

3.0 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT TEXT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The revisions to the text of the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) outlined below present minor corrections, additions, and revisions initiated by the Lead Agency (Placer County) based on comments received during the public review period by reviewing agencies and/or the public, as well as minor corrections added by the County during preparation of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

The changes represent minor clarifications/amplifications of the information contained in the Subsequent DEIR and do not constitute significant new information that, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5, would trigger the need to recirculate portions or all of the Subsequent DEIR.

3.2 DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES

New text is double underlined and deleted text is ~~struck through~~. Text changes are presented in the order of chapters in which they appear in the Subsequent DEIR.

1.0 COVER, TITLE PAGE

The document name has been updated to read as follows: Hidden Falls Regional Park Trails Expansion Project Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report.

The AECOM contact has been changed from Ken Koch to Steve Leach.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Section 1.4, “Definition of Baseline” has been revised to clarify the baseline conditions that are evaluated in the Draft SEIR as shown below.

According to Section 15125 of the State CEQA Guidelines, baseline conditions are normally defined as the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they exist at the time that the NOP is published. A lead agency may also use permit limits as baseline only where an action modifies a prior project that had CEQA review and the facts support it (i.e., reaching the limit is not hypothetical). In the case of this SEIR, the baseline condition assumes the HFRP is fully developed and operational. Therefore, the environmental setting described in the SEIR is directed toward conditions within the HFRP Trails Expansion Project Area is consistent with conditions at the time of the NOP was published. The exception is that two project features (one bridge and the nature education center) that were approved based on the 2010 EIR and have not been completed are not re-evaluated in the SEIR.¹ This approach to the environmental setting is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 which states the lead agency should use the baseline that provides the most accurate picture practically possible of the project’s impacts,

¹ The SEIR assumes the findings made by the County on the HFRP are in place and does not reopen the prior analysis. In-depth review of the HFRP approvals has already occurred, and the right to build is vested.

including conditions expected when the project becomes operational. The bridge and the nature center impacts were previously evaluated in the 2010 EIR that was approved by the County and both facilities are included within the approved Capital Improvement Program for the Parks Draft Master Plan. All impacts related to the construction of the bridge and nature education center were analyzed in the 2010 Certified EIR and the impacts for construction remain consistent with that analysis. The Draft SEIR included these facilities as part of the baseline because impacts of these facilities are supported by reliable projections and would occur in the absence of the proposed project.

3.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 2.4.3, “Reduced Visitor Access for Garden Bar Road Access Only (Alternative 3)” has been modified as shown below.

Alternative 3 would construct all the project improvements except at the Garden Bar Road entrance, where only Phase 1A, Phase 1B, and Phase 1C improvements would take place. Phase 2 (allowing for additional automobiles) and Phase 3 (allowing for equestrian trailers) would be eliminated from the Project Description. Alternative 3 would reduce the automobile parking count at this entrance by ~~40~~ 20 spaces and the equestrian parking count by 20 spaces. Under Alternative 3, improvements include 30 miles of new native-surface trail system, two bridges crossing Raccoon Creek, access roads, 30 parking spaces at the Garden Bar 40 parking area and full build-out of the Mears, Twilight Ride, and Harvego trailheads accommodating ~~247~~ 325 new automobile parking spaces and 48 new equestrian trailer parking spaces, supported with amenities including picnic benches and tables, restrooms, and potable water. All phases of the proposed Twilight Ride and Harvego trailheads as well as the additional 25 parking spaces at the Mears Place entrance would be open to the public and access would remain controlled by the reservation system on weekends, holidays and other peak usage days for the Mears, Twilight Ride and Harvego Bear River parking areas. Parking reservations would be required on a daily basis at the Garden Bar 40 parking area. This Alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact to visual resources associated with the full buildout of the Garden Bar Road trailhead. However, Alternative 3 would not implement full buildout of the Garden Bar Road access as originally intended and would not provide a western staging area for equestrian trailers.

The following changes have been added to Table 2-1 in section 2.6 “Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures” of the Subsequent DEIR: “SU” stands for “Significant and Unavoidable” and has been added to Table 2-1 key.

Table 2-1. Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Section 4.0, “Land Use”			
<p>IMPACT 4-1: Land Use and Agricultural Resources— Adverse Effect on Agricultural or Timber Resource Operations or Conversion of Important Farmland to Nonagricultural Uses. The project area is designated as Farmland of Local Importance. Taylor Ranch and the east parcel of the Harvego Preserve, as well as the Liberty Ranch, are currently under Williamson Act contracts. The proposed project would increase use of the area by the public where grazing activities currently take place. Although this change would be different from surrounding uses, project elements would ensure compatibility with land uses in the project area. Current grazing activities have been and would continue on the properties and such activities are included as a component of the County’s Vegetation, Fuels, and Range Management Plan (2007) for operations and maintenance of the existing park as well as the Land Management Plans for the various properties owned by PLT. Management Plans and the Placer County Public Recreation Ordinance would be adapted to ensure regulation of public activities that have the potential to impact agricultural operations on expansion properties. Therefore, the properties’ agricultural use would be sustained as part of the project. The Timberland land use designation for the project area allows forestry uses, while also allowing open space, residential, and recreation land uses in the same areas.</p>	<p>LTS (Consistent with prior analysis in the 2010 HFRP Certified EIR)</p>	<p>None Warranted</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>LTS = Less than Significant PS = Potentially Significant <u>SU = Significant and Unavoidable</u></p>			

The permanent area of soil compaction from constructed facilities, described in Impact 11-4 in Table 2-1 in Section 2.6 “Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures” of the Subsequent DEIR has been updated as presented below.

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>IMPACT 11-4: Hydrology and Water Quality— Change in the Supply and Availability of Groundwater through Withdrawals, Interception, or Loss of Recharge Capacity. While soil compaction from constructed facilities could slightly impede recharge in localized areas, only approximately 18 <u>13.5</u> acres of the 2,765+/- acres of HFRP Trails Expansion project would be <u>permanently</u> developed with impervious surfaces. Installation of groundwater wells for uses related to the park and proposed project facilities could increase the demand for groundwater; however, project-related groundwater demand would not be substantial and is similar to yield rates found in private wells in the project vicinity. In addition, the demand for water is limited by the number of people permitted to visit under the reservation system. Proposed project-related water needs include water necessary for fire suppression, but the 2009 water demand calculation report did not evaluate project requirements related to fire suppression. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	<p>PS (Consistent with prior analysis in the 2010 HFRP Certified EIR)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 11-2: Implement Groundwater Protection through a Transient Non-community Water System Permit. Mitigation Measure 11-3: Calculate Water Demands for Fire Suppression.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Section 3.2.2, “2019 – Proposed Trails Expansion Area” has been updated to note that the Twilight Ride Property was acquired by Placer County.

The Twilight Ride property is comprised of two parcels consisting of a 10-acre parcel (APN 026-110-012) and a 40-acre parcel (APN 026-110-018) and is located in the unincorporated area of Placer County, south of the Bear River. The County entered into a Purchase and Sale Agreement with the owners of the Twilight Ride property in 2018. These negotiations ~~may result in the eventual~~ resulted in the purchase of the property in spring 2020. Topography of the site is gentle with an elevation differential ranging from approximately 1,075 to 1,240 feet above mean sea level from southwest to northeast. The property lies within the Raccoon Creek watershed and is approximately 0.25 mile north of Raccoon Creek. The property is dominated by annual grasslands with scattered blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*) and patches of blue oak woodland. The 10-acre portion includes an existing single-family residence and various out-buildings. The 40-acre parcel has an existing storage structure near the middle of the parcel. A parking area on the northwest portion of the 40-acre parcel is proposed with this project. The parking area would connect with the existing trails located on Taylor Ranch. An access road would connect Bell Road with the parking area on the 40-acre parcel.

Table 3-1 was updated to correct one project detail included for HFRP under the category of access (County managed). As shown in the corrected table below, a dedicated turn lane is not proposed for HFRP.

Table 3-1. Existing HFRP and Proposed Expansion

Improvement	HFRP (Existing) Approved and Built	HFRP Approved, Not Built Yet	Proposed Expansion	Combined
Coverage Area¹	1,200 acres	-	Approximately 2,765 acres	Approximately 3,965 acres
Trail Network¹	30 miles of trails (6 miles from Didion portion and 24 from Spears portion)	-	30 miles of trails	60 miles of trails
Bridges and Stream Crossings	3 major bridges 13 trail bridges 23 stream ford crossings 15 culvert crossings	1 major bridge -	2 major bridges 15 trail bridges 30 stream ford crossings 20 culvert crossings	6 major bridges 28 trail bridges ¹ 53 Stream ford crossings ¹ 35 culvert crossings ¹
Educational				
Nature Center	-	1 nature center	-	1 nature center
Information Kiosks	2 kiosks	-	3 kiosks	5 kiosks
Picnic Areas	6	-	12	18
Scenic Overlook	2	-	3	5
Caretaker Residence				
House Rehab	0	1 (existing, but not rehabilitated yet)	1 Existing residence at Twilight Ride. Could be utilized for caretaker's residence in the future	2
Access Improvements				
Access (County Managed)				
Reservation System	1 Mears Mears – Operational	1 Garden Bar -	2 points of access (Twilight Ride and Harvego) Expand to new parking areas, including Garden Bar 40	4 points of access Covers all parking lots
Web Cam	Mears – Operational	-	Expand to new parking areas	Covers all parking lots
Signage – Entrance, directional, wayfinding, regulatory and interpretive	Completed for Mears Entrance	Approved for Garden Bar entrance, Not Complete	Additional Signage	Additional signage
Striping	-	Approved for Garden Bar Road, Not Complete	Striping of Garden Bar Road in Phase 1A	Garden Bar Road
Pull Outs	-	Approved for Garden Bar Road, Not Complete	Garden Bar Road - Phase 1B; Curtola Road – Phase 2: add pullouts	Garden Bar and Curtola Roads
Widening	-	Approved for Garden Bar Road, Not Complete	Curtola Road – Phase 3: widen road to 20 feet.	Widen Garden Bar and Curtola Road
Curve Improvements	-	Garden Bar Rd – Phase 2, improve vertical curves, Phase 3, improve horizontal curves		Phases 2 and 3 Improve curves on Garden Bar Road
Dedicated Turn Lane	-	Not Complete	Twilight Ride – Phase 2 -Add left turn pocket on Bell Road	Construct left turn pocket – Bell Road
Gated Public Access Road	1 (Mears)	1 (Garden Bar Road gated access not currently open to general public)	Add gated access to Twilight Ride, Harvego, and new Garden Bar 40 entry	Construct gated access points

Improvement	HFRP (Existing) Approved and Built	HFRP Approved, Not Built Yet	Proposed Expansion	Combined
Parking				
Autos	101 spaces at Mears (including paved and gravel areas)	45 spaces at Garden Bar	98 auto spaces at Twilight Ride 115 auto spaces at Harvego	384 auto parking spaces
Trailers	12 at Mears	20 spaces at Garden Bar	25 auto spaces at Mears 38 trailer spaces at Twilight Ride	80 equestrian trailer parking spaces
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliant	4 spaces at Mears	5 spaces at Garden Bar	10 trailer spaces at Harvego 4 ADA spaces at Twilight Ride 5 ADA spaces at Harvego	18 ADA parking spaces
Emergency Response				
Helipad	3	-	2 (Twilight Ride and Harvego)	5
Water Tanks with hydrants	1 (12,000 gallon)	-	3 (12,000 gallon) at each of the new parking areas	4
Shaded Fuel Breaks	3 (120 acres total)		2 already constructed on Harvego (90 acre and 30 acre)	5
Water and Sanitation				
Groundwater Well	2 existing	1 – Garden Bar parking area	2 groundwater wells (Twilight Ride and Harvego)	5
Septic Systems	2 (1 at Mears entrance, 1 serving existing ranch house at west end of HFRP)	1 – Garden Bar parking area	2 septic systems (Twilight Ride and Harvego)	5
Permanent Restrooms	1 building with 2 stalls (10 portable restrooms) plus 2 restrooms at existing ranch house (not public)	2 – Garden Bar parking area and nature education / camping area	2 permanent restroom buildings, one each at Twilight Ride and Harvego (6 stalls)	5
Portable Restrooms		Portable restrooms at strategic locations	Portable restrooms may be used until permanent restrooms are constructed and for convenience within the trail network	Approximately 20

Source: AECOM 2019; Placer County 2019

¹ Acreages and trail mileages, as well as number of trail bridges, stream ford crossings and culvert crossings are approximate

Page 3-4: The webcam address has been changed. The current address is <https://www.placer.ca.gov/6412/Webcam>

The following bullet has been added to Section 3.7.1 “Approvals Required by Placer County” (page 3-49):

- County permits for buildings and tree removal

The following bullet has been added to Section 3.7.2 “Approvals Issued by Other Agencies” (page 3-49):

- Encroachment permit for any construction within the Nevada Irrigation District (NID) canal right-of-way (Nevada Irrigation District)

4.0 LAND USE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

No changes.

5.0 SOILS, GEOLOGY, SEISMICITY, AND MINERAL RESOURCES

On page 5-11 of Chapter 5.0, Section 5.2.6 “Naturally Occurring Asbestos,” the last paragraph has a typographical error that has been corrected as follows:

The potential presence of and hazards posed by naturally occurring asbestos are discussed in greater detail in Section 9.3.1, “Toxic Air Contaminants,” in Chapter 9.0, “Air Quality.”

Mitigation Measures S5-2: Obtain and Implement Seismic Engineering Design Recommendations includes the following revision to the last sentence:

It is the responsibility of the ~~applicant~~County to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.

6.0 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

No changes.

7.0 VISUAL RESOURCES

The following changes have been made to section 7.1.2 at the bottom of page 7-1 of the Draft SEIR:

7.1.1 HFRP Mitigation Measures Adopted by the County in 2010

Implementation of the following mitigation measures, which were adopted by Placer County when the HFRP EIR was certified in 2010, reduced impacts of the project on visual resources.

- ▶ **Mitigation Measure 7-~~31~~**: Revegetate and Restore All Disturbed Areas to Minimize Visual Quality Impacts.
- ▶ **Mitigation Measure 12-8**: Protect Oak Woodland Habitat.

8.0 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Page 8-28. The following change has been made to the last paragraph:

~~As noted earlier,~~ Three (3) collisions have occurred from 2014 - 2016 ~~over the last 3 years~~ in this area.

The following changes have been made to Mitigation Measure S8-2. Install No Parking Signs to discourage Pedestrian Travel on Local Roads:

Prior to the use of the new parking areas, install “No Parking” signs along public roads serving the Project site as authorized by the Placer County Board of Supervisors at the discretion of the ~~County Department of Public Works~~ to discourage offsite parking and limit pedestrian movement between offsite street parking and each project entry. If parking on side streets near park entrances becomes a repetitive problem, the County shall institute “No Parking” areas along the impacted portions of the roadways.

9.0 AIR QUALITY

There are two sections in Chapter 9.0, both listed as section 9.2.3. Toxic Air Contaminants and section 9.2.3. Odors on page 9-11, which should have been combined. The following change has been made to the Draft SEIR:

9.2.3 EXISTING AIR QUALITY—TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS AND ODORS

Mitigation Measure 9-1, described in Section 9.5 of the Draft SEIR has been updated to include additional performance measures recommended by PCAPCD to further minimize the potential air quality issues associated with naturally occurring asbestos.

Mitigation Measure 9-1: Conduct On-Site Soil Testing and Prepare and Implement an Asbestos Dust Control Plan, If Needed. *(Applies to Impact 9-35-2)*

Prior to construction activity, the County shall test the on-site soils for the presence of asbestos. If naturally-occurring asbestos, serpentine, or ultramafic rock is either known to be located onsite, or is disclosed in the project’s geology/soils survey report, or if the project is located in, partly or entirely, “a most likely” to contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos Area, as shown on the Geologic maps prepared by the California Geologic Survey (formerly the California Division of Mines and Geology), the following measures shall be implemented.

The project shall comply with PCAPCD Rule 228 for fugitive dust control. When the construction area is equal to or greater than one acre, the applicant shall prepare an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) as required in Section 93105 of the California Health and Safety Code, “Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations.” The ADMP shall be submitted to the PCAPCD a minimum of 21 days before construction activity is scheduled to commence. The applicant should contact the PCAPCD before retaining a qualified state registered geologist to conduct initial geologic evaluations as part of the ADMP application process. The County shall submit the plan to the County Planning Department for review and PCAPCD for review and approval before construction of the first project phase. Approval of the plan must be received from PCAPCD

before any asbestos-containing rock (serpentine) can be disturbed. Upon approval of the asbestos dust control plan by PCAPCD, the County shall ensure that construction contractors implement the terms of the plan throughout the construction period.

If asbestos is found in concentrations greater than 5 percent, the material shall not be used as surfacing material as stated in state regulation CCR Title 17 Section 93106 (“Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure-Asbestos Containing Serpentine”). The material with naturally-occurring asbestos can be reused at the site for sub-grade material covered by other non-asbestos-containing material in accordance with Placer County APCD Rule 228 and Section 93105, Title 17, California Code of Regulation (CCR) by the California Air Resources Board per Health and safety Code Section 39666.

If asbestos containing soil is found on trail surfaces, the asbestos dust control plan shall include provisions, including capping or other treatment of trail surfaces to avoid exposure by trail users.

10.0 NOISE

The analysis of Impact 10-3 Noise Increases in Transportation-Related Noise Levels for long-term operational impacts for the proposed access road to the Twilight Ride parking area states, “At 25 mph, the resulting exterior noise level would be 47 dBA L_{eq} at 40 feet from the adjacent residential property line” (Draft SEIR page 10-25). There is a typographical error and it should be “48 dBA L_{eq} ”, which is supported by Appendix F Noise Data.

11.0 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The total area of grading and vegetation removal summarized on Page 11-13 was updated for consistency with the biological resource section Table 12-4. The updated text is presented below.

Grading and vegetation removal during construction of access roads, parking areas, bridge and overlook footings, restrooms, and the trail system has the potential to result in soil erosion. Construction of activity would require total ground disturbance of approximately ~~41.8~~ 49.2 acres (~~21.2~~ 28.7 permanent acres and ~~20.6~~ 20.5 temporary acres). Construction of the trail system would disturb approximately 23 acres (7.7 acres permanent and 15.5 acres temporary) of land in linear construction corridors distributed around the expansion area along the proposed trail alignments. Trailhead improvements including parking, access road and amenities would disturb 18.5 acres (13.5 permanent and 5.0 temporary). Vegetation removed during construction would be chipped or lopped and broadcast in the immediate area. Vegetation removed at parking areas would be stockpiled and following construction, used as mulch on exposed areas.

12.0 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following update has been made to Table 12-3 on page 12-27 of the Subsequent DEIR:

Table 12-3. Special-Status Wildlife Species Potentially Occurring in the Project Area

Special-Status Species	Regulatory Status (Federal; State) ¹	Habitat Requirements	Potential for Occurrence in the Project Area ²
Amphibians/Reptiles			
Foothill yellow-legged frog <i>Rana boylei</i>	SC <u>T for Feather River and Northern Sierra clades</u>	Streams and rivers with rocky substrate and open, sunny banks, in forests, chaparral, and woodlands; sometimes found in isolated pools, vegetated backwaters, and deep, shaded, spring-fed pools. Breeding occurs exclusively in streams and rivers and requires cobble-sized substrate for eggs and a minimum of 15 weeks of water for larval development.	Likely to occur; suitable aquatic habitat is present at Raccoon Creek and other drainages with cobble substrate. A possible foothill yellow-legged frog was observed during surveys in December 2016.

The total area values presented in Table 12-4 and the preceding text have been updated to correct minor calculation errors in the draft table as shown below.

Table 12-4 summarizes the extent of temporary and permanent impacts of the proposed project on vegetation communities and land cover types. The impact analysis was based on the conservative assumption that temporary impacts associated with trail construction would require a 15-foot wide construction corridor. Construction of the trail system would disturb 23.2 acres (7.7 acres permanent and 15.5 acres temporary) of land in linear corridors including drainage crossings. Trailhead improvements including parking, access road and amenities would disturb ~~18.5~~ 26.0 acres (~~13.5~~ 21.0 permanent and 5.0 temporary). Total land disturbance required to construct and operate the project is estimated at ~~41.8~~ 49.2 acres.

Table 12-4. Habitat Impacts of Proposed Hidden Falls Expansion by Project Element

Habitat Type	Trails*		Parking & Access		Total Acres
	Temporary	Permanent	Temporary	Permanent	
Annual Grassland	0.03	0.015	1.23	4.257	3.858 <u>5.532</u>
Blue Oak Woodland	2.90	1.450	0.00	0.000	<u>4.351</u>
Mixed Oak Woodland	0.00	0.000	1.63	4.595	4.504 <u>6.225</u>
Oak Savanna	0.00	0.000	1.79	10.162	9.204 <u>11.952</u>
Oak-Foothill Pine Woodland	12.50	6.249	0.13	1.396	19.044 <u>20.275</u>
Developed	0.00	0.000	0.16	0.318	0.543 <u>0.478</u>
Valley Foothill Riparian Woodland	0.00	0.000	0.07	0.263	0.184 <u>0.333</u>
Intermittent Drainage	0.02	0.011	0.00	0.011	0.045 <u>0.042</u>
Ephemeral Drainage	0.04	0.018	0.00	0.000	0.056 <u>0.058</u>
Seasonal Wetland	0.000		0.01		0.012 <u>0.010</u>
Subtotal	15.5	7.7	5.0	13.5 <u>21.0</u>	-
TOTAL	23.2		18.5 <u>26.0</u>		41.8 <u>49.245</u>

*Temporary Impacts (assuming 15-ft wide construction corridor for trails)

Total is rounded to nearest hundredth of an acre.

The PCCP is described in detail on page 12-38 of the Draft SEIR and using the PCCP as mitigation options is described in detail in several of the biological mitigation measures. To clarify the consistency, the following sentence has been added to the second paragraph of Section 12.4.3 Issues not discussed further on page 12-41 of the Subsequent DEIR:

The proposed project would support the plans and policies of the General Plan. Because the proposed project would have no impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or native or migratory wildlife corridor, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and would not adversely affect an adopted habitat conservation plan, including the PCCP ~~onee~~if adopted, no further discussion is provided on the topics.

The following changes have been made to the paragraphs pertaining to the Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP) in mitigation measures S12-1 through S12-5 and S12-7 on pages 12-48 through 12-60 of the Subsequent DEIR. These changes have also been included in the MMRP (Chapter 4 of this Final SEIR):

- ▶ In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of improvement plans for this project or prior to the project's own State and federal permits being obtained for effects associated with listed species and their habitats, waters of the State, and waters of the U.S., then Mitigation Measure 12-2 may be replaced with the PCCP's mitigation fees and conditions on covered activities to address this resource impact and avoidance and minimization measures as set forth in the PCCP implementation document to the extent compliance with the PCCP provides equal or greater mitigation or reduction in the significance of impacts. If PCCP enrollment is chosen and/or required by the State and federal agencies as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the PCCP avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures shall apply only to those species, habitat types, and waters that are covered by the PCCP.

The following changes have been made to Mitigation Measure S12-4 on page 12-57 of the Draft SEIR (additions to fifth and sixth bullets):

Mitigation Measure S12-4: Implement Measures to Protect Foothill Yellow-Legged Frog and Northwestern Pond Turtle

- Suitable foothill yellow-legged frog and northwestern pond turtle aquatic habitat shall be surveyed within 2 weeks before the start of construction activities. If northwestern pond turtles or foothill yellow-legged frogs, tadpoles, or eggs are found, they may be moved from the project area only with CDFW approval and appropriate take permits. If neither northwestern pond turtle nor foothill yellow-legged frog is identified, construction may proceed.
- A qualified biologist holding the appropriate take permits shall be present at active work sites until the removal of foothill yellow-legged frog and northwestern pond turtle, instruction of workers, and habitat disturbance have been completed. After this time, the County shall designate a person to monitor on-site compliance with all minimization measures.

The following changes have been made to Mitigation Measure S12-5 on page 12-48 of the Draft SEIR (revision to first bullet and third bullet, addition of last bullet):

Mitigation Measure S12-5: Implement Measures to Protect Raptors and Other Nesting Birds.

The County and its contractors shall implement the following measures to reduce impacts on raptors and other nesting birds:

- ▶ If construction activities or vegetation removal, including tree and shrub removal, occurs between February 15 and August 31, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys for nesting birds in the proposed construction area and 500 feet beyond the project construction footprint. Surveys shall be conducted no more than ~~two weeks~~ 3 days before the start of the activity. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation is required, unless construction activities cease for a period of 2 weeks or more. Another pre-construction survey shall be conducted as described above if a lapse in construction activities of two weeks or more occurs.
- ▶ If an active golden eagle nest, white tailed kite, American peregrine falcon, or California black rail is located within 0.25-mile of ~~public trails or roads that will be used during construction~~ construction access routes or construction sites, the County shall:
 - Notify CDFW of the nest within one working day of discovery of the nest; and
 - Implement recommendations from CDFW to avoid disturbance to golden eagle nesting activities.
- ▶ If an active nest is discovered outside of the typical nesting season, it should be avoided using the same avoidance measures that would be applied during the typical nesting season until such time as the young have fully fledged and are foraging independently of their parents.

The following change has been made to Impact 12-5 on page 12-48 of the Subsequent DEIR:

The potential impacts of the proposed project do not differ substantially from those described in the 2010 HRFP Certified EIR. Tree removal associated with construction of trails and parking areas could result in direct or indirect impacts on dens of ringtails. This impact would be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure 12-6, *Implement Measures to Protect Ringtail and Townsend's Big-Eared Bat Roosts*, requires pre-construction surveys to identify potential ringtail dens within 100 feet of proposed trail construction, and avoidance of those trees if feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, tree removal would be implemented in a way that would avoid and minimize direct and indirect impacts on ringtails. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 12-6, impacts on ringtails would be reduced to **less than significant**.

IMPACT 12-5 **Biological Resources—Potential Disturbance of Dens and Individual Ringtails.** *Trees along riparian portions of the project area such as Raccoon Creek that are 5 inches or greater dbh and are hollow or have large cavities provide potential den sites for ringtail. Removal of such trees or other vegetation during trail construction and for road improvements could destroy dens, resulting in potential loss of adults and/or young.*

Significance *Potentially significant - (Consistent with prior analysis in 2010 HFRP Certified EIR)*

Mitigation Proposed *Mitigation Measure 12-6: Implement Measures to Protect Ringtail and ~~Other Bat Roosts~~ Townsend's Big-Eared Bat*

Residual Significance *Less Than Significant*

The following change has been made to the first paragraph on page 12-50 of the Subsequent DEIR:

The potential impacts of the proposed project do not differ substantially from those described in the 2010 HFRP Certified EIR. Tree removal associated with construction of trails, overlooks, bridges and parking areas could result in direct or indirect impacts on bat roosts, including roosts of Townsend's big-eared bats. This impact would be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure 12-6, *Implement Measures to Protect Ringtail and Townsend's Big-Eared Bat Roosts*, requires pre-construction surveys to identify potential bat roosts within 100 feet of proposed trail, bridge, or parking facility construction, and avoidance of those trees if feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, tree removal would be implemented in a way that would avoid, minimize, or mitigate direct and indirect impacts on bats. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 12-6, impacts on bats would be reduced to **less than significant**.

The following change has been made to the description of wetland impacts for the 2019 HFRP Trails Expansion Project presented on Page 12-51 to correct a typographical error.

The wetland surveys were conducted (Exhibit 12-1) across approximately 154.13 acres, and of this total, ~~5.01~~ 5.61 acres are features that are potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States. The study area included 1.15 acres of the Bear River, 0.48 acre of Raccoon Creek, six intermittent drainages (0.45 acre), and 17 ephemeral drainages (0.56 acre).

The following change has been made to the impact conclusion at the end of mitigation measures S12-2 on page 12-55 of the Subsequent DEIR:

Implementation of this mitigation measure, along with Mitigation Measure 12-1 above, and Mitigation Measure S5-1 in Chapter 5.0, "Soils, Geology, and Seismicity," ~~and Mitigation Measure 11-1 in Chapter 11.0, "Hydrology and Water Quality,"~~ would reduce Impacts 12-1 and to **less-than-significant**.

The following changes have been made to Mitigation Measure S12-5 on page 12-58 of the Subsequent DEIR:

Mitigation Measure S12-5: Implement Measures to Protect Raptors and Other Nesting Birds

The County and its contractors shall implement the following measures to reduce impacts on raptors and other nesting birds during construction:

- If construction activities or vegetation removal, including tree and shrub removal, occurs between February 15 and August 31, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys for nesting birds in the proposed construction area and 500 feet beyond the project construction footprint. Surveys shall be conducted no more than ~~two weeks~~ 5 to 7 days before the start of the activity. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation is required, unless construction activities cease for a period of 2 weeks or more. Another pre-construction survey shall be conducted as described above if a lapse in construction activities of two weeks or more occurs.
- if an active nest is discovered outside of the typical nesting season, it should be avoided using the same avoidance measures that would be applied during the typical nesting season until such time as the young have fully fledged and are foraging independently of their parents.

The following change has been made to the beginning of Mitigation Measure 12-6 on page 12-59 of the Draft SEIR:

Mitigation Measure 12-6: Implement Measures to Protect Ringtail and Townsend's Big-Eared Bat

The County and its contractor shall implement the following measures to protect the dens or ringtails and roost sites of Townsend's big-eared bat and other bat species:

- ~~1. The County and its contractor shall implement the following measures to protect the dens or ringtails and roost sites of Townsend's big-eared bat and other bat species:~~

13.0 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

No changes.

14.0 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND HAZARDS

No changes.

15.0 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND ENERGY

The following change has been made to the text on page 15-6 of the Draft SEIR:

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) prepared a regional analysis of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and found average daily VMT for Placer County, excluding Tahoe Basin, to be approximately ~~8,605~~ 8.6 million miles. This travel demand is forecast to increase to ~~41,360~~ 11.4 million miles in 2020 and to ~~43,762~~ 13.8 million miles in 2036 under the Metropolitan

Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) (SACOG 2016). Within the SACOG region (which includes Placer County), the population growth rate has been greater than the rate of increase of total VMT, resulting in a reduction in VMT per capita from 2000 through 2012. VMT forecasts project a continuation of this declining per-capita VMT trend for the region through 2036 (SACOG 2016). The SACOG 2016 MTP/SCS identifies several policies and factors as supporting this declining trend in per-capita VMT. Among these factors are the trend toward more compact development, with more residents able to find jobs, schools, shopping, and other activities closer to their place of residence, and proposed improvements in transit and walkability that promote a shift away from reliance on private vehicles for transportation

The following change has been made to the text starting on page 15-12 of the Draft SEIR:

SACOG's MTP/SCS for 2035 was adopted on April 19, 2012. SACOG's MTP/SCS calls for meeting and exceeding CARB's GHG reduction goals for passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks of 7 percent by 2020 and 16 percent by 2035, where 2005 is the baseline year for comparison (SACOG 2012). SACOG's 2016 MTP/SCS was adopted on February 18, 2016 (SACOG 2016). The 2016 MTP/SCS demonstrates how the region can accommodate expected regional population growth and the increased demand for transportation in the region, while also showing that the region could achieve a reduction in per-capita passenger VMT.

SACOG has created a framework for describing the MTP/SCS that is made up of community types. Local land use plans (e.g., adopted and proposed general plans, specific plans, master plans, corridor plans) were divided into one of five community types based on the location of the plans. The project site is in the community type identified by the MTP/SCS as a "Developing Community Lands Not Identified for Future Development" (SACOG 2016):

Lands Not Identified for Future Development ~~Developing Communities~~ are typically, though not always, situated on vacant land at the edge of existing urban or suburban development; they are the next increment of urban expansion are areas of the region that are not expected to develop to urban levels during the MTP/SCS planning period. ~~Developing Communities~~ are identified in local plans as special plan areas, specific plans, or master plans and may be residential only, employment only, or a mix of residential and employment uses. Transportation options in ~~Developing Communities~~ often depend, to a great extent, on the timing of development. Bus service, for example, may be infrequent or unavailable today, but may be available every 30 minutes or less once a community builds out. Walking and bicycling environments vary widely though many ~~Developing Communities~~ are designed with dedicated pedestrian and bicycle trails. The MTP/SCS includes 31 policies and multiple strategies to address the principles of smart land use; environmental quality and sustainability; financial stewardship; economic vitality; access and mobility; and equity and choice. Highlights of MTP/SCS policies include:

- ▶ Implement the Rural-Urban Connection Strategy (RUCS) which ensures good rural-urban connections and promotes the economic viability of rural lands while also protecting open space resources to expand and support the implementation of the Blueprint growth strategy and the MTP/SCS.

- ▶ Support and invest in strategies to reduce vehicle emissions that can be shown as cost effective to help achieve and maintain clean air and better public health.
- ▶ Use the best information available to implement strategies and projects that lead to reduced GHG emissions.
- ▶ Consider strategies to green the system, such as quieter pavements, cleaner vehicles, and lower energy equipment where cost effective, and consider regional funding contributions to help cover the incremental cost.
- ▶ SACOG encourages locally determined developments consistent with Blueprint principles and local circulation plans to be designed with walking, bicycling, and transit use as primary transportation consideration.

16.0 WILDFIRE

“The following minor change has been made to the sentence under “Placer County General Plan” on page 16-9 of the Draft SEIR:

The following are the relevant goals and policies identified by the *Placer County General Plan* (General Plan)(Placer County 2013) for ~~hazardous materials and hazards~~ wildfire.”

17.0 ALTERNATIVES

The description of the visual resource impacts associated with Alternative 2 (Reduced Trailhead Amenities) is updated to state that the significant unavoidable impact associated with the Garden Bar Road improvements would be eliminated. The revised text from the first paragraph on Page 17-5 is provided below.

Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of parking and amenities proposed at the Garden Bar, Twilight Ride and Harvego Preserve parking areas. Alternative 2 assumes 30 miles of proposed natural-surface trails, 2 bridge crossings over Raccoon Creek, and stream crossings would be constructed over time as described under the proposed project. Alternative 2 would also provide 25 additional vehicle parking spaces at the existing Mears Place park entry, 30 automobile parking spaces at the Garden Bar entrance (along with the improvements associated with Phase 1A, 1B, and 1C of the new Garden Bar parking area), 18 automobile parking spaces at the Harvego Preserve parking area (in addition to other Phase 1 and 2 improvements), and 54 automobile and 20 equestrian parking spaces, along with other corresponding improvements associated with Phase 1 of the Twilight Ride parking area. In total, Alternative 2 would reduce the total number of new automobile parking spaces to 127 and the equestrian parking spaces to 20, versus 297 automobile and 68 equestrian spaces proposed at full buildout. This Alternative would potentially reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with VMT but not to a less than significant level. The significant unavoidable impact to visual resources created by the Garden Bar Road improvements would ~~remain~~ be eliminated. Alternative 2 would not implement full buildout of the parking area, trailhead amenities and sanitation improvements planned for the entrances at Garden Bar Road, Harvego Preserve, and Twilight Ride.

The discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and energy impacts of Alternative 2, presented on Page 17-9, is updated to clarify the point that the GHG emissions would be reduced under Alternative 2. The revised text is provided below.

Sources of operational related emissions of the project include motor vehicles and trucks, energy usage, water usage, and waste generation. The proposed project would generate approximately 6,419 MT CO₂e per year, which would be well below the operational threshold of 10,000 MT CO₂e per year established by the PCAPCD. With the reduction in parking capacity by over a half with Alternative 2, the resulting decrease in vehicle trips ~~and related~~ would reduce GHG emissions ~~would be greater~~ under Alternative 2 ~~than under~~ compared to the proposed project.

The total disturbance of the proposed project disturbance on page 17-13 is corrected as shown below.

Biological Resources

Land disturbance with the proposed project was estimated to be approximately ~~41.8~~49.2 acres. Of this total, trails represent 7.7 acres, and the remainder of disturbance involves improvements at the trailheads. As with the project, Alternative 3 would require construction of two bridge crossings over Raccoon Creek and trail crossings over other unnamed drainages within the trail expansion areas. Under either development scenario, grading activity is needed although fewer trees would be removed by Alternative 3 because Garden Bar Road would not be widened. Under either development scenario, mitigation to reduce impacts on special-status species, oak woodlands, and waters of the United States would be required. But because Alternative 3 does not require the removal of oak trees along Garden Bar Road, and its area of grading is less than that of the proposed project, it would have less potential impact on biological resources than the proposed project.

Table 17-1, Comparison of Environmental Impacts for HFRP Trails Expansion Project Alternatives is updated to clarify that the “No Project” Alternative would have no impacts on the CEQA topics. The revised Table 17-1 is presented below.

Table 17-1. Comparison of Environmental Impacts for HFRP Trails Expansion Project Alternatives

Issue Area	No Project (Alternative 1)	Reduced Access (Alternative 2)	Reduced Access for Garden Bar Road Only (Alternative 3)
Land Use and Agricultural Resources	Less <u>None</u>	Similar	Similar
Biological Resources	Less <u>None</u>	Less	Less
Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources	Less <u>None</u>	Less	Slightly Less
Visual Resources	Less <u>None</u>	Significantly Less	Significantly Less
Transportation and Circulation	Less <u>None</u>	Slightly Less	Slightly Less
Air Quality	Less <u>None</u>	Less	Slightly Less
Noise	Less <u>None</u>	Less	Slightly Less
Soils, Geology, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources	Less <u>None</u>	Less	Slightly Less
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less <u>None</u>	Less	Slightly Less
Public Services and Utilities	Less <u>None</u>	Less	Slightly Less
Hazardous Materials and Hazards	Less <u>None</u>	Slightly Less	Slightly Less
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy	Less <u>None</u>	Less	Slightly Less
Wildfire	Less <u>None</u>	Less	Slightly Less

18.0 OTHER CEQA

No changes.

19.0 REPORT PREPARERS

The following correction has been made to the list of County preparers on page 19-1.

Josh Huntsinger, Agricultural Commissioner

The following correction has been made to the list of AECOM preparers on page 19-1.

Wendy ~~Reynolds~~ Copeland, Senior Environmental Scientist

Jody Fessler, Environmental Scientist

20. REFERENCES

No changes.

Contents

3.0 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT TEXT3-1
3.1 Introduction 3-1
3.2 Description of Changes 3-1

Tables headers

Table 2-1. Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3-3
Table 3-1. Existing HFRP and Proposed Expansion 3-5
Table 12-3. Special-Status Wildlife Species Potentially Occurring in the Project Area 3-10
Table 12-4. Habitat Impacts of Proposed Hidden Falls Expansion by Project Element 3-10
Table 17-1. Comparison of Environmental Impacts for HFRP Trails Expansion Project
Alternatives 3-18