Pruning)" (A300, Part 1) and with the 1995 International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) companion publication of "Tree Pruning Guidelines." The removal or severing of any roots on trees to be retained shall only be done at the discretion of an onsite arborist and shall not cause permanent damage to the tree. Roots shall be cut cleanly as close to the excavation as possible. Roots with cut faces of more than 1.5 inches shall be coated with emulsified asphalt or other approved coating formulated for use on damaged plant tissues. Any tree impacted by activity within its CRZ, including

cuts to branches and/or roots shall be considered impacted and subject to the same mitigation as a removed tree.

In the event that a stand of trees will be preserved, the entire stand may be fenced, as a group, per the above stated guidelines. Fencing shall be shown on construction plans and shall be installed before the onset of grading activities. Signs shall be attached to the fencing describing the trees as protected.

B) No grading, vehicular traffic, dumping of excavated debris, materials storage, or disposal of chemicals or contaminated water shall be allowed within the CRZ of the trees to be retained as shown on final site plans. This includes but is not limited to washing concrete from tools or trucks; paint materials; sheetrock, mud, or stucco materials; or other chemicals such as solvents and herbicides. Nails, ties, screws, or other fasteners shall not be use to attach signs, braces, etc. to any tree trunks or branches.

C) Drainage patterns on the site shall not be modified so that water accumulates in, or is diverted across, the CRZ of any preserved tree.

D) Construction crews shall be informed of the above measures and shall be required to comply with the guidelines of this mitigation plan. They will also be provided a copy of the map illustrating areas to be fenced and avoided. Before construction, all construction personnel shall be required to sign a document acknowledging receipt and understanding of all tree protection and preservation requirements.

E) A certified arborist shall monitor the protected trees periodically during construction to ensure the above-mentioned measures are carried out and to monitor the health and structure of the trees.

F) If construction activities intercept major roots outside of the CRZ, a certified arborist shall be consulted to advise construction crews on how best to minimize damage to roots.

G) Whenever feasible, utility trenches shall be established outside of the CRZ. If utilities must be located within this area, they should be placed in a conduit that is bored through the soil. Immediately backfill and water to the point of saturation all areas where soil cuts and trenches enter the CRZ of any existing tree.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-19*:** To mitigate for the loss of trees, the following tree replacement measures shall be implemented for individual trees removed as part of the SPRA Master Plan:

A) Based on final grading plans, each SPRA Master Plan project that would require tree removal shall be subject to an arborist survey and report. All trees that occur within the construction footprint will be inventoried by an ISA Certified Arborist. The survey will include numbering each qualifying tree (per El Dorado County guidelines) and recording required data such as species, size, health, and structural condition. Following the inventory of all trees proposed for removal, an arborist

report will be completed and submitted to the Manager of Environmental Review Division.

Replacement shall be required for all healthy native trees equal to or greater than 6 inch diameter at breast height (DBH) that will be removed. A healthy tree is defined as a tree with an average to be below-average amount of deadwood with respect to the tree's size and growing environment and little evidence of stress. A healthy tree shall also exhibit a low risk for failure as a public hazard in that it has minimal evidence of wounds, cavities, decay, or indication of hollowness within the root crown, trunk, or primary limbs, as well as lack of co-dominant stems or included bark in major trunk or branch attachments.

B) For all trees, at least one (1) one-gallon seedling shall be replanted for every two inches of impact for a mitigation ratio of 1:2, thus a 12 inch DBH tree would require six (6) one-gallon replacement seedlings. Replacement seedlings shall be of the same genus and species removed.

C) For oak (*Quercus* spp.) trees removed, replacement trees may be up to but in no case larger than 15-gallon size or to be consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.5.2, the replacement requirement shall be calculated on an inch for inch basis, whichever measure is more stringent on tree replacement. The ratio of a 5-gallon oak replacement seedling to inches removed shall be at a minimum 1:3; the ratio of a 15-gallon oak replacement seedling to inches removed shall be at a minimum of 1:6.

D) Tree re-planting may take place anywhere in SPRA in a location that provides conditions suitable to the growth requirements of the species including areas identified for reforestation in the Forest Management Plan.

E) Replacement stock seedlings shall be purchased from a source in the SPRA region where feasible.

F) A complete tree monitoring plan shall be required for the replacement trees. Monitoring shall be designed to ensure compliance with the established performance standard and to discover and remediate conditions that are detrimental or potentially detrimental to the plantings to ensure the continued success of the plantings. A minimum of eighty percent (80%) of the total plantings will survive annually (exhibiting fair health characteristics or higher) for a period of 3 years from the date of planting. If the plantings fail to meet the performance standard, they shall be replaced annually on an inch-for-inch basis, under the guidelines of this management plan to meet the 80% survival goal.

Monitoring of the plantings will occur annually for three years, from the date of installation, conducted by a certified arborist or qualified biologist. Monitoring will consist of a site assessment to evaluate the health of each planting. Annual monitoring reports shall be submitted to the Manager of Environmental Review Division.

The project proponent, or its successor, is the responsible party for monitoring plantings within SPRA. Any maintenance or remediation required to achieve the performance standard is the responsibility of the project proponent.

Impact BIO-3: Currently, several sites within Rainbow and Kamloop camps are located within 50 feet of Hazel Creek and are planned for removal under the SPRA Master Plan in an effort to widen the buffer between campsites and riparian habitat associated with Hazel Creek. Removal of existing campsites within the 50-foot buffer of Hazel Creek could potentially affect upland winter aestivation habitat for special-status amphibian species including California red-legged frog and foothill yellow-legged frog, although because these existing campground areas are disturbed from human use, the potential for impacts to these species and/or habitat is minimal (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR and Table 2.3-1 of the Final Master EIR).

Also, the re-configuration of campgrounds would not allow construction of new sites within 50 feet from the ordinary high-water mark of any creeks. The reconfiguration of campsites could encourage recreational collection of special-status amphibian species as well; however, the 50-foot setback from new campsite construction would assist in preventing collection.

The reconfiguring of campsites at Kamloop and Rainbow camps has the potential to affect Hazel Creek, a water of the U.S., and regulated waterway by the Corps. The Hazel Creek riparian corridor is also regulated under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code. Additionally, the El Dorado County General Plan includes policies for wetland protection. Work associated with campsite reconfiguration would involve the removal of existing campsites and work below the ordinary high water mark of Hazel Creek. Work occurring within the stream corridor may also affect federally sensitive freshwater invertebrates.

Any reconfiguration improvements would avoid removal of healthy native trees greater than six inches in diameter at breast height (DBH); however, some trees may require removal to meet the goals of the reconfiguration of campgrounds. If trees are proposed for removal, these trees maybe used by raptors as a nest tree. Also, trees planned for removal under these project elements may be used as a bat roost site and therefore, impacts to bat roost sites or removal of bat roost trees could occur upon implementation.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-5, BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-6*:** A Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFG, pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code, for each stream crossing and any other activities affecting the bed, bank or associated riparian vegetation

of any stream within SPRA, specifically work that is occurring near Carpenter and Hazel creeks. Appropriate mitigation measures shall be developed in coordination with CDFG in the issued 1602 agreement.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-7*:** A pre-construction survey for California red-legged frog and foothill yellow-legged frog should be performed within any areas proposed for a bridge crossing or where work will be occurring within a riparian corridor. Generally, this includes work being performed in proximity to Hazel and Carpenter creeks. Aquatic and upland habitat will be surveyed by a qualified biologist for the presence of California red-legged frog or foothill yellow-legged frog.

Because foothill yellow-legged frogs have been identified within Sly Park Creek within the SPRA, a clearance survey should be performed prior to construction to ensure no impacts will occur to this species that is known to occur within the SPRA. If this species is identified during the pre-construction clearance survey, any individuals should be safely re-located by a qualified professional out of the construction zone to an equivalent habitat located within the SPRA. The qualified biologist performing the survey should possess a valid California Department of Fish and Game Scientific Collecting Permit.

Although California red-legged frogs have not been identified within the SPRA before, if this species is identified during a pre-construction survey, the USFWS should be contacted immediately for subsequent measures. No California red-legged frogs shall be moved or re-located as part of the pre-construction survey.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-8*:** As discussed in Table 4.7.3, several Master Plan components shall require a Corps permit and/or Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement. If either the Corps or California Department of Fish and Game require specific California red-legged frog or foothill yellow-legged frog impact avoidance measures, the applicant shall adhere to the conditions of the permit. These conditions are expected to include construction impact avoidance measures such as the presence of a biological monitor during creek restoration activities, a seasonal time restriction on work occurring within the creek bed, or a pre-construction survey.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-10*:** Signs shall be posted to discourage collecting and handling of aquatic wildlife by recreational users. Interpretive trail signage and kiosks proposed for specific campgrounds shall serve to inform the public of the sensitivity and the ecological importance for preserving of riparian habitat and creek corridors. Interpretive signs and kiosks shall also define Park rules and prohibit collecting aquatic wildlife (other than fishing). Also, design measures such as creek access controls (boulders and cable fencing) at Pine Cone, Rainbow, and Kamloop camps have been incorporated into the SPRA Master Plan project where applicable. The re-configuration of campsites away from Hazel Creek at Hazel Creek, Kamloop, and Rainbow campgrounds would widen the buffer to Hazel Creek to enhance riparian habitat value; the increased distance of campsites to Hazel Creek shall further discourage foot traffic along Hazel Creek and reduce the likelihood of aquatic wildlife collection.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-15*:** Avoidance measures for reducing impacts to federally sensitive invertebrate species have been incorporated into the SPRA Master Plan as a design guideline to the maximum extent feasible. Additionally, the 50- and 100-foot setbacks as required under the El Dorado County General Plan policies would aid in protecting federally sensitive invertebrate species. Also, the re-configuration of campgrounds shall not allow construction within 50 feet from the ordinary high-water mark of any creeks.

Before construction occurring within the creek corridors for the two proposed span bridges, these potential habitat areas shall be surveyed to determine the presence or absence of Button's Sierra sideband, Gold rush hanging scorpionfly, South Forks ground beetle, and spiny rhyacophilan caddisfly. A qualified entomologist or invertebrate zoologist shall be retained that is familiar with the biology, habitat requirements, and identification of these species. An adequate number of surveys shall be performed over a period when the invertebrate species are identifiable. These species are assumed to be active and identifiable year-round. If any of these federally sensitive invertebrate species are identified within the SPRA area, any individuals should be safely re-located by a qualified entomologist out of the construction zone to an equivalent habitat located within the SPRA. If these species are not identified, bridge construction shall proceed as scheduled and no further mitigation should be necessary.

Impact BIO-4: Trail construction at Hazel Creek Campground could result in impacts to special-status amphibian species (California red-legged frog and foothill yellow-legged frog) because of its proximity of the proposed work to Hazel Creek and mapped riparian habitat. The remaining campgrounds are not expected to be potential special-status amphibian habitat therefore impacts to these species are not expected to occur from trail construction in these areas (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR and Table 2.3-1 of the Final Master EIR).

Specifically, the construction of the new mountain bike trail along the southern portion of the lake may affect potential riparian habitat where the trail is proposed to cross the two mapped riparian drainages in this area, although these stream crossings would be fitted with bridge crossings. These areas may be regulated under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code and indirect impacts to water quality could occur during trail construction. The portions where the new bike trail is proposed to cross Sly Park and Hazel creeks at the eastern portion of the lake are potential special-status amphibian species and western pond turtle habitat. The portion of the mountain bike trail proposed at the southeast corner of the lake may occur in close proximity to the bald eagle and osprey nest that have been located on USFS land.

Trail construction is expected to avoid trees and tree removal to extent practical by designing new trails around any trees; however, minor tree removal may be necessary. Any trees planned for removal may also be used by a nesting raptor and/or roosting bat species. Any trees planned for removal may be used as a bat roost site or by a nesting raptor.

Along the northern portion of the lake where the proposed mountain bike trail will occur in more undisturbed and undeveloped portions (open forest areas) may represent potential sensitive plant species habitat and therefore impacts may occur to special-status plant species.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-17, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-4*:** Based on site-specific projects, all Master Plan components that can feasibly be fitted with a crossing that will span and remain out of the ordinary high water mark and the 100-year flood hazard area of that waterway should be identified. Where determined feasible, all bridge abutments shall be located outside of the ordinary high water mark.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-9*:** Avoidance measures for reducing impacts to potential habitat for western pond turtle have been incorporated into the SPRA Master Plan as a design guideline to the maximum extent feasible. Also, the 50- and 100-foot setbacks as required under the El Dorado County General Plan will aid in the protection of western pond turtle and potential marsh habitat during construction activities. However, impacts may still occur during removal of existing campsites within the 50-foot buffer, construction of span bridges, and other project elements that are expected to occur within the 50- and 100-foot creek buffer.

A pre-construction clearance survey for western pond turtle is recommended before construction activities occurring within potential pond turtle habitat. Potential habitat for western pond turtle occurs along Sly Park and Hazel creeks and potentially other perennial, slow-moving drainages. The clearance survey shall be performed during April or May when western pond turtle are most active and identifiable. It is assumed construction is not going to take place during the rainy season, a period when western pond turtle would be less identifiable. Open water areas with emergent vegetation with open rocks for basking shall be adequately surveyed to determine the presence or absence of western pond turtle within the creek corridors. The areas to be subject to clearance surveys shall be based upon final grading plans for each project element, specifically the two span bridges and campground reconfigurations. If western pond turtle are not observed, construction activities shall proceed as scheduled. If western pond turtle are observed, shall be consulted on subsequent impact avoidance measures.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-11*:** Based on final grading plans, any project component that would involve the removal of potential nest trees shall be surveyed for the presence of a bald eagle nest. Federal protocol surveys shall be performed to determine the presence or

absence of nesting and wintering bald eagles. As stated previously, bald eagles are known to winter at Jenkinson Lake and the first confirmed successful nesting attempt by a bald eagle pair occurred during 2004 south of Jenkinson Lake on USFS property as well as the previous two years. Additionally, nesting bald eagles have been recorded from nearby lakes in 2004. Therefore, tree removal shall not take place until confirming a bald eagle nest does not occur within the trees planned for removal.

Timing construction activities to occur outside of the active bald eagle breeding season (early-February through July) at Jenkinson Lake, would reduce the likelihood of adverse effects on nesting bald eagle. Additionally, work associated with the implementation of the SPRA Master Plan is not expected to occur during the rainy season, which will also avoid impacts to bald eagles. CDFG recommends that specific survey guidelines and scheduling of surveys be handled with consultation with CDFG at the agency district or regional office level. CDFG recommends a minimum of three surveys during the nesting season to confirm the location of eagle territories (CDFG 1999). One survey shall be performed during early March (early incubation) to determine whether territories are occupied. CDFG recommends a second survey during late-April or early-May (early nesting period) to confirm if the territory is unoccupied, or if occupied in March to determine whether the breeding pair is still present. A third survey shall be performed during mid-June (late nestling period) to determine how many nestlings are present and may fledge (CDFG 1999). Performing directed surveys to identify breeding bald eagles shall also determine the location of any wintering bald eagles. Trees harboring any roosting, wintering bald eagles shall not be removed. As discussed in BIO 12 through BIO 14, in order to avoid impacts to northern goshawk, bald eagle, California spotted owl, and other nesting raptors during their typical breeding seasons, construction activities should not occur from February through September.

If bald eagle nesting territories are found and defined, the bald eagle management and design guidelines for the SPRA Master Plan shall establish management zones based on a radius around the bald eagle nest. For example, the Habitat Management Guidelines for the Bald Eagle in the Southeast Region (USFWS 1987) provides recommended restrictions in a "primary management zone" within approximately 750 feet of a bald eagle nest, and lesser restrictions within a "secondary management zone" between 750 feet and one mile from the nest (exact distance would be dependent upon site specific factors). The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's (WDFW) Priority Habitat and Species Management Recommendations (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife 2004) recommend a survey buffer of at least 800 feet of a bald eagle nest. WDFW recommends buffering bald eagle nests within a two-zone management system similar to the USFWS guidelines, but with a primary zone within 400 feet of the nest and a secondary zone between 330 and 880 feet of the nest. For wintering eagles, 800- to 1,000-foot buffers around perching areas have been recommended where little screening cover is present (WDFW 2004).

CDFG has not developed bald eagle protection guidelines for California, and reasonable measures may vary depending on site-specific and project-specific conditions. The bald eagle guidelines for the SPRA Master Plan shall be developed in coordination with the

wildlife agencies and based on site-specific information and the best available scientific information regarding the bald eagle.

The bald eagle management and design guidelines shall be designed to avoid "take" of bald eagles as defined under the California and Federal Endangered Species Acts and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Acts, so that a take permit will not be necessary. However, even with these guidelines in place, if any federally funded or permitted activities take place that may affect bald eagles, a formal Section 7 Consultation with the USFWS shall be necessary. The bald eagle management and design guidelines shall be a useful component in assisting any Section 7 Consultation that takes place, to provide assurance to the USFWS that species impacts will be adequately minimized.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-12*:** Based on final grading plans, any project component that would involve the removal of potential nest trees shall be surveyed for the presence of a nesting northern goshawk. The USFS has implemented a survey protocol for northern goshawk on USFS lands, Survey Methodology for Northern Goshawks in the Pacific Southwest Region (USFS 2000). This survey protocol is typically applied to USFS logging activities on state forest and non-state forest land; however, this survey methodology is recommended for implementation of the SPRA Master Plan project components as well. As with bald eagle, tree removal shall not take place until confirming an active northern goshawk nest does not occur within the trees planned for removal.

For activities planned adjacent to non-USFS lands, databases and resource agencies shall be consulted for the location of known northern goshawk protected activity centers (PACs) (USFS 2004). To date, no northern goshawk PACs are known to occur within SPRA. PACs are delineated to include the known and suspected nest stand and to designate the best available 200 acres of forested habitat in the largest continuous patches based on aerial photography. If PACs occur within SPRA, directed surveys to establish the location or activity of the nest or PAC shall be performed. The USFS also recommends maintaining a limited operating period (LOP) prohibiting activities occurring within approximately 0.25 mile of a goshawk nest during the breeding season (generally February 15 through September 15)) on USFS lands. The LOP would only apply to new Master Plan components occurring on USFS lands. The LOP would not apply to existing recreational trail use or maintenance or continued recreation use such as those at SPRA; however, new construction activities associated with the Master Plan components occurring on USFS lands shall be subject to USFS protocol guidelines. The LOP may be waived for individual components or activities of limited activity and duration or when a biological evaluation determines that such components are unlikely to result in breeding disturbance. The LOP may be reduced if the biological evaluation concludes that a nest site would be shielded from the proposed activity by natural topographic features that would minimize disturbance. If a northern goshawk nest is identified, the CDFG and/or USFS shall be consulted on subsequent impact avoidance measures. As discussed in BIO-10 through BIO-13, in order to avoid impacts to northern goshawk, bald eagle, California spotted owl, and other nesting raptors during their typical breeding seasons, construction activities should not occur from February through September.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-13*:** As with northern goshawk, a similar USFS survey protocol is recommended for California spotted owl and is based on the presence of owl PACs within the project site. This survey protocol is typically applied to USFS logging activities on state forest and non-state forest land; however, this methodology is recommended for implementation of the SPRA Master Plan project components. A California spotted owl protected activity center is identified by the USFS in the southeastern corner of SPRA (pers. comm. July 2004, Susan Yasuda, USFWS). As with bald eagle and northern goshawk, tree removal shall not take place until confirming an active northern goshawk nest does not occur within the trees planned for removal.

For activities planned adjacent to non-USFS lands, databases and resource agencies shall be consulted for the location of known spotted owls PACs (USFS 2004). PACs are delineated using aerial photographs to include the known and suspected nest stand and to designate the best available 300 acres of contiguous forested habitat in the largest continuous patches. If PACs occur within SPRA, directed surveys to establish the location or activity of the nest or PAC shall be performed. The USFS recommends a LOP that prohibits construction activities occurring within 0.25 mile of an activity center during the breeding season on USFS lands (generally March 1 through August 31) unless directed surveys conducted before confirmed no spotted owls were nesting. The LOP would only apply to new Master Plan projects occurring on USFS lands. The LOP may be waived for individual components or activities of limited activity and duration or when a biological evaluation determines that such components are unlikely to result in breeding disturbance to California spotted owls on USFS lands. The LOP may be reduced if the biological evaluation concludes that a nest site would be shielded from the proposed activity by natural topographic features that would minimize disturbance. If a California spotted owl nest is identified, the CDFG and/or USFS shall be consulted on subsequent impact avoidance measures. As discussed in BIO-10 through BIO-13, in order to avoid impacts to northern goshawk, bald eagle, California spotted owl, and other nesting raptors during their typical breeding seasons, construction activities should not occur from February through September.

Impact BIO-5: Although the SPRA Design Standards and Guidelines identify clear span bridges where feasible to minimize impacts to drainage corridors, it may be infeasible to keep all bridge construction out of the 100-year flood hazard area and ordinary high water mark in individual locations, based on site-specific characteristics. Therefore, construction of span bridges at Scout/Youth Group Camp and Hazel Creek Camp may result in indirect impacts to Carpenter Creek and Hazel Creek, both jurisdictional waters of the U.S. subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Both creeks and riparian habitat are also subject to regulation under the California Fish and Game Code Section 1600. Any indirect impacts that may occur to the water quality of Hazel Creek would be temporary and would be expected to last the duration of construction activities. Additionally, the El Dorado County General Plan includes policies for wetland protection (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Construction of span bridges proposed for the trail crossing at Hazel Creek and Carpenter Creek could potentially affect any special-status amphibian species (California red-legged frog and foothill yellow-legged frog) occurring within the immediate upland

banks of the creeks. Also, bridge construction could affect potential western pond turtle if marsh habitat occurs in this portion of Hazel Creek as the creek opens up into the lake. The construction of new bridges could encourage recreational collection of special-status amphibian species. Additionally, western pond turtle has the potential to be impacted by the construction of span bridges at Hazel Creek Campground and Scout/Youth Camp.

Construction of span bridges will avoid tree removal to the extent practical; however minor tree removal may be necessary to allow for proper bridge fittings. Therefore, tree removal may have the potential to affect active raptor nests if the tree is used as a nest tree. Trees planned for removal under these project elements may be used as a bat roost site and therefore, impacts to bat roost sites or removal of bat roost trees could occur upon implementation.

Bridge construction within suitable mixed conifer habitat has the potential to affect special-status plant species.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-9, BIO-10, BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-17, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

Impact BIO-6: The reconfiguration of existing parking would most likely require some tree removal. Trees proposed for removal may be used by roosting bat species or nesting raptors (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-11, BIO-12, BIO-13, BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

Impact BIO-7: The construction of new parking areas at the Miwok Trailhead may result in impacts to potential habitat for special-status amphibians within Carpenter Creek. Carpenter Creek is regulated under Section 404 and Section 1600 as well as any riparian habitat that occurs in the portion of Carpenter Creek proposed for new parking. Only indirect impacts may occur to Carpenter Creek during construction of the new parking area; work is not expected to occur directly within the creek bed therefore no direct impacts to waters of the U.S. or sensitive freshwater invertebrates are expected to occur. However, removal of riparian habitat may be necessary for parking lot

construction near Carpenter Creek (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR and Table 2.3-1 of the Final Master EIR).

The construction of new parking areas may require minor tree removal. Any trees proposed for removal may be used as a bat roosting site or a nesting raptor. If the existing museum structure at the Miwok Trailhead is used as a bat roost, demolition of the structure would affect roosting bat species.

The construction of new parking areas within suitable mixed conifer habitat has the potential to affect special-status plant species. Specifically, the proposed Retreat and Event Center site has been identified as suitable Pleasant Valley mariposa lily habitat; however, this plant was not observed within this area of SPRA during directed floristic surveys.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-11, BIO-12, BIO-13, BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-17, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

Impact BIO-8: The expansion of the Marina Parking Lot will require the removal of existing trees. Based on a preliminary site plan review for the parking lot expansion footprint, including a 15-wide buffer for construction, approximately 182 trees would be removed. The majority of trees to be removed would be among the species of pines identified in SPRA, ranging in size from 6 to 42 inches diameter at breast height (DBH). Six of the trees proposed for removal are oaks (Quercus spp.). The 182 trees proposed for removal fall into the following age classes: 62 trees 6 to 12 inch DBH; 77 trees 13 to 24 inch DBH; 37 trees 25 to 36 inch DBH; and 6 trees are greater than 37 inch DBH (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Trees planned for removal under these project elements may be used as a bat roost site and therefore, impacts to bat roost sites or removal of bat roost trees could occur upon implementation.

Trees planned for removal as a result of the proposed Marina parking lot expansion may be used as a bat roost and therefore impacts to bat roosts or the removal of a bat roost trees could occur during construction and would require mitigation. The removal of any tree that is occupied by an active raptor nest or as a bat roost within the areas of the proposed Marina parking lot expansion would be considered a significant impact.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-5, BIO-11, BIO-12, BIO-13, BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

Impact BIO-9: Generally, the realignment of existing Park roads would avoid the removal of trees, but minor tree removal may be necessary for proper roadway improvements. Trees larger than 6 inch DBH would be avoided where possible. Trees planned for removal under these project elements may be used as a bat roost site or by a nesting raptor and therefore, impacts to roosting bats or nesting raptors could occur upon implementation (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR and Table 2.3-1 of the Final Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

Impact BIO-10: Work associated with the relocation of the dump station and reconfiguration of the main entrance may require minor tree removal although tree removal would be avoided to the extent practical. Tree removal has the potential to affect active raptor nests, and/or remove potential raptor nest trees if that tree is used by a nesting raptor. Trees planned for removal under these project elements may be used as a bat roost site and therefore, impacts to bat roost sites or removal of bat roost trees could occur upon implementation (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

Impact BIO-11: Construction of the new visitor center and visitor parking at the Main Park Entrance may require minor tree removal .If a tree proposed for removal is used by a nesting raptor, potential impacts may occur to active raptor nests, and/or remove potential nest trees. Any trees planned for removal under these project elements may also be used as a bat roost site and therefore, impacts to bat roost sites or removal of bat roost trees could occur upon implementation. Additionally, if the two existing small buildings

at the Main Park Entrance are used as a bat roost, demolition of the structures would affect roosting bat species (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

Impact BIO-12: The removal of any trees in this area that are occupied by active raptor nests would be a significant impact and would require mitigation. Trees planned for removal under these project elements may be used as a bat roost site and therefore, impacts to bat roost sites or removal of bat roost trees could occur during construction of the Sugarloaf Fine Arts Center (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-11, BIO-12, BIO-13, BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-18, and BIO-19*:** See above.

Impact BIO-13: Only vegetation rehabilitation activities occurring at Hazel Creek Camp may affect sensitive biological resources because of work occurring below the ordinary high water mark. The Hazel Creek restoration project would occur within the riparian corridor of Hazel Creek, a jurisdictional waterway under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code and Section 404 of CWA. Direct and indirect impacts to Hazel Creek are anticipated to occur from rehabilitation activities. Also, work occurring in the stream corridor has the potential to affect foothill yellow-legged frog, California red-legged frog, and to a lesser extent western pond turtle (if marsh habitat occurs in this area of the creek). Work occurring within the stream bed may potentially affect federally sensitive freshwater invertebrate species (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-9*:** See above.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-2*:** The Hazel Creek restoration project will require a Corps permit as the restoration activities will be occurring within below the ordinary high water mark. This work would be covered under Nationwide Permit (NWP) 27, Stream and Wetland Restoration Activities. A pre-construction notification is required for the restoration of Hazel Creek and must be submitted to the Corps before work occurring within the creek corridor. Any permit conditions required by the Corps in the issuance of the permit will be followed for the duration of the restoration work.

The stabilization of the bank along Lake Drive will require a Corps permit as it is occurring below the ordinary high water mark. This work would be covered under Nationwide Permit 13, Bank Stabilization; therefore NWP 13 shall be acquired before bank stabilization work occurring along Lake Drive. If the bank stabilization activity is less than 500 feet in length and the activity will not disturb more than one cubic yard per running foot, a post-notification to the Corps will be required to ensure compliance with this nationwide permit. If the length of bank stabilization is greater than 500 feet, a pre-construction notification package must be submitted to the Corps to ensure compliance with the permit. If a pre-construction package is required for the bank stabilization along Lake Drive, any permit conditions required by the Corps will be followed for the duration of the work.

Impact BIO-14: Stabilization of Lake Drive may affect Jenkinson Lake during activities associated with moving the road away from the shoreline and the reinforcement of the bank to prevent undercutting. Work is anticipated to occur below the ordinary high water mark. Direct and indirect impacts may occur to Jenkinson Lake during the realignment of approximately 500 feet of Lake Drive away from the existing shoreline (see Table 4.7–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-5*:** See above.

<u>Cultural Resources</u>

Impact CR-1: CA-Eld-461 has the potential to contain subsurface cultural deposits that extend into the areas that would be disturbed by proposed Scout/Youth Group Camp improvements. If the deposit has data potential, the impact would be considered significant under CEQA (see Section 4.8.4 of the Draft Master EIR).

The completion of the Scout/Youth Group Camp would result in an increase in the number of individuals per year at the camp. This expected increase is estimated at approximately 5,000 people per year. The increased use in an area adjacent to a historical resource puts the resource at risk of disturbance from vandalism and unauthorized

collection of cultural materials. Such disturbance would be considered significant under CEQA.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure CR-1*:** Avoid Ground-Disturbing Activities within 100 ft. of Bedrock Milling Stations at CA-Eld-461.

***Mitigation Measure CR-2*:** Monitor Site Impacts at CA-Eld-461 and Take Appropriate Mitigation Action in Consultation with Native Americans.

Impact CR-2: The reconfiguration of existing parking areas, establishment of new parking areas, improvement and rehabilitation of existing campsites, establishment of tent platforms, and the rehabilitating vegetation have the potential to affect CA-Eld-263 as a result of associated ground-disturbing activities. If the cultural deposit associated with CA-Eld-263 extends into any of the areas that would be disturbed by these project components and if those areas of deposit contain data potential, the impact would be considered significant under CEQA (see Section 4.8.4 of the Draft Master EIR).

The installation of signage and barriers to limit shore access to eight designated points has the potential to affect CA-Eld-263 as a result of ground-disturbing activities in areas known to contain a data-rich cultural deposit and in the shore area that contains the bedrock mortars. This impact is considered significant.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure CR-3*:** Test Excavate to Determine Data Potential of Impact Areas at CA-Eld-263.

***Mitigation Measure CR-4*:** Data Recovery in Areas of Impacts at CA-Eld-263.

Impact CR-3: Proposed improvements at Stonebraker Camp would reroute the existing lake access trail, improve the campground entry, reconfigure camp and day use sites, and rehabilitate vegetation. These components have the potential to affect SP-2005-1-H as a result of ground-disturbing activities. A significant impact would occur if SP-2005-1-H is determined eligible for the CRHR (see Section 4.8.4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure CR-5*:** Documentation and Evaluation of SP-2005-1-H.

Impact CR-4: Proposed improvements at the Hilltop Camp include reconfiguring campsites and rehabilitating vegetation. These components have the potential to affect P-9-1817 as a result of ground-disturbing activities. If P-9-1817 contains a subsurface cultural deposit that extends into the area that would be disturbed by these improvements, and if that deposit indicates that P-9-1817 has data potential, the impact would be considered significant under CEQA (see Section 4.8.4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure CR-6*:** Test Excavate in Areas of Impacts to Determine Data.

Impact CR-5: The proposed improvements at Chimney Camp include reconfiguring parking and campsites and rehabilitating vegetation. These components have the potential to affect SP-1985-1 as a result of ground-disturbing activities. If SP-1985-1 contains a subsurface cultural deposit that extends into the area that would be disturbed by these components and if that deposit has data potential, the impact would be considered significant under CEQA (see Section 4.8.4 of the Draft Master EIR).

The proposed addition of two deluxe cabins at Chimney Camp could result in significant impacts to cultural resources. CA-Eld-1333-H is exposed on a regularly basis each autumn when the lake reaches maximum draw down. The increased use of the campground during the time of the year when the site is exposed increases the potential for the site to be damaged through unauthorized artifact searching and vandalism. If CA-Eld-1333-H meets criteria a, b, or d of the CRHR, that impact would be considered significant under CEQA.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure CR-7*:** Avoid Ground-Disturbing Activities within 50 ft. of Bedrock Milling Stations at SP-1985-1.

***Mitigation Measure CR-8*:** Evaluate CA-Eld-1333-H for CRHR Eligibility under Criteria a, b, and d.

6: The Primitive Camp Area proposes the addition of signage and an access trail to the campsites, establishment of 10 campsites, and the installation of two double-pit toilets. This project has the potential to affect CA-Eld-1331 and CA-1335 as a result of ground disturbance. If CA-1331 or CA-Eld-1335 contains subsurface cultural deposits that extend into the areas that would be disturbed by the construction of the new Primitive Camp Area and if those deposits have data potential, the impact would be considered significant under CEQA.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CR-9: Avoid Ground-Disturbing Activities within 50 ft. of Bedrock Milling Stations at CA-Eld-1331 and CA-Eld-1335.

Impact CR-7: Ground-disturbing activities associated with construction of the proposed Mountain Bike Trail would have the potential to affect CA-Eld-1335 and P-9-1817. These sites are in close proximity to the proposed trail route. If these resources contain subsurface cultural deposits that extend into the areas that would be disturbed by proposed trail, and if either of those deposits have data potential, the impact would be considered significant under CEQA (see Section 4.8.4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure CR-10A*:** Avoid Ground-Disturbing Activities within 50 ft. of Bedrock Milling Stations at CA-Eld-1335.

***Mitigation Measure CR-10B*:** Test Excavate in Areas of Impacts to Determine Data Potential of P-9-1817.

Impact CR-8: Ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed Lake Drive Access Improvements would have the potential to affect CA-Eld-263, CA-Eld-728, and SP-1985-1, as these sites are situated in close proximity to Lake Drive. If cultural deposits associated with these sites extend into the areas that would be disturbed by the

proposed improvements and if any of those deposits have data potential, the impact would be considered significant under CEQA (see Section 4.8.4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure CR-11A*:** Test Excavate to Determine Data Potential of Impact Areas at CA-Eld-263 and CA-Eld-728.

***Mitigation Measure CR-11B*:** Avoid Ground-Disturbing Activities within 50 ft. of Bedrock Milling Stations at SP-1985-1.

Impact CR-9: Such disturbance may result in the loss of integrity of cultural deposits and the loss of information if these deposits do exist. If such a deposit is determined to be a historical resource as defined by CEQA, its disturbance would result in a significant impact (see Section 4.8.4 of the Draft Master EIR).

Although no discernible impacts to human remains are anticipated, there is always the remote possibility that such remains are present below the ground surface and could be unearthed during ground-disturbing activities. This impact would be considered significant under CEQA.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure CR-12*:** Train Staff to Recognize Cultural Deposits and Stop Work in the event of an Unanticipated Discovery.

***Mitigation Measure CR-13*:** Stop Work if Human Remains are Unearthed and Contact the El Dorado County Coroner.

Geology/Soils

Impact GEO-1: It is not anticipated that implementation of the SPRA Master Plan would result in substantial adverse impacts related to Geology and Soils. SPRA Master Plan goals and objectives identify the importance of protecting of natural resources, including the reduction of erosion within SPRA. Construction activities associated with implementation of the SPRA Master Plan and development of individually proposed components would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to geology and Soils. However, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce potentially

significant impacts associated with implementation of the Master Plan on a project by project basis. Implementation of the Master Plan would result in a planning strategy for the long-term management of resources and soils conservation within SPRA (see Table 4.9–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure GEO-1*:** The applicant shall hire a California-registered geotechnical engineer experienced and knowledgeable in the practice of soils engineering to perform site-specific geotechnical studies. The study shall identify any areas of unstable geology or soils, as well as map and characterize the extent of slope instability or potential for landsliding. The report shall provide recommendations for project design alterations, considerations or other features which could reduce the potential hazards to an acceptable level. All feasible recommendations from the study(s) shall be required as part of the project approval and may include the designation of building envelopes, where appropriate. Areas of landsliding identified within the studies shall be repaired or avoided by development to the extent that they would pose no risk to life or property.

Impact GEO-2: See Impact GEO-1 discussion above.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure GEO-2*:** Final grading plans shall be submitted to a licensed professional geotechnical engineer for review and recommendation. All recommendations shall be incorporated into project design.

<u>Hazards & Hazardous Materials</u>

Impact HAZ-1: Implementation of the SPRA Master Plan would provide the framework for long-term management of SPRA for continued recreational use as well as resource conservation. Implementation would not involve land uses that would be likely to result in exposure of the environment or the public to hazardous materials. However, the potential exposure during project construction of previously unidentified hazardous materials related to historical and current land uses does exist. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant (see Table 4.10–1 of the Draft Master EIR).

The risk of wildfire is very high within SPRA. However, SPRA Master Plan proposes proactive planning for fuel load reduction, emergency preparedness and evacuation, as

well as continued coordination with CDF and the El Dorado County Fire Safe Council. Continued interagency coordination, in combination with broad planning for emergency response within SPRA, as well as risk reduction is anticipated not to result in significant risk related to wildfire hazard.

It should also be noted that forest management by EID in accordance with the FMP and past and future fuel load management help Sly Park to act as a buffer between residential and private/public forests. The SPRA Master Plan is not "development" in the sense of an "urban wildland interface community." In this particular case, the changes resulting from the Master Plan would reduce the risk of fire.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure HAZ-1*:** Before demolition of existing on-site structures, the project applicant shall:

- Remove and properly dispose of or recycle all petroleum, chemicals, and hazardous materials from the property;
- Follow standard remedial procedures as required by the County Department of Environmental Management;
- Conduct an asbestos survey for all existing on-site structures proposed for demolition. The survey shall be conducted under the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) guidelines before commencement of any demolition activities. Pursuant to NESHAP guidelines, all friable asbestos shall be removed by qualified professionals before building demolition; and
- Conduct a lead paint survey of existing on-site structures proposed for demolition. As a component of this survey, all soils surrounding the existing structures shall be sampled for residual fragments of lead-based paint.

Impact HAZ-2: Impacts would occur from construction of new parking areas and reconfiguration of the main entrance to the Park. See Impact HAZ-1 for discussion (see Table 4.10–1 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure HAZ-2*:** During site preparation and construction activities, if evidence of previously unidentified hazardous materials contamination is observed or suspected (i.e., stained or odorous soil, or oily or discolored water) construction activities shall cease and a Registered Environmental Professional II shall assess the situation. If necessary, the environmental professional shall prepare a sampling plan to collect soil and/or groundwater samples to determine whether or not the suspected location has been adversely affected by past activities. The samples shall be analyzed for the contaminants determined to be a potential health concern by the environmental professional. Depending on the nature of the contamination (if any), the Hazardous Materials Division of the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management shall be contacted for further direction, which could include further investigation or remediation to all applicable federal, State, and local standards.

Impact HAZ-3: Fire prevention activities associated with implementation of the SPRA Master Plan would result in a net benefit to SPRA, and surrounding residents and communities by development and implementation of fuel reduction management activities, coordination with the El Dorado County Fire Safe Council for public education and outreach, development of an evacuation plan for SPRA, and continued coordination with CDF for controlled burning and the removal of dead, dying and diseased trees. No adverse impact would result with implementation of a Fire Safe Plan as specified in the required mitigation (see Table 4.10–1 of the Draft Master EIR).

It should also be noted that forest management by EID in accordance with the FMP and past and future fuel load management help Sly Park to act as a buffer between residential and private/public forests. The SPRA Master Plan is not "development" in the sense of an "urban wildland interface community." In this particular case, the changes resulting from the Master Plan would reduce the risk of fire.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure HAZ-3*:** Before adoption of the SPRA Master Plan by the EID Board of Directors, a Fire Safe Plan prepared by an RPF shall be reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District and/or CDF.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Impact HWQ-1: Construction activities associated with these components (Reconfigure Existing Parking; Construct New Parking Areas; Marina Parking Expansion; Realign/Improve Campground Access Roads; Reconfigure Main Entrance; Construct Visitor Center/New Maintenance Shop; Fine Arts Center; and Lake Drive Stabilization) would have the potential to violate water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements by resulting in the creation of a source for sediment, petroleum

hydrocarbons and other construction chemicals (e.g. asphalt, Portland cement, and paint). The SWRCB's NPDES permit process for construction sites would address prevention and controlling discharges of these and other potential construction pollutants. The NPDES requirements, in conjunction with the environmentally proactive Design Standards and Guidelines set forth in the SPRA Master Plan would work together to reduce construction (temporary) impacts to a less than significant level (see Table 4.11–3 of the Draft and Final Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure HWQ-1*:** Proper timing of construction and maintenance activities throughout the year such that potential impacts to water quality are minimized or avoided.

***Mitigation Measure HWQ-2*:** Storm water runoff from developed impervious construction areas shall be pre-treated, especially first flush, from roads and parking lots before discharging into existing waterways.

Impact HWQ-2: Construction activities associated with Bridges at Trail Crossings would have the potential to violate water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements by resulting in the creation of a source for sediment, petroleum hydrocarbons and other construction chemicals (e.g. asphalt, Portland cement, and paint). The SWRCB's NPDES permit process for construction sites would address prevention and controlling discharges of these and other potential construction pollutants. The NPDES requirements, in conjunction with the environmentally proactive Design Standards and Guidelines set forth in the SPRA Master Plan would work together to reduce construction (temporary) impacts to a less than significant level (see Table 4.11–3 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure HWQ-3*:** A creek drainage study shall be prepared for bridged trail crossings, and design the bridge to either span the 100-year flood hazard or to not impede or redirect flood flows.

Impact HWQ-3: • Construction activities associated with installation of Interpretive/Trail Signage/Kiosks (see Table 4.11–3 of the Draft and Final Master EIR).

***Mitigation Measure HWQ-4*:** Non storm water discharges (i.e. sediment and building materials) from construction areas shall be contained, reduced and eliminated.

A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (General Construction Permit) will be required when disturbances to the ground occur such as clearing, grading, stockpiling or excavation. Coverage under the General Construction Permit is requires for disturbances that are one acre or greater, or are a part of a larger common plan of development. Requirements of the General Permit include identification and implementation of site specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are specifically designed to protect water quality from construction site storm water runoff. El Dorado County erosion control and storm water protection policies will also be applied to the project through the grading and building permit process.

***Mitigation Measure HWQ-5*:** Under the El Dorado County General Plan policy 7.3.3.4, development of new facilities shall provide at least 100-foot setbacks from perennial streams and lakes, and 50-foot setbacks from intermittent streams. Any facilities or new activities that must encroach closer shall be designed to minimize indirect impacts to wetlands to the greatest extent practicable. Construction of facilities will comply with the Master Plan Design Standards and Guidelines such as the minimization of cut and fill activities and the minimization of culvert installation that will minimize impacts to potentially jurisdictional wetland features. Projects that don't meet the minimum setbacks established by the County will be required to demonstrate to the County that the proposed setback is sufficient to protect the particular riparian area at issue.

Cumulative Impacts (Air Quality)

Impact C-AQ-1: The implementation of a general plan amendment from Natural Resource to Tourist Recreational and the rezoning of portions of SPRA from Residential Agriculture to Recreational Facility, as described above under Land Use and Planning, is required for development of certain SPRA components, including the Sugarloaf Fine Arts Center and the Retreat and Events Center. The projected emissions of ROG and NOx from the proposed SPRA Master Plan components, although less than significant as a single project, would be greater than emissions created by development allowed under the existing Natural Resource designation, and therefore would be considered cumulatively significant by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD). As the projected increase in emissions is primarily because of use of group centers, mitigation is proposed to in the form of education to increase car pooling and use of buses for group events. Mitigation would reduce the cumulative impacts to less than significant (see Section 5.1.1.1 of the Draft Master EIR).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as set forth in the MMRP.

Finding: For the reasons stated in the Final Master EIR and the record of proceedings, the adopted mitigation measures described below will mitigate the above impact to a less than significant level.

***Mitigation Measure C-AQ-1*:** EID will encourage car pooling, van pooling, and use of buses for groups attending events at the Scout Camps, Sugarloaf Fine Arts Center, and the Retreat and Events Center. This may include but not be limited to, providing information on brochures and event applications on the air quality benefits of group transit alternatives. EID shall consult with the El Dorado AQMD for ideas on appropriate education measures.

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The Final Master EIR indicates that the SPRA Master Plan would result in significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts that, even with the incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, remain significant and unavoidable. These impacts and the mitigation measures identified to lessen the impacts are as follows:

Aesthetics

Impact AES-4: Development of the Marina Parking lot would have the potential to significantly affect the aesthetics of SPRA. Primary components of this project would include removal of numerous mature coniferous trees, creating a significant opening in the tree canopy, which would be visible from Sierra campground, the group campgrounds on the peninsula, the first dam site, the lake, and sections of the south shore trail. The parking lot would also involve cut and fill walls up to 12 feet tall. Additionally, cars parked in the lot will be highly visible because of bright colors and glare.

The proposed parking lot is in a Class II objective area according to the visual assessment protocol applied. Changes should not attract the attention of the casual observer and should be low-level.

The proposed changes are of such a magnitude, given the number of trees removed, the height of the retaining walls and the proximity to the lake that this project would result in potentially significant impacts to on site aesthetics for ten years or more, even if all mitigation measures are implemented. While the simulations showed that aesthetic impacts for vista views would be reduced within ten years by vegetative growth, this would not be true for areas immediately adjacent to the proposed parking lot, such as the road north of the lot and the trail between the lot and the lake.

Mitigation Measures AES-1, AES-2, AES-3, AES-4, AES-5, AES-6, AES-7, and AES-8: See above.

Significance After Mitigation: Substantially reduced, but remains significant and unavoidable.

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the Final Master EIR. The Final Master EIR evaluated alternative approaches to accomplish the following objectives of the project:

- Protect and enhance Sly Park's natural resources, scenic quality, water quality, and historical and cultural resources.

- Manage the development and operation of Sly Park within the limits of available of financial resources while seeking innovative approaches to provide additional revenues.

- Protect the health, property, and safety of park visitors, staff, and the surrounding community.

- Explore a variety of environmentally and financially sustainable recreational facilities and programs to meet the diverse needs of District residents and other park visitors.

- Maintain and develop facilities in a manner consistent with available resources, the character of the affected recreation area, user needs, public safety, and park resource protection.

- Establish cooperative relationships between EID, other jurisdictions, and the public in providing recreational resources to the region and the local community.

The Master EIR analyzed the following range of reasonable alternatives:

- No Project Alternative (Alternative 1);

- Proposed Project without New Marina Parking Lot (Alternative 2);

- Widen Marina Drive for Parking on Both Sides – 20 Spaces (Alternative 3); and

- Widen Marina Drive for Parking on One Side – 10+ Spaces (Alternative 4).

No Project Alternative (Alternative 1)

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed SPRA Master Plan would not be implemented. EID would continue to operate and maintain SPRA under existing policies and standards. There would be no application to the County for a GPA. The new Marina parking lot would not be constructed; and therefore, no adverse impacts to aesthetics would occur. As a result, the scenic views much appreciated by Park visitors would not be affected

FINDINGS:

None of the project objectives would be met with the No Project Alternative. The lack of a master plan would mean that the park would continue to degrade over time because of overuse and lack of resources for much needed maintenance and restoration efforts. SPRA would continue to be understaffed. Safety, access, group events, retreat potential, and education would continue to be considered inadequate by some members of the public. The main entrance would not be improved, campgrounds would not be

reconfigured, the Retreat/Events Center and Sugarloaf Fine Arts Camp would not be constructed, nor would the remaining components proposed under the SPRA Master Plan be implemented. Ultimately, the No Project Alternative would not facilitate EID's mission statement and objectives, allowing significant adverse impacts to aesthetics, water quality, and biological resources to continue.

Proposed Project without New Marina Parking Lot (Alternative 2)

This alternative involves approval of the Master Plan without the new Marina Parking Lot component. None of the aesthetic impacts associated with the new Marina Parking Lot would occur. However, implementation of this alternative would be facilitated by reducing the maximum number of boats allowed at SPRA to match available parking supplies. This would prevent the admission of vehicles/trailers to the park when no spaces are available.

FINDINGS:

All of the project objectives would be met with the exception of one . . . "Maintain and develop facilities in a manner consistent with available resources, the character of the affected recreation area, user needs, public safety, and park resource protection." Parking supplies at the existing Marina parking area would continue to be inadequate when boating demands are high. Enforcing the existing "no parking" rule along Marina Road could avoid the circulation and safety issues discussed in Section 4.4.1.1 of the Draft Master EIR. However, this could result in a de-facto reduction in the current level of boating on peak days only (primarily in June, July and August) as boaters may find it too difficult to find a place to park.

Widen Marina Drive for Parking on Both Sides – 20 Spaces (Alternative 3)

Under this alternative, Marina Drive would be widened from the existing Marina restrooms northeast for about 500 feet. This location is adjacent to the northeast boundary of the new Marina Parking Lot proposed in the SPRA Master Plan. Road widening would provide adequate room for two-way traffic circulation and a total of 20 designated parallel parking spaces with 10 spaces located on each side of the road. This number of spaces is equivalent to that which would be provided by the proposed new Marina Parking Lot. The road would need to be shifted northwest by approximately 10 feet to allow space for parking on the southeast side. A drainage ditch on the northwest side of the existing road would also need to be relocated to the northwest of the new parking lane and possibly resized to handle the additional runoff. This alternative would require establishing a new turnout lane on an existing dirt road that would connect Marina Drive with Lake Drive southeast of its existing intersection. Vehicles with trailers would enter this lane, turn left on Lake Drive, and left on Marina Drive to either park on the northwest side of Marina Drive or to return to the boat launch to pick up their boats.

The existing cut slope would be cut back by an average of about 20 feet to create the necessary space, and an approximately 12-foot retaining wall constructed. No lower fill slope with a retaining wall would be involved. Along the cut slope, tree density is similar to that of the proposed new parking lot. With this alternative, approximately 17,500

square feet of area would be disturbed with an estimated loss of 70 trees. The retaining wall would not be visible from the lake because it would be screened by mature conifers downslope of Marina Drive. However, the retaining wall would be visible from Marina Drive.

While tree loss would be an impact of this alternative, the loss would occur along an existing road and farther from Jenkinson Lake than the proposed project, and would be better screened from the lake and trail area. Impacts to the existing trail and the forest alongside the lake through which it passes would be avoided.

FINDINGS:

This alternative would meet all of the objectives of the project. However, widening of the Marina Drive would remove an unknown number of trees. Visual impacts would be somewhat reduced due to the removal of trees at a greater distance from the lake than the proposed project. In addition, this alternative parking design could be somewhat problematic for boaters attempting to parallel park their vehicles. This alternative parallel parking design would require greater driver skill and maneuverability than the pull through design provided under the proposed project.

Widen Marina Drive for Parking on One Side – 10+ Spaces (Alternative 4)

This alternative is similar to Alternative 3 (Widen Marina Drive for Parking on Both Sides), except the widening would be limited to an average of 10 feet to provide 10 designated parallel parking spaces on the northwest (uphill) side of the road (Figure 7-1). Adequate two-way traffic circulation would also be provided. As with Alternative 3, the drainage ditch on the northwest side of the existing road would need to be relocated to the northwest of the new parking lane and possibly resized to handle the additional runoff. This alternative would require the same addition of a turnout lane to facilitate turning at the Lake Drive and Marina Drive intersection.

Because the existing slope would not be cut back as far as in Alternative 3, it would also not be as high. The retaining wall would be an estimated 10 feet high. Approximately 10,000 square feet of area would be disturbed with approximately 40 trees removed.

FINDINGS:

All of the project objectives would be met with the exception of one . . . "Maintain and develop facilities in a manner consistent with available resources, the character of the affected recreation area, user needs, public safety, and park resource protection." As many as 10 fewer parking spaces would be provided. As a result, parking supplies at the existing Marina parking area would continue to be inadequate when boating demands are high. Enforcing the existing "no parking" rule along Marina Road could avoid the circulation and safety issues discussed in Section 4.4.1.1 of the Draft Master EIR. However, this could result in a de-facto reduction in the current level of boating on peak days only (primarily in June, July and August) as boaters may find it too difficult to find a place to park. In addition, this alternative parking design could be somewhat problematic for boaters attempting to parallel park their vehicles. This alternative

parallel parking design would require greater driver skill and maneuverability than the pull through design provided under the proposed project.

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

In determining whether to approve the project, CEQA requires a public agency to balance the benefits of a project against its significant unavoidable environmental impacts (Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines). In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the Board has, in determining whether or not to approve the proposed project, balance the economic, social, technological, academic, and other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental effects, and has found that the benefits of the project outweigh the significant adverse environmental effects that are not mitigated to less than significant levels, for the reasons set forth below. This statement of overriding considerations is based on the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan EIR, oral and written testimony, and other evidence received at public meetings and hearings held on the project and the EIR. The Board finds that each of the following benefits is an overriding consideration, independent of the other benefits, that warrants approval of the project notwithstanding the project's significant unavoidable impacts.

Implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the Draft Master EIR and the Final Master EIR will avoid or substantially lessen all but one significant impact (Impact AES-4). See Table 4.3-4 of the Draft Master EIR under Marina Parking Expansion (Component ID 24.01).

EID recognizes that the proposed project will cause significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics. EID has carefully balanced the benefits of the proposed project against the unavoidable adverse impacts identified in the Draft Master EIR, Final Master EIR and EID's Findings of Fact. Notwithstanding the disclosure of impacts identified as significant and which have not been eliminated or mitigated to a level of insignificance, EID, acting pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, hereby determines that the benefits of the project outweigh the significant unmitigated adverse impacts. Based upon the above recitals and the entire record, including the Sly Park Recreation Area Master Plan EIR, or and written testimony, and other evidence received at the public hearing held on the project and the EIR, the EID Board of Directors finds that there is evidence that supports a finding that the project will result in substantial local, community and regional benefits, that outweigh and render acceptable the significant effects on the environment that cannot be mitigated to a level less than significant.

EID finds it imperative to balance competing goals in approving the project. Not every environmental concern has been fully satisfied because of the need to satisfy competing concerns to a certain extent. Accordingly, in some instances EID has chosen to accept certain environmental impacts because to eliminate them would unduly compromise other important benefits to the project. EID finds and determines that the text of the proposed project approval document provides for a positive balance of the competing goals and that the economic, fiscal, social, planning, land use and other benefits to be

obtained by the proposed project outweigh the one specific environmental impact of the proposed project that cannot be sufficiently mitigated.

Substantial evidence is included in the record of these proceedings and in documents relating to the project demonstrating the environmental, land use, social, and economic benefits which EID would derive from the implementation of the project.

The proposed SPRA Master Plan includes the much needed Marina parking lot expansion to facilitate recreation in keeping with EID's mission statement for SPRA, which ultimately provides for a greater social value than preservation of the existing views. While the Draft and Final Master EIR finds there will be a significant aesthetic impact from several viewpoints located throughout the park, the extent of this impact on the park is likely to decrease somewhat over time as vegetation along the shoreline becomes re-established and matures. Much of the aesthetic impact will be experienced by boaters on the lake in close proximity to the new facility. Thus many of the viewers most likely to be subjected to the adverse impact are the same park visitors that are likely to derive the most benefit from the new facility. Hikers on the pedestrian trail adjacent to the proposed parking lot will also be impacted by the alteration in views in the immediate area of the project. The aesthetic impact of the Marina parking lot expansion as seen from more distant viewpoints within the park (e.g., Group Campground and Pinecone Camp) would be less than from closer viewpoints, eventually becoming less adverse over time as young trees mature. The additional parking lot is needed to provide adequate parking capacity for boat/trailer combinations during peak use periods. Existing illegal parking causes traffic and safety issues, creates an enforcement burden on staff, and results in the loss of parking spaces intended for non-boating park users. The new parking facility will substantially help to address these important issues, and thus the benefit of the project outweighs the impact to aesthetic resources.