



Draft Recirculated Environmental Impact Report  
for the

# Tuolumne County General Plan Update Project

State Clearinghouse No. 2015082027

Prepared for:



Tuolumne County  
Community Resources Agency  
2 South Green Street  
Sonora, CA 95370

August 2018

**Draft Recirculated Environmental Impact Report**

**for the**

**Tuolumne County General Plan Update Project**

**State Clearinghouse No. 2015082027**

PREPARED FOR

**Tuolumne County**

Community Resources Agency

2 South Green Street

Sonora, CA 95370

Quincy Yaley, AICP

CRA Assistant Director - Development

PREPARED BY

**Ascent Environmental, Inc.**

455 Capitol Mall, Suite 300

Sacramento, CA 95814

Mike Parker, AICP

Project Manager

**August 2018**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Section   | Page        |
|---|-------------|
| <b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>                     | <b>v</b>    |
| <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>                              | <b>ES-1</b> |
| ES.1 General Plan Synopsis .....                            | ES-1        |
| ES.2 Scope and Content of the EIR.....                      | ES-3        |
| ES.3 Alternatives .....                                     | ES-3        |
| ES.4 Areas of Known Controversy.....                        | ES-4        |
| ES.5 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....       | ES-4        |
| <b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>                                 | <b>1-1</b>  |
| 1.1 Overview of the General Plan .....                      | 1-2         |
| 1.2 General Plan Update Process.....                        | 1-2         |
| 1.3 Overview of the CEQA Process.....                       | 1-4         |
| 1.4 Scope and Content of This EIR .....                     | 1-6         |
| 1.5 Lead, Responsible, and Trustee Agencies.....            | 1-6         |
| 1.6 EIR Process .....                                       | 1-7         |
| <b>2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>                          | <b>2-1</b>  |
| 2.1 Geographic Extent of the General Plan Area .....        | 2-1         |
| 2.2 1996 General Plan .....                                 | 2-3         |
| 2.3 Distinctive Communities Growth Scenario .....           | 2-3         |
| 2.4 General Plan Update .....                               | 2-4         |
| 2.5 Required Discretionary Actions .....                    | 2-24        |
| <b>3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES.....</b> | <b>3-1</b>  |
| 3.1 Aesthetics.....   | 3.1-1       |
| 3.2 Agricultural and Forest Resources .....                 | 3.2-1       |
| 3.3 Air Quality .....                                       | 3.3-1       |
| 3.4 Biological Resources .....                              | 3.4-1       |
| 3.5 Cultural Resources .....                                | 3.5-1       |
| 3.6 Energy.....   | 3.6-1       |
| 3.7 Geology and Soils .....                                 | 3.7-1       |
| 3.8 Global Climate Change.....                              | 3.8-1       |
| 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....                   | 3.9-1       |
| 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality.....                       | 3.10-1      |
| 3.11 Land Use and Planning .....                            | 3.11-1      |
| 3.12 Noise .....  | 3.12-1      |
| 3.13 Population and Housing.....                            | 3.13-1      |
| 3.14 Public Services.....                                   | 3.14-1      |
| 3.15 Recreation.....  | 3.15-1      |
| 3.16 Transportation and Circulation.....                    | 3.16-1      |
| 3.17 Utilities and Service Systems.....                     | 3.17-1      |
| <b>4 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS.....</b>                    | <b>4-1</b>  |
| 4.1 Methods of Analysis .....                               | 4-1         |
| 4.2 Cumulative Impacts.....                                 | 4-4         |
| <b>5 OTHER CEQA DISCUSSIONS .....</b>                       | <b>5-1</b>  |
| 5.1 Growth Inducing Impacts .....                           | 5-1         |
| 5.2 Irreversible Environmental Effects .....                | 5-3         |

|          |   |            |
|----------|---|------------|
| <b>6</b> | <b>ALTERNATIVES</b> .....                                   | <b>6-1</b> |
| 6.1      | Introduction to Alternatives .....                          | 6-1        |
| 6.2      | Attainment of Project Objectives .....                      | 6-2        |
| 6.3      | Summary of Project Impacts.....                             | 6-2        |
| 6.4      | Update to the Alternatives Analysis.....                    | 6-3        |
| 6.5      | Description of Alternatives and Comparison of Impacts ..... | 6-6        |
| 6.6      | Environmentally Superior Alternative .....                  | 6-28       |
| <b>7</b> | <b>REFERENCES</b> .....                                     | <b>7-1</b> |
| <b>8</b> | <b>LIST OF PREPARERS</b> .....                              | <b>8-1</b> |

### Appendices (included in a CD on back cover)

|  |
|--|
| Appendix A – NOP and Comment Letters                                   |
| Appendix B – Biological Resources                                      |
| Appendix C - Air Quality Modeling Data                                 |
| Appendix D – Traffic Study   |
| Appendix E – Noise Modeling Data                                       |
| Appendix F – Proposed Changes to Title 17 of the County Ordinance Code |

### Exhibits

|                |  |        |
|----------------|--|--------|
| Exhibit 2-1    | Regional Location .....                                      | 2-2    |
| Exhibit 2-2    | Existing 1996 General Plan Land Use Diagram .....            | 2-11   |
| Exhibit 2-3    | General Plan Update Land Use Diagram .....                   | 2-13   |
| Exhibit 2-4    | Parcels with Proposed Changes in Land Use Designation .....  | 2-15   |
| Exhibit 2-5    | Countywide Circulation Network .....                         | 2-20   |
| Exhibit 3.1-1  | Visual Character of the Rural Environment.....               | 3.1-2  |
| Exhibit 3.1-2  | Visual Character of the Built Environment .....              | 3.1-3  |
| Exhibit 3.1-3  | Scenic Routes and Byways .....                               | 3.1-5  |
| Exhibit 3.1-4  | Scenic Routes Photographs .....                              | 3.1-6  |
| Exhibit 3.2-1  | Williamson Act Contract Lands.....                           | 3.2-5  |
| Exhibit 3.2-2  | Proposed Timber Production Designation .....                 | 3.2-19 |
| Exhibit 3.4-1  | Land Cover .....   | 3.4-3  |
| Exhibit 3.4-2a | National Wetlands Inventory .....                            | 3.4-5  |
| Exhibit 3.4-2b | National Wetlands Inventory .....                            | 3.4-7  |
| Exhibit 3.4-2c | National Wetlands Inventory .....                            | 3.4-9  |
| Exhibit 3.4-3  | Critical Habitat .....                                       | 3.4-15 |
| Exhibit 3.4-4  | Essential Connectivity Areas.....                            | 3.4-17 |
| Exhibit 3.9-1  | Tuolumne County Fire Hazard Severity Zones.....              | 3.9-5  |
| Exhibit 3.9-2  | Columbia Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan .....           | 3.9-8  |
| Exhibit 3.9-3  | Pine Mountain Lake Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan ..... | 3.9-9  |
| Exhibit 3.10-1 | Hydrology .....  | 3.10-3 |
| Exhibit 3.10-2 | Flood Zones.....   | 3.10-7 |
| Exhibit 3.10-3 | Dam Inundation Areas .....                                   | 3.10-9 |
| Exhibit 3.12-1 | Noise Monitoring Locations .....                             | 3.12-4 |
| Exhibit 3.12-2 | Columbia Airport Noise Impact Area – 2015.....               | 3.12-9 |

|                |   |         |
|----------------|---|---------|
| Exhibit 3.12-3 | Pine Mountain Lake Airport Noise Impact Area – 2015.....                          | 3.12-10 |
| Exhibit 3.12-4 | Roadway Noise Contour Map (CNEL) .....  | 3.12-19 |
| Exhibit 3.15-1 | Proposed Parks and Recreation, Open Space, and Public Land Use Designations ..... | 3.15-13 |
| Exhibit 4-1    | Tuolumne County and Surrounding Counties .....                                    | 4-2     |

## Tables

|              |  |         |
|--------------|--|---------|
| ES-1         | Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance After Mitigation.....    | ES-5    |
| Table 2-1    | Existing and Projected Population .....  | 2-6     |
| Table 2-2    | Existing and Projected Land Use Acreage.....   | 2-6     |
| Table 2-3    | Projected Development Under the General Plan Update .....  | 2-7     |
| Table 2-4    | General Plan Update Land Use Designations by Acreage .....                                       | 2-10    |
| Table 2-5    | Description of General Plan Land Use Designations .....  | 2-17    |
| Table 2-6    | Tuolumne County Total Potential Affordable Housing Units and 2014–2019 RHNA Allocation .....     | 2-19    |
| Table 3.2-1  | Agricultural Rating System.....  | 3.2-2   |
| Table 3.2-2  | Tuolumne County 2016 Agricultural Value Summary.....   | 3.2-3   |
| Table 3.3-1  | Ambient Air Quality Data .....   | 3.3-3   |
| Table 3.3-2  | Ambient Air Quality Standards.....   | 3.3-5   |
| Table 3.3-3  | Modeled Daily Maximum Construction Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors .....     | 3.3-17  |
| Table 3.3-4  | Modeled Annual Construction Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors .....            | 3.3-17  |
| Table 3.3-5  | Summary of Maximum Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors in 2040 ..... | 3.3-19  |
| Table 3.3-6  | Summary of Annual Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors in 2040 .....  | 3.3-19  |
| Table 3.5-1  | Tuolumne County Historical Resources .....   | 3.5-3   |
| Table 3.5-2  | Divisions of Geologic Time .....   | 3.5-4   |
| Table 3.6-1  | Construction Energy Consumption over the 2040 Planning Horizon.....                              | 3.6-17  |
| Table 3.6-2  | Gasoline and Diesel Consumption in 2040.....   | 3.6-18  |
| Table 3.6-3  | Operational Energy Consumption .....   | 3.6-19  |
| Table 3.7-1  | Tuolumne County Earthquake History 1930-2011.....  | 3.7-2   |
| Table 3.8-1  | Construction Related GHG Emissions Through 2040 .....  | 3.8-25  |
| Table 3.8-2  | Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions at Planning Horizon Year 2040.....                          | 3.8-25  |
| Table 3.8-3  | General Plan Update - GHG per Service Population (2040).....                                     | 3.8-26  |
| Table 3.9-1  | Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones.....  | 3.9-7   |
| Table 3.10-1 | Tuolumne County Water Bodies Listed as Impaired .....  | 3.10-5  |
| Table 3.10-2 | Designated Beneficial Uses for Waterbodies in the Plan Area .....                                | 3.10-12 |

|               |   |         |
|---------------|---|---------|
| Table 3.12-1  | Existing Noise Measurements.....  | 3.12-3  |
| Table 3.12-2  | Existing 2015 Noise Contours.....   | 3.12-5  |
| Table 3.12-3  | Caltrans Recommendations Regarding Vibration Levels .....   | 3.12-11 |
| Table 3.12-4  | Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure—Aircraft Noise Sources .....   | 3.12-12 |
| Table 3.12-5  | Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure—Transportation Noise Sources Excluding Aviation-<br>Related Noise.....                         | 3.12-15 |
| Table 3.12-6  | Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure—Aircraft Noise Sources .....   | 3.12-16 |
| Table 3.12-7  | Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure—Stationary Noise Sources.....  | 3.12-16 |
| Table 3.12-8  | Significance of Changes in Cumulative Noise Exposure .....  | 3.12-17 |
| Table 3.12-9  | 2040 Noise Levels and Contours .....  | 3.12-21 |
| Table 3.12-10 | Comparison of Existing and Future Noise Levels Along Road Segments .....  | 3.12-24 |
| Table 3.12-11 | Noise Levels from Construction Equipment.....   | 3.12-27 |
| Table 3.12-12 | Noise Levels from Construction Activities .....   | 3.12-27 |
| Table 3.12-13 | Construction Equipment Vibration Levels .....   | 3.12-29 |
| Table 3.12-14 | Vibration Levels for Rail Transit.....  | 3.12-34 |
|               |   |         |
| Table 3.13-1  | Existing Population and Dwelling Unit Count.....  | 3.13-1  |
| Table 3.13-2  | Regional Housing Needs Allocation for Unincorporated Tuolumne County 2014–2019 ....   | 3.13-3  |
|               |   |         |
| Table 3.14-1  | Tuolumne County Fire Stations and Staff .....   | 3.14-1  |
| Table 3.14-2  | Schools within Tuolumne County and 2013-2014 Enrollment .....   | 3.14-3  |
|               |   |         |
| Table 3.15-1  | Park and Recreational Facilities in Unincorporated Tuolumne County.....   | 3.15-1  |
| Table 3.15-2  | County Parks Identified in 2002 Recreation Master Plan .....  | 3.15-2  |
| Table 3.15-3  | Parkland Provision Standards of Other Sierra/Foothills Counties .....   | 3.15-10 |
|               |   |         |
| Table 3.16-1  | TCTC Generalized Roadway Average Daily Traffic (ADT) LOS Lookup Table.....  | 3.16-3  |
| Table 3.16-2  | Level of Service Definitions and Criteria for Intersections .....   | 3.16-4  |
| Table 3.16-3  | Existing Roadways with Unacceptable LOS .....   | 3.16-5  |
| Table 3.16-4  | Existing Intersections with Unacceptable Peak Hour LOS.....   | 3.16-6  |
| Table 3.16-5  | Total Annual VMT .....  | 3.16-10 |
| Table 3.16-6  | Roadway Segments with an Unacceptable LOS with Projected Development Under the<br>General Plan Update .....                     | 3.16-23 |
| Table 3.16-7  | Intersections with Unacceptable Levels of Service (2030/2040) with Projected<br>Development Under the General Plan Update ..... | 3.16-28 |
|               |   |         |
| Table 3.17-1  | Water Supply in TUD Service Area .....  | 3.17-2  |
| Table 3.17-2  | Water Demand in TUD Service Area .....  | 3.17-2  |
| Table 3.17-3  | Water Supply Shortage Stages and Conditions.....  | 3.17-3  |
| Table 3.17-4  | Supply and Demand Comparison in GCSD Service Area – Multiple Dry-Year Scenario.....   | 3.17-4  |
| Table 3.17-5  | Net Increase in Solid Waste Generation by 2040.....   | 3.17-19 |
|               |   |         |
| Table 4-1     | Population, Households, and Employment Projections of Cumulative Impact Analysis<br>Area 2015 - 2040.....                       | 4-3     |
| Table 4-2     | Geographic Scope of Cumulative Impacts .....  | 4-5     |
|               |   |         |
| Table 6-1     | Comparison of 2040 Buildout Characteristics of Project Alternatives.....  | 6-5     |
| Table 6-2     | Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternatives .....   | 6-29    |

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| °F                | degrees Fahrenheit  |
| 2017 Scoping Plan | <i>California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan</i>                  |
| AB                | Assembly Bill   |
| ACM               | asbestos-containing material  |
| ADT               | average daily traffic   |
| ADT               | average daily trip  |
| AFY               | acre-feet per year  |
| ALUC              | Airport Land Use Commission   |
| ALUCP             | Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan                                   |
| APCD              | Air Pollution Control District  |
| AQMD              | Air Quality Management District                                       |
| BMP               | best management practice  |
| CAA               | federal Clean Air Act   |
| CAAQS             | California ambient air quality standards                              |
| CAFE              | Corporate Average Fuel Economy  |
| CAL FIRE          | California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection                 |
| Cal/OSHA          | California Occupational Safety and Health Administration              |
| CalEEMod          | California Emissions Estimator Model                                  |
| Caltrans          | California Department of Transportation                               |
| CAP               | Climate Action Plan   |
| CARB              | California Air Resources Board  |
| CBC               | California Building Code  |
| CCAA              | California Clean Air Act  |
| CCR               | California Code of Regulations  |
| CDE               | California Department of Education                                    |
| CEC               | California Energy Commission  |
| CEQA              | California Environmental Quality Act                                  |
| CERCLA            | Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act |
| CESA              | California Endangered Species Act                                     |
| CFC               | California Fire Code  |
| CFC               | chlorofluorocarbon  |
| CFGC              | California Fish and Game Code   |
| CFR               | Code of Federal Regulations   |
| CH <sub>4</sub>   | methane   |
| CHP               | California Highway Patrol   |
| CIP               | Capital Improvements Program  |
| CNEL              | community noise equivalent level                                      |
| CNPS              | California Native Plant Society                                       |
| CNRA              | California Natural Resources Agency                                   |
| CO                | carbon monoxide   |
| CO <sub>2</sub>   | carbon dioxide  |
| County            | Tuolumne County   |
| CRHR              | California Register of Historical Resources                           |
| CRPR              | California Rare Plant Ranks   |
| CSD               | Community Services District   |
| CWA               | Clean Water Act   |
| CWHR              | California Wildlife Habitat Relationships                             |

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| dB                  | decibels   |
| dBA                 | A-weighted sound pressure level                                      |
| DHS                 | California Department of Health Services                             |
| DOC                 | California Department of Conservation                                |
| DOT                 | U.S. Department of Transportation                                    |
| DTSC                | California Department of Toxic Substance Control                     |
| DWR                 | California Department of Water Resources                             |
| ECA                 | Essential Connectivity Area  |
| EIA                 | U.S. Energy Information Administration                               |
| EIR                 | environmental impact report  |
| EMT                 | Emergency Medical Technician   |
| EO                  | Executive Order  |
| EPA                 | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency                                 |
| ESA                 | federal Endangered Species Act                                       |
| FCEP-CIP            | Financially Constrained Expenditure Plan Capital Improvement Program |
| FEMA                | Federal Emergency Management Agency                                  |
| FICAN               | Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise                      |
| FIRM                | Flood Insurance Rate Map   |
| FMMP                | Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program                              |
| FPD                 | Fire Protection District   |
| GCSD                | Groveland Community Services District                                |
| GHG                 | greenhouse gas   |
| gpd                 | gallons per day  |
| GWP                 | global warming potential   |
| HAP                 | hazardous air pollutant  |
| HCP                 | habitat conservation plan  |
| HFC                 | hydrofluorocarbon  |
| HMP                 | Hazard Mitigation Plan   |
| ISO                 | Insurance Service Office   |
| LAMP                | local agency management plan   |
| LBP                 | lead-based paint   |
| LCFS                | Low Carbon Fuel Standard   |
| L <sub>dn</sub>     | day-night average level  |
| L <sub>eq</sub>     | equivalent noise level   |
| L <sub>max</sub>    | maximum instantaneous noise level                                    |
| LOS                 | level of service   |
| LUST                | leaking underground storage tank                                     |
| MCAB                | Mountain Counties Air Basin  |
| MCL                 | maximum contaminant level  |
| MEI                 | Maximum Exposed Individual   |
| MMTCO <sub>2e</sub> | million metric tons of carbon dioxide–equivalent                     |
| mph                 | miles per hour   |
| MPO                 | metropolitan planning organization                                   |
| MRZ                 | Mineral Resource Zone  |
| MS4                 | municipal separate storm sewer system                                |
| MTCO <sub>2e</sub>  | metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent GHG emissions              |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| N <sub>2</sub> O       | nitrous oxide  |
| NAAQS                  | national ambient air quality standards                                 |
| NAHC                   | Native American Heritage Commission                                    |
| NCCP                   | natural community conservation plan                                    |
| NEHRP                  | National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program                          |
| NESHAP                 | National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants              |
| NFPA                   | National Fire Protection Association                                   |
| NMFS                   | National Marine Fisheries Service                                      |
| NOI                    | Notice of Intent   |
| NO <sub>x</sub>        | oxides of nitrogen oxides  |
| NPDES                  | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System                        |
| NRCS                   | U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service |
| NRHP                   | National Register of Historic Places                                   |
| NWI                    | National Wetlands Inventory  |
| OEHHA                  | Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment                       |
| OPR                    | California Office of Planning and Research                             |
| OSHA                   | federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration                  |
| PFC                    | perfluorocarbon  |
| PG&E                   | Pacific Gas and Electric Company                                       |
| PM                     | post mile  |
| PM <sub>10</sub>       | particulate matter measuring no more than 10 microns in diameter       |
| PM <sub>2.5</sub>      | particulate matter measuring no more than 2.5 microns in diameter      |
| PPD                    | pound per day  |
| ppm                    | parts per million  |
| PPV                    | peak particle velocity   |
| PRC                    | Public Resources Code  |
| PRG                    | Preliminary Remediation Goal   |
| project                | General Plan Update  |
| Providers              | refiners, blenders, producers, or importers                            |
| RCP                    | Representative Concentration Pathway                                   |
| RCRA                   | Resource Conservation and Recovery Act                                 |
| Recirculated Draft EIR | Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report                         |
| RHNA                   | Regional Housing Needs Assessment                                      |
| RMP                    | Risk Management Plan   |
| RMS                    | root mean square   |
| ROG                    | reactive organic gases   |
| RTP                    | Regional Transportation Plan   |
| RWQCB                  | Regional Water Quality Control Board                                   |
| RWWTP                  | Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant                                    |
| SANDAG                 | San Diego Association of Governments                                   |
| SARA                   | Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act                           |
| SARC                   | School Accountability Report Card                                      |
| SF <sub>6</sub>        | sulfur hexafluoride  |
| SFPUC                  | San Francisco Public Utilities Commission                              |
| SGMA                   | Sustainable Groundwater Management Act                                 |
| SIP                    | state implementation plan  |
| SMAQMD                 | Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District                |
| SMARA                  | Surface Mining and Reclamation Act                                     |
| SO <sub>2</sub>        | sulfur dioxide   |

---

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| SR     | State Route                                    |
| SRA    | state responsibility area                      |
| SWIFT  | Southwest Interface Team                       |
| SWPPP  | storm water pollution prevention plan          |
| SWRCB  | State Water Resources Control Board            |
|        |  |
| TAC    | Toxic air contaminant                          |
| TCAPCD | Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District |
| TCFD   | Tuolumne County Fire Department                |
| TCOC   | Tuolumne County Ordinance Code                 |
| TCR    | Transportation Concept Report                  |
| TCSO   | Tuolumne County Sheriff's Office               |
| TCTC   | Tuolumne County Transportation Council         |
| TMDL   | Total Maximum Daily Load                       |
| TUD    | Tuolumne Utilities District                    |
|        |  |
| UBC    | Uniform Building Code                          |
| USC    | U.S. Code                                      |
| USFWS  | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service                 |
|        |  |
| VMT    | vehicle miles traveled                         |
|        |  |
| ZEV    | zero-emission vehicle                          |

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report is part of the ongoing environmental review process for the draft Tuolumne County General Plan Update and was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the project (State Clearinghouse Number 2015082027). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.). Recirculation of an EIR requires notice pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 and consultation pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15086.

The environmental impacts of the proposed project are analyzed in this Recirculated Draft EIR to the degree of specificity appropriate, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15146. This document addresses the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that may be directly or indirectly associated with the policies set forth in the revised General Plan. This Recirculated Draft EIR is intended to serve as an informational document for the public agency decision makers and the public regarding the proposed project. This Recirculated Draft EIR includes substantial revisions to every section of the original Draft EIR and includes a new section, “3.6 Energy,” as well as evaluation of two additional alternatives (summarized below) in Chapter 6, “Alternatives.”

## ES.1 GENERAL PLAN SYNOPSIS

The proposed project is a comprehensive update to the Tuolumne County General Plan (hereinafter referred to as the “General Plan Update”). The General Plan Update, which updates the 1996 General Plan, establishes the community’s vision for the development of Tuolumne County through the year 2040 and will serve as the fundamental land use policy document for the County. The General Plan Update consists of two components: the Countywide General Plan and Community Plans, which relate to the communities of Jamestown, Columbia, East Sonora, Tuolumne, and Mountain Springs. The General Plan Update includes goals, policies and implementation programs to guide the development of Tuolumne County through the year 2040.

Since 2007, the County of Tuolumne has been participating in Tuolumne Tomorrow, a Regional Blueprint planning process for directing future growth and enhancing the quality of life in the County over the next few decades. Through this coordinated effort, the City of Sonora, Tuolumne County, the Tuolumne County Transportation Council, and community members developed Guiding Principles for growth and development, and studied the potential effects of the likely land use development pattern and possible alternative growth scenarios on the transportation system, housing, local economy, quality of life, natural resources, and the environment. As a result of this effort, the Distinctive Communities Growth Scenario was selected and adopted by the Board of Supervisors in August 2012 as the preferred growth scenario for Tuolumne County. The General Plan Update has been formulated to reflect this preferred growth scenario.

The General Plan Update is intended to function as a policy document to guide land use decisions within Tuolumne County’s planning area through the year 2040. As discussed above, Tuolumne County’s General Plan Update has been formulated to reflect the preferred growth scenario (the Distinctive Communities Growth Scenario of the Tuolumne Tomorrow Blueprint). Based on the general philosophy and input from the community and County decision makers, the General Plan Update includes the following overall objectives:

- ▲ Adopt a County-wide General Plan that reflects the current values and vision of the communities in the County and reflects the latest legal, statutory, scientific, and technical changes and advancements.
- ▲ Update the County General Plan to achieve and enable maximum flexibility for development within the bounds of state and federal law as well as an ever-evolving legal, cultural and environmental landscape.

- ▲ Promote the delivery of efficient and cost-effective public services.
- ▲ Enhance the unique nature of identified communities while providing services and amenities for residents, businesses, and visitors on a County-wide basis.
- ▲ Minimize or eliminate restrictions and requirements that can increase delays and/or the cost to development.
- ▲ Promote development within the County that is designed to fit the needs of the County's residents, businesses, and visitors.
- ▲ Promote the stewardship of the County's natural resources, which includes providing for the productive use of natural resources, and management to reduce risks of wildland fires.
- ▲ Conserve the County's historic resources and recognize their unique value to the County's social and economic fabric.
- ▲ Allow residents and property owners to use their land to the maximum extent of the law, while respecting the values of the community.

The General Plan Update includes the update of the seven mandatory General Plan elements. Government Code Section 65302 requires a General Plan to have both a Conservation Element and an Open Space Element, but also authorizes these elements to be combined. Due to the similar themes of these elements, they have been combined in the General Plan Update as the Natural Resources Element to minimize redundancy. The mandatory elements included in the General Plan Update are as follows:

- ▲ Community Development and Design Element (equivalent to a land use element),
- ▲ Transportation Element (equivalent to a circulation element),
- ▲ Housing Element,
- ▲ Natural Resources Element (equivalent to a combined open space and conservation element),
- ▲ Noise Element, and
- ▲ Natural Hazards Element (equivalent to a safety element).

In addition to the mandatory elements discussed above, the General Plan Update includes the following optional elements to guide the development of the County through 2040:

- ▲ Utilities Element,
- ▲ Economic Development Element,
- ▲ Managed Resources Element,
- ▲ Agriculture Element,
- ▲ Healthy Communities Element,
- ▲ Parks and Recreation Element,
- ▲ Education and Libraries Element,
- ▲ Cultural Resources Element,
- ▲ Water Supply Element,
- ▲ Air Quality Element,
- ▲ Public Safety Element, and
- ▲ Climate Change Element.

Finally, there are plans for five of Tuolumne County's identified communities:

- ▲ Columbia Community Plan,
- ▲ East Sonora Community Plan,
- ▲ Jamestown Community Plan,
- ▲ Mountain Springs Community Plan, and
- ▲ Tuolumne Community Plan.

Consistent with Policies 8.D.1, 8.E.2, and 8.E.3 and Implementation Programs 8.D.a and 8.E.c in the Agriculture Element, the General Plan Update also includes proposed amendments to Title 17 of the Ordinance Code, which would expand the range of economic activities allowed on land zoned for agriculture. The amendments to Title 17 are described in Section 2, “Project Description,” and the actual proposed text amendments (in strike-through/underline) are included as Appendix F of this Draft EIR.

## ES.2 SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE EIR

The following issues are evaluated in Section 3, “Environmental Impact Analysis,” of this Recirculated Draft EIR:

- ▲ Aesthetics
- ▲ Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- ▲ Air Quality
- ▲ Biological Resources
- ▲ Cultural Resources
- ▲ Energy
- ▲ Geology/Soils
- ▲ Global Climate Change
- ▲ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- ▲ Hydrology/Water Quality
- ▲ Land Use/Planning
- ▲ Noise
- ▲ Population/Housing
- ▲ Public Services
- ▲ Recreation
- ▲ Transportation and Circulation
- ▲ Utilities/Service Systems

## ES.3 ALTERNATIVES

As required by CEQA, this EIR evaluates a range of alternatives to the proposed project. Alternatives, analyzed in Chapter 6, include five total alternatives, including three growth scenarios identified through the Tuolumne Tomorrow Regional Blueprint process and two additional alternatives identified after receiving public comments on the Draft EIR. Alternatives evaluated in Chapter 6 include:

- ▲ Alternative 1: No Project (Recent Trends, Existing);
- ▲ Alternative 2: Public Services;
- ▲ Alternative 3: Recent Trends, Proposed;
- ▲ Alternative 4: Historic Structure Preservation; and
- ▲ Alternative 5: Williamson Act Property Preservation.
- ▲ Alternative 6: Modified Public Services

Each of the alternatives discussed in Chapter 6 are summarized below.

- ▲ **Alternative 1: No Project (Recent Trends, Existing).** Under this alternative, the current 1996 General Plan’s land use diagram would be retained and the existing policies in the current 1996 General Plan would remain in effect. The historic and current trend of primarily low-density suburban and rural development would continue.
- ▲ **Alternative 2: Public Services:** Under this alternative, new development would be allocated at higher densities in locations closer to multiple public services than under existing conditions. Although development would continue to grow within identified communities, it also would radiate outward along a select number of arterials, major collectors, and transit corridors where public water and sewer exist. The proposed policies and implementation programs in the General Plan Update would still apply to the Public Services alternative, with the exception of those that are narrowly tailored to the proposed Distinctive Communities Growth Scenario.
- ▲ **Alternative 3: Recent Trends, Proposed.** Under this alternative, the current 1996 General Plan land use diagram would remain unchanged; however, the alternative would include the proposed policies and

implementation programs in the General Plan Update (with the exception of those that are narrowly tailored to the proposed Distinctive Communities Growth Scenario). As with the General Plan Update, this alternative would promote locating development near existing communities; however, it would generally continue the historic and current trend of primarily low-density residential development.

The following two new alternatives were not included in the originally circulated Draft EIR.

- ▲ **Alternative 4: Historic Structure Preservation.** This alternative is consistent with the proposed General Plan Update with respect to the land use diagram and is primarily consistent with the proposed policy framework, but with one key difference. The Historic Structure Preservation Alternative would include policies prohibiting demolition or substantial alteration of significant historic structures (with some exceptions based on the structural condition and cost of preservation). This alternative is designed to substantially reduce significant impacts associated with historic resources.
- ▲ **Alternative 5: Williamson Act Property Preservation.** The primary difference between this alternative and the proposed General Plan Update is that, under this alternative, the 134 acres of land designated agriculture that are currently under Williamson Act contracts, would not be redesignated to residential use. To achieve the same amount of housing identified in the General Plan Update, this alternative would require increased residential density in other areas designated for residential development. This alternative is designed to substantially reduce significant impacts associated with consistency with the Williamson Act.
- ▲ **Alternative 6: Modified Public Services.** The Modified Public Services Alternative, which was recommended as part of public comment on the originally circulated Draft EIR, would be designed to directly reduce new development outside identified communities by providing similar incentives in the General Plan Update for encouraging growth within identified communities, but also going further than the General Plan Update to create disincentives for development in rural areas. Under this alternative, no land located outside identified communities would be redesignated from Agriculture to a non-agricultural use.

Because it would likely reduce multiple significant impacts associated with the proposed project, Alternative 6, the Modified Public Services Alternative, is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

## ES.4 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

Tuolumne County received 57 letters during the public review period for the Draft EIR. These comments covered a range of topics. Key areas of potential controversy and concern raised in these comments included: population projections, the classification of areas as “urban” and development assumptions, natural resources impacts, oak woodland policy, water supply, wastewater service, groundwater quality, flooding and dam failure, wildfire risk, traffic impacts, noise impacts, land use compatibility, increases in density and increased development, coordination with tribes, effects on community character and historic resources, other aesthetic impacts including light pollution, impacts to agriculture and impacts associated with agritourism, project alternatives, and consistency with state regulations and guidelines. Impacts related to these issue areas are addressed throughout Section 3, “Environmental Impact Analysis” of this EIR. Please note that cumulative impacts are addressed in Section 4, “Cumulative Impacts.”

## ES.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1 includes a brief description of the environmental issues relative to the proposed project, the identified environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and residual impacts.

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact   | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant  | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <b>3.1 Aesthetics</b>   |                                |   |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.1-1: Impacts to a Scenic Vista or Scenic Resource Visible from a Visually Sensitive Location</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update would facilitate development visible from locally designated scenic routes. General Plan Update policies also would protect scenic vistas along locally designated scenic routes. With implementation of these policies, projected development under the General Plan Update would not be expected to substantially alter views of important scenic resources from visually sensitive areas. Therefore, impacts to vistas and scenic resources viewed from key locations, including designated roadways, would be less than significant.</p> | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.  | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.1-2: Substantial Degradation of Existing Visual Character or Quality</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update would promote development within and near identified communities, which would minimize changes to the County’s predominantly rural character. Policies in the General Plan Update would encourage new development to be compatible with the scale and character of existing development and would enhance the distinct visual identities of communities and preserve aesthetic quality. General Plan Update policies also would protect the visual character of communities with historic buildings. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>                     | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.  | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.1-3: New Substantial Light or Glare That Would Adversely Affect Daytime or Nighttime Views</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update would facilitate development that would introduce new sources of light and glare, which would increase overall ambient nighttime light and daytime glare from building materials. Dark sky standards for the communities of Tuolumne and Jamestown would minimize light spillover and glare in those planning areas, and the General Plan Update includes standards for light and glare in other identified communities. Impacts to existing development would be less than significant.</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.  | LTS                           |                                  |
| <b>3.2 Agricultural and Forest Resources</b>  |                                |   |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.2-1: Loss of High-Value Agricultural Land</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update would re-designate 4,509 acres, of a total 160,735 acres, of land designated for Agriculture to residential or commercial uses. While policies in the General Plan Update would limit development in agricultural areas and minimize the potential for indirect conversion of agricultural land to other uses, re-designation of Agricultural land may occur on parcels that would be considered High-Value Agricultural Land, according to the</p>   | S                              | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1: Evaluate Land Using Tuolumne County’s Agricultural Rating System Matrix and Conserve High-Value Agricultural Land at a 1:1 Ratio</b><br/>                     The County will include the following as a new implementation program of the General Plan Update.<br/> <b>Implementation Program 8.A.x</b> [Specific numbering to be provided with Final General Plan</p> | SU                            |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact  | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant  | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <p>Tuolumne County Agricultural Rating System Matrix. The re-designation of Agricultural Land to residential or commercial use would remove barriers to conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. This would reduce the value of agricultural land under the Agricultural Rating System. Because the quantity and location of potential High-Value Agricultural Land is currently unknown, based on readily available data and the site-by-site evaluation needed under the System Matrix, the extent of the potential conversion cannot be determined at this time; however, the loss of High-Value Agricultural Land would be significant.</p> |                                | <p>Update): Establish a new procedure for evaluating development on lands with an Agricultural land use designation that includes the following requirements:</p> <p>For any proposed non-agricultural development on land designated Agricultural (according to the land use diagram in the General Plan Update), the County shall require, prior to issuing a completeness letter, the submittal to and approval by the Tuolumne County planning staff of the Tuolumne County Agricultural Rating System Matrix to determine whether the land proposed for development qualifies as High-Value Agricultural Land. If the results of the Tuolumne County Agricultural Rating System Matrix provided in Exhibit 3.2-1 of the Recirculated Draft EIR indicate that the land proposed for development does not qualify as High-Value Agricultural Land, no further action is required. If the results of the Tuolumne County Agricultural Rating System Matrix indicate that the land proposed for development does qualify as High-Value Agricultural Land, the County, consistent with Implementation Program 8.A.a, shall require the applicant to purchase agricultural conservation easements at a 1:1 ratio (acres preserved: acres converted), commensurate with the type of High-Value Agricultural Land (e.g., grazing land) that would be converted by the project. Proof of the purchase shall be provided to the County prior to issuance of grading permits.</p> |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.2-2: Conflict with Land Zoned as Forest Land, Timberland, or Timber Production Zone</b><br/>                     Although the General Plan Update would redesignate 1,194 acres of land designated Timberland to Public Land, this change corrects a previous error in the land use map and constitutes a “paper change” with no resulting physical effect. General Plan Update policies also would protect timber resources from development. Impacts from the rezoning or loss of timber land would be less than significant.</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.  | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.2-3: Conflict with Williamson Act Contracts or Agricultural Preserve Overlay Districts</b><br/>                     Future development under the General Plan Update could conflict with Williamson Act contracts and lands within agricultural preserves on some properties. If land under a Williamson Act contract is proposed for development, the property owner could either allow the contract to expire under a notice of non-renewal or obtain a cancellation. Land under agricultural preserves would need to be re-zoned to remove the County’s AP Combining</p>   | S                              | <p><b>Mitigation Measure: 3.2-3 Adopt an Implementation Program to Limit Growth-Inducing Public Services</b><br/>                     The County shall add the following implementation program under Policy 8.B.4 of the General Plan Update:<br/> <b>Implementation Program 8.B.x</b> [Specific numbering to be provided with Final General Plan Update]: Establish development standards to provide County staff with discretion to deny development that proposes to introduce growth-inducing public services like public sewer</p>  | SU                            |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact   | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant                                     | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <p>District or approved by the Board of Supervisors to be removed from a preserve. No development would be allowed until the Williamson Act contract is expired or cancelled and the parcel is removed from an agricultural preserve; therefore, direct conflicts with Williamson Act contracts would not occur. However, the overarching purpose of the Williamson Act is to promote voluntary farmland conservation; therefore, the redesignation of land currently under Williamson Act contracts to non-agricultural uses would constitute a conflict with the overall intent of the Williamson Act. This impact would be significant.</p>  |                                | <p>systems and potable public water into agricultural areas.</p> |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.2-4: Conflicts with Agricultural Land Uses</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update would alter the present land use pattern in portions of the County and may result in incompatibilities where community and agricultural uses would be located in close proximity to each other. The proposed allowance of special events on agricultural land also may result in incompatibilities with nearby agricultural operations. However, potential conflicts would be reduced through the proposed policies that guide growth to identified communities, the review process for Conditional Use Permits, and application of the County’s Right to Farm Ordinance. Therefore, impacts that would occur from development and commercial events would be less than significant.</p> | LTS                            | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                                | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>3.3 Air Quality</b></p>   |                                |  |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.3-1: Generation of Construction-related Emissions that Would Violate an Existing Air Quality Standard</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would result in construction activities associated with the development of new land uses in the County. Construction activity associated with the development of these new land uses would result in emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> that would not exceed the daily or annual emissions thresholds established by TCAPCD. Therefore, construction activity associated with projected development under the General Plan Update would not violate an existing air quality standard and this impact would be less than significant.</p>                    | LTS                            | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                                | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.3-2: Generation of Long-term Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors that would Violate an Existing Air Quality Standard</b><br/>                     Implementation of the General Plan Update would result in operational activities associated with the development of new land use in the County. These activities would result in emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, but emissions of these pollutants would not exceed the thresholds set by TCAPCD of 1,000 lb/day or 100 tons/year. In addition, the General Plan Update includes policies and implementation programs in the Transportation,</p>  | LTS                            | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                                | LTS                           |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures          | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact  | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <p>Climate Change, and Air Quality Elements that would reduce emissions of air pollutants in the County. The General Plan Update would not exceed TCAPCD's air pollutant thresholds and, therefore, would not violate an existing air quality standard. This impact would be less than significant.</p>  |                                |                              |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.3-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to TACs</b><br/>                     The development of new land uses would result in TAC emissions of diesel PM from the exhaust of off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment used during construction. These emissions could expose nearby existing sensitive receptors to TACs, particularly diesel PM exhaust emissions. The General Plan Update would also allow for the development of residential land uses in close proximity to local roadways and other potential sources of TACs. As a result, existing and new sensitive receptors could be exposed to TACs that may cause health risks. The General Plan Update includes policies and implementation programs specifically for mitigating exposure of existing and new sensitive receptors to TACs. Additionally, all new development undergoing discretionary review would be required to evaluate existing TAC exposure and incorporate available reduction measures, if necessary. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Update would not result in the exposure of existing or new sensitive receptors to a substantial increase in TAC emissions, and this impact would be less than significant.</p> | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.3-4: Generation of Long-term Mobile-Source CO Concentrations that would Violate an Existing Air Quality Standard</b><br/>                     Long-term operational mobile-source emissions of CO potentially generated by vehicle trips associated with projected development under the General Plan Update would not violate or contribute substantially to localized concentrations of CO that exceed the CAAQS or NAAQS for CO. Additionally, the traffic volume increase under the General Plan Update would not result in affected intersections experiencing more than 31,600 vehicles per hour and, therefore, would not exceed CO hotspot concentration thresholds. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.3-5: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Odors</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update could result in construction activities that would introduce new odor sources into the plan area (e.g., temporary diesel exhaust emissions during construction and delivery trucks associated with commercial land uses). However, these odor sources would be temporary and intermittent and would largely come from mobile sources. Projected development under the General Plan Update could</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation      | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| <p>N = No Impact      LTS = Less than significant</p>  | <p>PS = Potentially significant</p> | <p>S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable</p>  |                               |
| <p>result in new sensitive receptors being located near existing odor emitting land uses and could potentially cause a nuisance. However, the Community Development and Design Element and Agriculture Element of the General Plan Update both include policies regarding the siting of incompatible land uses that would consider potential odor impacts. Further, except for agricultural operations, TCAPCD Rule 205 prohibits the emission of any material that may cause a nuisance to a person or the public. As a result, projected development under the General Plan Update would not result in odor impacts on new or existing sensitive receptors; therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p> |                                     |   |                               |
| <p><b>3.4 Biological Resources</b></p>   |                                     |   |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.4-1: Disturbance or Loss of Special-Status Plant and Animal Species</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update may result in the disturbance or loss of special-status plant and animal species. However, the compliance with state and federal law, as well as implementation of the General Plan Update’s policies and implementation programs, would reduce potential impacts of projected development under the General Plan Update and require project-level environmental review and mitigation, if needed. This impact would be less than significant.</p>   | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>   | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>Impact 3.4-2: Loss or Degradation of Riparian, Oak Woodland, and Other Sensitive Natural Communities</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update may result in the loss or degradation of riparian habitat, oak woodlands, or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>   | <p>PS</p>                           | <p>For projects that may cause a significant loss of oak woodland, as defined in Policy 16.B.5 and Implementation Program 16.B.j, the following mitigation measure is recommended to reduce and compensate for significant impacts to oak woodland.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2: Implement Oak Woodland Mitigation Guidelines</b></p> <p>The following new implementation programs shall be added under General Plan Policy 16.B.5:</p> <p><b>Implementation Program 16.B.x</b> [specific numbering to be provided in the Final General Plan Update]: When considering discretionary development proposals, the County, through CEQA reviews, will require that project applicants map oak woodland resources on the project site and, where feasible, establish buffers around existing oak woodland stands to prevent adverse effects. For mapping purposes, project applicants may use the County’s existing oak woodland map (developed for the Recirculated Draft EIR) as an initial base map for project-specific ground-truthing/field verification. The County will require implementation of BMPs while working near retained oak woodlands to avoid inadvertent damage to oak trees. BMPs will include establishment of no-disturbance buffers around the outer canopy edge to prevent root and crown damage, soil compaction, and standard management practices to reduce introduction and spread of invasive species and other indirect effects.</p> | <p>LTS</p>                    |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts       |                             | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures |   | Significance after Mitigation |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| N = No Impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant     | SU = Significant and Unavoidable  |                               |
|               |                             |                                |                     | <p>For those impacts on oak woodland that cannot be avoided, the County will require the project applicant to minimize adverse effects. If substantial conversion of oak woodland will occur based on Implementation Program 16.B.j, the County will require one or more of the following mitigation measures be implemented to mitigate the impact from loss of oak woodland habitat pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.4, (which specifies certain projects, including commercial agricultural production, are exempt from the requirements of Section 21083.4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Conserve oak woodlands through the purchase of conservation easements.</li> <li>▲ Plant acorns and container stock from a local seed source to replace oak woodland removed. The following parameters will be applied:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▣ Plant an appropriate number of trees, including maintaining plantings and replacing dead or diseased trees.</li> <li>▣ Maintain trees for seven years after the trees are planted.</li> <li>▣ Planting may not account for more than 50 percent of the required mitigation and must occur on lands that are subject to conservation easements, zoned open space, or similarly restricted from development.</li> <li>▣ Mitigation through planting may be used to restore former or degraded oak woodlands.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▲ Contribute funds to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund, as established under subdivision (a) of Section 1363 of the Fish and Game Code, for the purpose of purchasing oak woodland conservation easements, the Tuolumne County Oak Woodland Conservation Fund, or other appropriate established oak woodland conservation fund.</li> </ul> <p><b>Implementation Program 16.B.x</b> [specific numbering to be provided in the Final General Plan Update]: The County will require project applicants to develop a mitigation and monitoring plan to compensate for the loss of oak woodland habitat. The mitigation and monitoring plan will describe in detail how loss of oak woodlands shall be avoided or offset, including details on restoration and creation of habitat, compensation for the temporal loss of habitat, success criteria ensuring habitat function goals and objectives are met, performance standards to ensure success, remedial actions if performance standards are not met, and requirements for reporting implementation actions and progress to the County. The plan will include detailed information on the habitats present within the preservation and mitigation areas, the long-term management and monitoring of these habitats, legal protection for the preservation and mitigation areas (e.g., conservation easement,</p> |                               |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact  | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
|  |                                | declaration of restrictions), and funding mechanism information (e.g., endowment).<br>If planting is used as part of compensatory mitigation, an oak planting plan will be developed by a qualified professional such as a professional biologist, arborist, or registered professional forester using the best available science and will clearly state all mitigation measures required.<br><b>Implementation Program 16.B.x</b> [specific numbering to be provided in the Final General Plan Update]: Oak woodlands habitat placed under conservation easements will be at appropriate ratios to offset the loss of habitat functions and values of the oak woodland to be lost. Oak woodland habitat preserved this way should have similar tree sizes and densities, species composition, site condition, and landscape context to the oak woodland to be removed to serve the same function and have similar habitat value. At a minimum, 1 acre of oak woodland habitat providing similar functions and values will be placed under conservation easement for every acre of oak woodlands habitat lost. |                               |                                  |
| <b>Impact 3.4-3: Loss or Degradation of Federally Protected Wetlands</b><br>Projected development under the General Plan Update may result in the loss or degradation of federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, streams, vernal pool, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Through project-level environmental review and compliance with existing applicable federal and state regulations protecting wetlands and other waters of the United States, and implementation of applicable General Plan Update policies and implementation programs, this impact would be less than significant. | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |
| <b>Impact 3.4-4: Disturbance or Loss of Animal Movement Corridors</b><br>Projected development under the General Plan Update may interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors. This impact would be less than significant.   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |
| <b>Impact 3.4-5: Potential Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources</b><br>Projected development under the General Plan Update would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. This impact would be less than significant.  | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation      | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>N = No Impact      LTS = Less than significant</p>  | <p>PS = Potentially significant</p> | <p>S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable</p>   |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.4-6: Potential Conflict with an Adopted Conservation Plan</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. There are no adopted local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans in Tuolumne County. Therefore, there would be no impact.</p> | <p>N</p>                            | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>  | <p>N</p>                      |
| <p><b>3.5 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources</b></p>   |                                     |  |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.5-1: Change in the Significance of a Historical or Unique Archaeological Resource</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update could adversely affect historical or unique archaeological resources. The General Plan Update includes policies to protect resources, however, avoidance of these historical or unique archaeological resources may not be possible. Impacts would be potentially significant.</p>                         | <p>PS</p>                           | <p>The General Plan Update includes implementation programs requiring cultural resources surveys to be prepared by qualified professionals for all discretionary projects and that the reports would be prepared in compliance with State and Federal standards including the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Identification, Evaluation, Documentation, Registration, Historical Documentation, Architectural and Engineering Documentation, and Archaeological Documentation. Proposed Implementation Program 13.B.3 would require that determinations of impacts, significance, and mitigation be made by qualified archaeological or historical consultants and that discretionary development projects be designed to avoid potential impacts to significant cultural resources whenever possible. However, avoidance may not always be feasible. No further mitigation is available other than to deny a project if historical or unique archaeological resources would be affected. As discussed in Chapter 6, “Alternatives,” this EIR analyzes a Historic Structure Preservation Alternative. Under that alternative, policy provisions would be included that would prohibit, with some exceptions, demolition or substantial alteration of a significant historic structure.</p> | <p>SU</p>                     |
| <p><b>Impact 3.5-2: Change In the Significance of Paleontological Resources</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update could have the potential to destroy, directly or indirectly, a unique paleontological resource. The General Plan Update includes policies to protect previously unknown resources. Implementation of these policies and protection programs would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>                | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>  | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>Impact 3.5-3: Accidental Discovery of Human Remains</b><br/>                     Previously undiscovered human remains could be discovered when soils are disturbed during construction of cultivation and processing sites for projected development under the General Plan Update. Compliance with Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and Public Resources Code Section 5097 would make this impact less than significant.</p>  | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>  | <p>LTS</p>                    |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation    | Mitigation Measures                     | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact  | LTS = Less than significant       | PS = Potentially significant            | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <p><b>Impact 3.5-4: Change In the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource</b><br/>                     No tribes that are culturally affiliated with Tuolumne County have formally requested notification under AB 52. Therefore, there is no trigger for consultation, and consequently no resources have been identified as tribal cultural resources as described under AB 52. However, recognizing the timeframe of General Plan Update, there is a potential that tribes may request consultation in the future and that tribal cultural resources could be identified during the implementation period of the General Plan. Therefore, although no resources have been identified that meet the criteria for a tribal cultural resource under Public Resources Code Section 21074, because tribes may request notification in the future, it is too speculative to determine the potential for impacts at this time.</p>  | cannot be determined at this time | No mitigation is required at this time. | LTS                           |                                  |
| <b>3.6 Energy</b>  |                                   |   |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.6-1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy during Construction or Operation</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would increase electricity and propane consumption. Buildings developed under the General Plan Update would comply with Title 24, Part 6 of the California Building Efficiency Standards. Policies and implementation programs in the General Plan Update address transit-oriented development, improved accessibility for alternative modes of transportation, and increased transit availability that would reduce VMT. Building energy would be reduced through increased use of solar photovoltaics and energy efficiency, as required under the 2019 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and as indicated through implementation programs under the General Plan Update. The development and implementation of a climate action plan through Policy 18.A.1 would further reduce both transportation- and building energy-related energy consumption. Construction-related energy consumption would be temporary and not require additional capacity or increase peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. Thus, energy consumption associated with projected development under the General Plan Update would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. This impact would be less than significant.</p> | LTS                               | No mitigation is required.              | LTS                           |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures          | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact   | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <b>3.7 Geology</b>  |                                |                              |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.7-1: Exposure of People and Structures to Primary Seismic Hazards</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update would result in development subject to future seismic events that could produce ground shaking, fault rupture, and ground failure within Tuolumne County that could damage structures and/or create adverse health and safety effects. However, with implementation of General Plan Update policies and required building codes, impacts would be less than significant.</p>  | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.7-2: Increase Risks Associated with Liquefaction of Soils and Land Subsidence</b><br/>                     Future seismic events could result in liquefaction of soils in portions of the County. However, because of the nature of the soils, groundwater conditions, and low seismicity in the County, the risk and danger of liquefaction and subsidence occurring within the County is considered to be minimal. With implementation of General Plan Update policies, impacts would be less than significant.</p>                            | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.7-3: Impacts from Mass Wasting Events</b><br/>                     Landslides have the potential to damage and destroy structures, roadways, and other improvements, as well as deflect or block drainage channels, causing accelerated erosion and more damage. However, with implementation of General Plan Update policies, impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.7-4: Risks Associated with Placement of Structures On Expansive Soils</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update would potentially result in development on expansive soils. Expansive soil conditions could result in foundation and building distress problems and cracking of concrete slabs. However, with implementation of General Plan Update Natural Hazards Element policies and applicable provisions of the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code, impacts relating to soil expansion would be less than significant.</p>          | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.7-5: Risk of Erosion from New or Redevelopment</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update would result in development that would require grading and other vegetation removal, which could increase potential for soil erosion, especially in areas with steep slopes. However, compliance with applicable policies of the General Plan Update Natural Hazards Element and applicable provisions of the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code would reduce the potential for substantial erosion. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact   | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <b>3.8 Global Climate Change</b>  |                                |  |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.8-1: Generation of GHG Emissions, either Directly or Indirectly</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would include construction and operational activities associated with the development of new land uses, both resulting in the generation of GHG emissions. Projected development under the General Plan Update would result in annual GHG emissions of 5.2 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per service population in Tuolumne County by 2040 and would remain above the 2040 statewide target of 3.1 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per service population established for this analysis. As a result, the General Plan Update would result in a considerable increase in GHG emissions and would conflict with the state’s 2017 Scoping Plan which was adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The General Plan Update includes a number of goals, policies, and implementation programs which would reduce GHG emissions associated new land uses. Policy 18.A.1 in the Climate Change chapter requires the development of a CAP with a target of reducing GHG emissions consistent with statewide targets. However, it is unknown whether the CAP would be fully implemented and, in turn, reduce countywide emissions consistent with state targets. Therefore, this impact would be significant.</p> | <p>S</p>                       | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-1: Revise Implementation Program 18.A.a</b><br/>                     The County will revise Implementation Program 18.A.a as follows to include the following GHG emissions reduction measures in the list of potential measures to include in the CAP.</p> <p>▲ <b>Implementation Program 18.A.a:</b> Include specific GHG emissions reduction measures in the CAP. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <u>Foster land use intensity near, along with connectivity to, retail and employment centers and services to reduce vehicle miles travelled and increase the efficiency of delivery services through adoption and implementation of smart growth principles and policies;</u></li> <li>➤ <u>Improve the local jobs/housing balance to reduce vehicle miles travelled;</u></li> <li>➤ Incentivize energy efficiency improvements in existing buildings;</li> <li>➤ Require energy audits for major additions to or alterations of existing buildings;</li> <li>➤ Require compliance with CALGreen Tier 1 Green Building standards and Tier 1 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for eligible alterations or additions to existing buildings;</li> <li>➤ Require compliance with CALGreen Tier 1 Green Building standards and Tier 1 standards for all new construction, and phase in Zero Net Energy (ZNE) standards for new construction;</li> <li>➤ Require new or replacement residential water heating systems to be electrically powered and/or alternatively fueled systems;</li> <li>➤ Expand current renewable energy and green energy incentives and update local ordinances;</li> <li>➤ Develop a program to offset project GHG emissions by retrofitting existing income-qualified homes and buildings;</li> <li>➤ Support waste-to-energy programs at landfills;</li> <li>➤ Increase availability and accessibility of transit information;</li> <li>➤ Support alternatives to private vehicle travel for visitors, such as shuttles;</li> <li>➤ Increase the supply of electric vehicle charging stations;</li> <li>➤ Promote telecommuting at office-based businesses;</li> <li>➤ Encourage expansion of composting programs;</li> </ul> | <p>SU</p>                     |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts       |                             | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation    |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
|               |                             |                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✔ Establish a waste diversion goal that exceeds the State’s 2020 75 percent target;</li> <li>✔ <u>Identify potential sites for renewable energy facilities and transmission lines;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Promote recycling to reduce waste and energy consumption;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Identify appropriate sites for waste recovery facilities to minimize escape of GHGs;</u></li> <li>✔ Convert all stationary diesel or gas-powered irrigation pumps to electric pumps;</li> <li>✔ Require Tier 4 equipment for all construction activity and forestry/mining operations by 2030;</li> <li>✔ Adopt a new water conservation ordinance for commercial and residential land uses limiting outdoor watering;</li> <li>✔ Expedite and/or reduce permit fees associated with water conservation installations in existing facilities;</li> <li>✔ Require water audits for large new commercial or industrial projects and significant expansions of existing facilities;</li> <li>✔ <u>Conserve natural lands for carbon sequestration;</u></li> <li>✔ Establish targets and enhanced programs for oak woodland and coniferous forest preservation and mandatory replanting;</li> <li>✔ Refine protection guidelines for existing riparian lands to establish a no-net-loss goal;</li> <li>✔ Develop a program to require repurposing of usable lumber from trees removed due to land conversion to avoid wood burning;</li> <li>✔ Promote the sale and consumption of locally-grown foods and/or products;</li> <li>✔ Establish and local carbon offset program;</li> <li>✔ <u>Identify lands suitable for wind power generation;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Promote alternatives to open burning of biomass, including exploring the feasibility of the development of a biomass power plant in the County;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Provide economic incentives and creative financing for renewable energy projects;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Pursue incentives, grants, and creative financing for projects that improve energy efficiency;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Prepare and implement a comprehensive plan to improve energy efficiency of</u></li> </ul> |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                             | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation    |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact  | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
|  |                             |                                | <p>municipal facilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✔ <u>Develop a program to promote forest health and enhance the carbon sequestration potential of forests in the County.</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Establish a coordinated, creative public outreach campaign, including publicizing the importance of reducing GHG emissions and steps community members can take to reduce their individual impacts;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Install renewable energy systems at municipal facilities including solar photovoltaic systems on municipal roofs and solar water heating;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Ensure that County staff receive appropriate training and support to implement objectives and policies to reduce GHG emissions included in the County CAP;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of using Community Choice Aggregation as a model for providing renewable energy to meet the community's electricity needs, including potential partnerships with other jurisdictions;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Identify and remove or otherwise address barriers to renewable energy production including revisions to the County's building and development codes, design guidelines, and zoning ordinances;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Provide information, marketing, training and technical assistance regarding green building practices and renewable energy systems;</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Identify and remove regulatory or procedural barriers to implementing green building practices within the County, such as updating codes, guidelines, and zoning, and ensure that all plan review and building inspection staff are trained in green building materials, practices, and techniques; and</u></li> <li>✔ <u>Establish menus and check-lists for developers and contractors to ensure water-efficient infrastructure and technology are used in new construction, including low-flow toilets and shower heads, moisture-sensing irrigation, and other such advances.</u></li> </ul> |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.8-2: Conflict with Any Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation for Reducing the Emission of GHGs</b></p> <p>Projected development under the General Plan Update would result in GHG emissions associated with temporary construction activity and long-term operational activity. The General Plan Update includes a series of policies which would reduce GHG emissions. These policies have been shown to be consistent the GHG reduction goals in the 2016 RTP and would not conflict with this plan. However, CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan states that plan-</p> |                             | S                              | No mitigation is available.   | SU                               |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures          | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact   | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <p>level projects should demonstrate reductions in GHG emissions levels consistent with statewide targets. The General Plan Update does include policies that would help to reduce overall GHG emissions in the County to support achievement of the statewide GHG reduction targets. However, it is unknown at this time what level of GHG reductions these General Plan policies would achieve. Projected development under the General Plan would result in annual GHG emissions of 5.2 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per service population in Tuolumne County by 2040 and would remain above the 2040 statewide threshold of 3.1 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per service population which demonstrates how plan-level projects would remain consistent with the statewide reduction targets. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Update would potentially conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, specifically the 2017 Scoping Plan. This impact would be significant.</p> |                                |                              |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b></p>   |                                |                              |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.9-1: Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment Through the Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials or Reasonably Foreseeable Upset of Known Hazards</b></p> <p>Potential development near known hazardous material users, construction in areas with existing hazardous materials, or accidental releases of hazardous materials during transportation could expose individuals to health risks due to soil/groundwater contamination or emission of hazardous materials into the air. However, compliance with federal, state, and local regulations would reduce the potential for substantial hazardous or upset conditions. This is a less-than-significant impact.</p>  | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.9-2: Expose People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Wildland Fires</b></p> <p>Projected development under the General Plan Update would introduce residential land uses into areas designated as Moderate or High Wildland Fire Hazard areas. However, because development in accordance with the General Plan Update would be largely within identified communities and compliance with General Plan Update policies and state and local regulations would require development standards, defensible space, and other features to reduce the potential for wildland fire hazards, projected development under the General Plan Update would result in less-than-significant impacts.</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures        | Significance after Mitigation |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| N = No Impact    LTS = Less than significant    PS = Potentially significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable   |                                |                            |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.9-3: Result in a Safety Hazard for People Residing or Working Within an Airport Land Use Plan or In the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip</b><br/>                     Public and private airports in Tuolumne County could create safety hazards for nearby development. Careful land use planning in accordance with General Plan Update policies and continued coordination with the ALUCP would reduce the potential for airport-related safety hazards. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>  | LTS                            | No mitigation is required. | LTS                           |
| <p><b>Impact 3.9-4: Impair Implementation of, or Physically Interfere with, an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the General Plan Update policies would limit the potential for hazards, particularly associated with wildfire potential and emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> | LTS                            | No mitigation is required. | LTS                           |
| <p><b>3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality</b></p>  |                                |                            |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.10-1: Impacts Related to Flooding</b><br/>                     Some areas within the County adjacent to waterbodies are located within the 100-year flood zone. Existing federal, state, and local regulations address the hazards associated with locating development in these zones. In addition, some of the policies and implementation programs in the General Plan Update restrict development within flood zones and strive to reduce hazards to existing development. Impacts related to flooding would be less than significant.</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required. | LTS                           |
| <p><b>Impact 3.10-2: Risk of Dam Inundation</b><br/>                     Portions of the County are located within an identified dam inundation zone; therefore, within the County, there is potential to expose people and structures to associated dam inundation hazards. However, dam safety monitoring and maintenance programs exist for dams of notable size and capacity, and the General Plan Update would not facilitate development in dam inundation areas. Therefore, impacts related to dam inundation would be less than significant.</p>        | LTS                            | No mitigation is required. | LTS                           |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation      | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>N = No Impact      LTS = Less than significant</p>  | <p>PS = Potentially significant</p> | <p>S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable</p> |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.10-3: Impacts to Waterways Associated with Stormwater and Point Source Contamination</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update could generate new sources of surface water and groundwater pollution, including both point and non-point sources. Point sources would include industrial or commercial facilities, while non-point sources would include new impervious or otherwise disturbed surfaces capable of generating an increase in stormwater runoff. Compliance with existing regulations and implementation of General Plan Update policies would result in less-than-significant impacts.</p>                     | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>Impact 3.10-4: Substantially Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere Substantially with Groundwater Recharge</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies because TUD's pumping rate would not change and construction of new private wells would be limited, dispersed throughout the County, and subject to permits that require appropriate setback distances and other special requirements. Furthermore, existing regulations, General Plan Update policies, and land ownership would limit development of impervious surfaces in areas of potential recharge. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>3.11 Land Use and Planning</b></p>   |                                     |  |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.11-1: Conflict with an Applicable Regional Plan</b><br/>                     The Tuolumne Tomorrow Regional Blueprint and the 2016 RTP are the regional plans that, in addition to the General Plan Update, apply to the County. The General Plan Update includes policies that are designed to be consistent with the Regional Blueprint and the RTP. Therefore, the General Plan Update would not conflict with the Tuolumne Tomorrow Regional Blueprint or the 2016 RTP. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>Impact 3.11-2: Physically Divide an Established Community</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would not physically divide any established communities. Instead, policies and land use changes under the General Plan Update would facilitate and direct growth and expansion of existing identified communities in an efficient and orderly manner. The General Plan Update also includes policies that would minimize potential incompatible land uses in identified communities. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>  | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact  | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant  | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <b>3.12 Noise</b>  |                                |   |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.12-1: Expose New Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would include the construction of future residences and other noise-sensitive land uses in close proximity to existing transportation noise sources and would be exposed to noise levels exceeding the maximum allowable range. In some cases, roadway noise levels reach 74.7 dBA CNEL and would require new development to achieve an approximate 15 dBA reduction in noise to meet exterior noise standards of 60 dBA CNEL. General Plan Update policies and implementation programs would require new development to conduct site-specific acoustical analysis and include measures to minimize noise exposure and meet County noise standards. However, at the County-wide scale of this analysis, without knowing the specific location, design, orientation, and type of development projects, it cannot be determined with certainty whether adequate noise reduction could be achieved, and this impact would be significant.</p> | S                              | No mitigation is available.   | SU                            |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.12-2: Expose Existing Sensitive Receptors to Traffic-Noise Increases</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would increase traffic and associated noise levels along area highways and roadways in Tuolumne County, thereby exposing existing land uses to increased traffic noise. Within the General Plan Update’s 2040 planning horizon, receptors along County roadways could experience noise level increases that exceed thresholds. Transportation-related policies aim to reduce automobile use and increase the use of alternatives modes of transit. Traffic noise would still result in a 3 dB increase on one County road segment. While this is a very limited area, compared to the overall County, that would experience this type of noise increase, this impact would be significant.</p>  | S                              | No mitigation is available.   | SU                            |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.12-3: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Construction Noise Levels That Exceed Applicable Standards</b><br/>                     Construction of individual projects under the General Plan Update could produce noise levels ranging from 90.9 to 96.6 dBA L<sub>max</sub> at 50 feet from the source. Depending the location, intensity, and timing of future construction activities, existing or new sensitive receptors could be exposed to disruptive nighttime construction activity. General Plan Update policies would require construction activities to implement all available noise reducing measures but would not ensure nighttime noise levels would not exceed thresholds in all cases. This impact would be significant.</p>   | S                              | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.12-3a: Establish Construction Noise Standards</b><br/>                     The following revision to General Plan Update Policy 5.A.5 is recommended to reduce noise impacts from construction as follows:<br/>                     ▲ <b>Policy 5.A.5:</b> Require that construction activity and temporary construction impacts do not expose existing noise-sensitive land uses to excessive noise levels. Require all new construction activities to implement all feasible noise-reducing measures as necessary to limit construction noise exposure at receiving occupied land uses to within acceptable County noise levels identified in Figure 5.3. Should nighttime construction activities be required (<u>between the hours of 7 p.m. and 7 a.m.</u>), exterior</p> | SU                            |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact  | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
|  |                                | <p>noise levels shall not exceed 65 dBA <math>L_{max}</math>, based on FICAN's 65 dBA SEL level for sleep disturbance (but conservatively using <math>L_{max}</math>, which is more appropriate for construction activities), night time noise maximum noise levels established for various land uses in [General Plan] Figure 5.3, [See Table 3.12-5 of this EIR.]</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.12-3b: Increase Construction Noise Buffer</b></p> <p>The following revision to General Plan Implementation Program 5.A.e is recommended to increase the distance construction activities are allowed from sensitive uses before additional measures are required:</p> <p>▲ <b>Implementation Program 5.A.e:</b> The County shall ensure that, where residences or other noise sensitive uses are located within <del>800</del>1,900 feet of construction sites, appropriate measures shall be implemented to limit noise exposure from construction. Specific techniques may include, but are not limited to, restrictions on construction timing, use of sound blankets on construction equipment, and the use of temporary walls and noise barriers to block and deflect noise.</p> |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.12-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Construction Vibration Levels That Exceed Applicable Standards</b></p> <p>Projected development under the General Plan Update could produce vibration levels that could potentially affecting adjacent sensitive land uses. Such vibration could cause temporary disturbance to nearby receptors. These impacts would be significant.</p>   | S                              | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.12-4: Establish Blasting Restrictions</b></p> <p>The following Implementation Program is recommended to reduce vibration and noise exposure from construction-related blasting to nearby sensitive land uses.</p> <p>▲ <b>Implementation Program 5.A.i:</b> Require, prior to approval of development or construction activities that would include blasting activities, proof of contract with a State licensed contractor if blasting is required for any construction activities. Blasting shall not be allowed during the sensitive night time hours (7 p.m. to 7 a.m.). In addition, prior to approval of construction/grading permits, Tuolumne County will review all proposed blasting activities and require construction contractors to implement available noise reduction measures, including alternatives to blasting.</p>   | SU                            |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.12-5: Expose Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Airport Noise That Exceeds the Standards in the Tuolumne County ALUCP</b></p> <p>Projected development under the General Plan Update could result in exposure of existing and future residences and other noise-sensitive land uses to air-traffic-related noise levels exceeding the "acceptable" range and noise standards as listed in the Tuolumne County ALUCP. However, implementation of policies in the General Plan Update to enforce noise standards for new development would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.   | LTS                           |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| N = No Impact      LTS = Less than significant   | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable  |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.12-6: Expose Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Operational Stationary Noise That Exceeds Applicable Standards</b></p> <p>Projected development under the General Plan Update could potentially result in exposure of future residences and other noise-sensitive land uses to noise impacts generated from operational stationary noise sources, especially from mining, timberland production, sawmills, and agricultural operations. Implementation of policies in the General Plan Update to enforce noise standards for new development would ensure that acceptable standards would not be exceeded in most cases. However, noise associated with operational stationary noise sources from agritourism uses could exceed applicable standards at nearby receptors, especially during the more noise-sensitive nighttime hours. These impacts would be significant.</p> | S                              | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.12-6: Restriction of outdoor gathering hours for agritourism uses and prohibition of exterior amplified sound</b></p> <p>The following implementation programs will be added to the General Plan Update under Policy 5.A.1 to reduce noise exposure from operational stationary noise sources of agritourism uses to nearby sensitive land uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ <b>Implementation Program 5.A.x</b> [specific numbering to be provided in Final General Plan Update]: Outdoor gatherings associated with normal, day-to-day agritourism uses shall be limited to daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.). Exceptions may be allowed with review and approval by the County. As part of the County review and approval, such exceptions shall include an operation noise plan prepared by an acoustical engineer that evaluates potential for outdoor gatherings occurring during nighttime hours to exceed County noise standards. If needed, the noise plan shall include noise minimization measures (such as siting/orientation of the gathering) to minimize sound exposure of any nearby residences such that County noise standards (Table 3.12-7 of this EIR) are not exceeded. The applicant shall demonstrate through the plan how the nighttime gathering would not exceed applicable County noise standards. After the noise plan is approved by the County for the agritourism operation, no additional noise plan would be required, unless the agritourism operation proposes changes to its nighttime outdoor uses that could meaningfully affect exterior noise levels (e.g., changes in location/orientation of gatherings, location of access/parking, and type of gatherings, and/or substantial change in typical number of guests).</li> <li>▲ <b>Implementation Program 5.A.x</b> [specific numbering to be provided in Final General Plan Update]: No exterior amplified sound systems (e.g., public address systems) will be allowed as part of any agritourism use. Exceptions may be allowed with review and approval by the County with the submittal of a plan analyzing the noise from the speakers/amplification. As part of the County review and approval, the applicant shall submit a speaker/amplification noise plan prepared by an acoustical engineer, that evaluates the potential for the proposed amplified sound to exceed County noise standards (Table 3.12-7 of this EIR). If necessary, the noise plan shall include protocols for siting, orientation, and operation of speakers (including potential volume limits) that would be implemented to reduce the effect of noise levels generated by on-site stationary noise sources. The applicant shall demonstrate through the plan how the speaker/amplification system would not exceed applicable County noise standards (Table 3.12-7 of this EIR). After the noise plan is approved by the County for the agritourism operation, no additional</li> </ul> | LTS                           |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact   | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant  | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
|   |                                | speaker/amplification noise plan would be required, unless the agritourism operation proposes changes to the speaker/amplification system that could meaningfully affect noise levels (e.g. changes to the location, orientation, or volume of the amplification system). |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.12-7: Expose Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Railroad Noise and Vibration that Exceeds Applicable Standards</b></p> <p>Projected development under the General Plan Update could result in exposure of future residences and other noise-sensitive land uses to railroad-related noise and vibration levels exceeding the “acceptable” range and noise standards. Implementation of policies in the General Plan Update to enforce noise standards for new development would generally reduce impacts. Impacts due to railroad-related noise and vibration levels would be less than significant.</p> | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.  | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>3.13 Population and Housing</b></p>   |                                |   |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.13-1: Result in Displacement that Necessitates the Construction of Replacement Housing</b></p> <p>The General Plan Update would facilitate the development of new housing in accordance with state and local housing requirements. Although future redevelopment projects could displace residents temporarily during construction activities, this displacement would not be wide-spread. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.  | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.13-2: Induce substantial population growth</b></p> <p>Implementation of the General Plan Update would facilitate new residential development in Tuolumne County, which would accommodate an increase in the population to approximately 63,243 by the year 2040. This growth would be expected to occur without adoption of the proposed General Plan Update. Because projected development under the General Plan Update would result in population growth consistent with regional population projections, impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.  | LTS                           |                                  |
| <p><b>3.14 Public Services</b></p>  |                                |   |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.14-1: Increase the demand for fire protection and emergency services</b></p> <p>Projected development under the General Plan Update would increase demand for fire protection service; however, excess capacity exists within the TCFD and new or expanded facilities would not be needed. Review of subsequent development by the Fire Department pursuant to existing County development review practices, the required provision of</p>   | LTS                            | No mitigation is required.  | LTS                           |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation      | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>N = No Impact      LTS = Less than significant</p>  | <p>PS = Potentially significant</p> | <p>S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable</p> |                               |
| <p>emergency access, and payment of impact mitigation fees would ensure that potential impacts are less than significant.</p>  |                                     |  |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.14-2: Increase the demand for law enforcement service</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would increase demand for law enforcement services, but would not result in the need to construct new law enforcement facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>Impact 3.14-3: Increase the demand for public schools</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update could increase student enrollment. However, the payment of state-mandated school impact fees is deemed full mitigation by the State of California. Therefore, impacts to schools would be less than significant.</p>  | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>3.15 Recreation</b></p>  |                                     |  |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.15-1: Require the Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities</b><br/>                     The General Plan Update includes a proposed policy that would change the County's goal of 30 acres of recreational facilities per 1,000 residents to 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. This policy change is consistent with the requirements of the Quimby Act and is also in line with standards of other Sierra/foothill counties. Furthermore, the availability of recreation opportunities provided by state and federal public lands further minimizes demand for County parks and reduces the potential for physical deterioration of existing parks as a result of overuse. Impacts to parks as a result of the policy change would be less than significant.</p>  | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>Impact 3.15-2: Physical Impacts to Existing Parks Resulting from Inadequate Park Provision</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would increase the County's population; however, parks would be provided that would meet the County's proposed standard of 5 acres of recreation facilities per 1,000 residents. (See Impact 3.15-1 above that evaluates potential impacts associated with the proposed change in the County's park provision standard.) Policies and implementation programs in the General Plan Update would contribute to the development of additional parkland. Furthermore, state and federal public lands located within Tuolumne County provide County residents substantial alternatives to County recreation facilities, which reduces demand for County parks as well as the potential for their overuse. Impacts from the overuse and deterioration of existing park and recreational facilities would be less than significant.</p> | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact   | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant  | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <b>3.16 Transportation and Circulation</b>  |                                |   |                               |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.16-1: Impacts to Roadway Segment Operations</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would generate vehicle trips that would result in LOS deficiencies to roadway segments within the local circulation system based on a threshold of LOS D. The fiscally constrained roadway improvements planned in the 2016 RTP (Tier 1a, 1b, and 1c) are intended to address projected deficiencies for roadway segments within the County. However, after the identified improvements are implemented, fifteen roadways segments could still operate at deficient LOS. Impacts are potentially significant.</p> | <p>PS</p>                      | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.16-1: Roadway Improvements</b><br/>                     As part of its update of the Tuolumne County Countywide Traffic Circulation Improvement Program, the County shall evaluate the following improvements for inclusion in the Program, thus allowing for funding through the Tuolumne County Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program. The improvements shall be incorporated into the Program if they are considered feasible and consistent with General Plan policies. If further analysis demonstrates that an alternative improvement would be adequate to achieve the target LOS, that alternative improvement shall be incorporated into the Program if feasible and consistent with General Plan policies.</p> <p><b>Roadway 3, Roadway 4, Roadway 5, and Roadway 23 – Widen the Segments to Four Lanes</b><br/>                     Widen the following segments to four lane expressways, consistent with FCEP-CIP Tier 3 projects, to improve conditions to LOS A in 2030 and 2040:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Roadway 3 - SR 108 between O’Byrnes Ferry Road and SR 120 (Yosemite Junction)</li> <li>▲ Roadway 4 - SR 108 between SR 120 (Yosemite Junction) and SR 49 (Montezuma Junction)</li> <li>▲ Roadway 5 - SR 108 between SR 49 (Stockton Road) and S. Washington Street/Lime Kiln Road</li> <li>▲ Roadway 23 - SR 49 between SR 49 (Montezuma Junction) and Bell Mooney Road</li> </ul> <p><b>Roadway 24 and Roadway 27 – Widen the Segment to Five Lanes</b><br/>                     Widen the following segments to five lanes, consistent with FCEP-CIP Tier 2 projects, to improve conditions to LOS C in 2030 and 2040:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Roadway 24 - SR 49 between Bell Mooney Road and South Junction Main Street</li> <li>▲ Roadway 27 - SR 49 between Fifth Avenue and Stockton Road/SR 108</li> </ul> <p><b>Roadway 32, Roadway 33, and Roadway 34 - Construct the North-South Connector Phase 1</b><br/>                     Construct the North-South Connector Phase 1 Greenley Road Extension to SR 49, consistent with FCEP-CIP Tier 2, by year 2030 to improve operating conditions along the following roadway segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Roadway 32 - SR 49 north of Dodge Street,</li> <li>▲ Roadway 33 - SR 49 south of N. Washington Street/Columbia Way</li> </ul> | <p>SU</p>                     |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts       |                             | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures |  | Significance after Mitigation |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| N = No Impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant     | SU = Significant and Unavoidable   |                               |
|               |                             |                                |                     | <p>▲ Roadway 34 - SR 49 north of N. Washington Street/Columbia Way<br/>If the aforementioned roadway improvement is deemed infeasible, or if further analysis demonstrates it will not result in acceptable operating conditions along the applicable roadway segment, the following improvements shall be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Construct the Western Bypass that would extend from SR 108/49 (south of Jamestown) to Rawhide Road. The Western Bypass is projected to further divert and reduce traffic on this segment of SR 49.</li> <li>▲ Improve alternative modes of transportation along Roadways 32, 33, and 34, such as transit service or bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Roadway 35 – Construct Left Turn Lane</b><br/>Construct a continuous two-way-left-turn median lane to improve conditions to an acceptable LOS D in the year 2040 to improve operating conditions along Roadway 35 - SR 49 east of Parrots Ferry Road (Pedro Wye)<br/>If the aforementioned roadway improvement is deemed infeasible, or if further analysis demonstrates it will not result in acceptable operating conditions along the applicable roadway segment, the following improvements shall be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Widen the segment to five lanes to improve conditions to LOS A in the year 2040.</li> <li>▲ Improve alternative modes of transportation along this roadway segment, such as transit or bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Roadway 52 and Roadway 116 - Construct the North-South Connector Phase 2</b><br/>Construct the North-South Connector Phase 2, consistent with FCEP-CIP's Tier 2 and Tier 3, that would extend Fir Drive from Mono Way to the Greenley Road Extension, which may reduce traffic on the following segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Roadway 52 - Mono Way west of Sanguinetti Road</li> <li>▲ Roadway 116 - S. Washington Street between Restano Way and Church Street</li> </ul> <p>If the aforementioned roadway improvement is deemed infeasible, or if further analysis demonstrates it will not result in acceptable operating conditions along the applicable roadway segment, the following improvement shall be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Improve alternative modes of transportation along Roadways 52 and 116, such as transit service, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Roadway 77 - Widen the Segment to Five Lanes</b><br/>Widen to five lanes Roadway 77 - Tuolumne Road from Mono Way to Lambert Lake Road to</p> |                               |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                             | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation    |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact  | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
|  |                             |                                | <p>improve conditions to an acceptable LOS D in the year 2040.</p> <p>If the aforementioned roadway improvement is deemed infeasible, or if further analysis demonstrates it will not result in acceptable operating conditions along the applicable roadway segment, the following improvement shall be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Improve alternative modes of transportation along this roadway segment, such as transit service or bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Roadway 31 - Construct the North-South Connector Phase 2</b><br/>                     Consistent with the FCEP-CIP's Tier 2 and Tier 3, construct the North-South Connector Phase 2 from Fir Drive Extension to SR 108, by the year 2040.</p> <p>If the aforementioned roadway improvement is deemed infeasible, or if further analysis demonstrates that it will not result in acceptable operating conditions along the applicable roadway segment, the following improvements shall be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Construct the Western Bypass that would extend from SR 108/49 (south of Jamestown) to Rawhide Road. The Western Bypass is projected to further divert and reduce traffic on this segment of SR 49, or</li> <li>▲ Improve alternative modes of transportation along Roadway 31, such as transit service or bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Roadway 69 - Construct the North-South Connector Phase 2</b><br/>                     Consistent with the FCEP-CIP's Tier 2 and Tier 3, construct the North-South Connector Phase 2 from Fir Drive Extension to SR 108, to improve conditions to an acceptable LOS by the year 2040 on Roadway 69 - Greenley Road between Cabezut Road/Morning Star Road and Delnero Drive.</p> <p>If the aforementioned roadway improvement is deemed infeasible, or if further analysis demonstrates it will not result in acceptable operating conditions along the applicable roadway segment, the following improvement shall be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Construct the Cabezut Road Extension from the Fir Drive Road Extension to Phoenix Lake Road, to further divert and reduce traffic on this segment of Greenley Road.</li> </ul> |                                  |
| <p><b>Impact 3.16-2: Impacts to Intersection Operations</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would increase traffic volumes at intersections throughout Tuolumne County. Intersection improvements planned in the 2016 RTP are intended to address projected deficiencies intersections within the County. The fiscally constrained roadway improvements planned in the 2016 RTP (Tier 1a, 1b, and</p> |                             | PS                             | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.16-2: Intersection Improvements</b><br/>                     As part of its update of the Tuolumne County Countywide Traffic Circulation Improvement Program, the County shall evaluate the following improvements for inclusion in the Program, thus allowing for funding through the Tuolumne County Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program. The improvements shall be incorporated into the Program if they are considered</p>   | SU                               |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |                                  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N = No Impact  | LTS = Less than significant    | PS = Potentially significant   | S = Significant               | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |
| <p>1c) are intended to address projected deficiencies at intersections within the County. However, after the identified improvements are implemented, three intersections could still operate at deficient LOS. Impacts are potentially significant.</p> |                                | <p>feasible and consistent with General Plan policies. If further analysis demonstrates that an alternative improvement would be adequate to achieve the target LOS, that alternative improvement shall be incorporated into the Program if feasible and consistent with General Plan policies.</p> <p><b>Intersection 11 - Installation of a Traffic Signal or Conversion to a High-T Type Intersection</b><br/>                     Improve the intersection of SR 49-SR 108/SR 108 and SR 49 (Stockton Road) by year 2030 to a High-T type intersection or install a traffic signal at the intersection.</p> <p><b>Intersection 23 - Construct a Southbound Right-Turn Pocket</b><br/>                     A southbound right-turn pocket shall be constructed at the intersection of S. Washington Street/SR 49 (S. Washington Street) and SR 49 (Stockton Road) to improve conditions to an acceptable LOS in the year 2040, with some movements operating at a LOS F. If this is not feasible due to the existing right-of-way, alternative modes of transportation shall be improved along this roadway segment, such as transit service, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</p> <p>If the aforementioned roadway improvement is deemed infeasible, or if further analysis demonstrates it will not result in acceptable operating conditions at the applicable intersection, the following improvements shall be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Construct the North-South Connector Phase 2 (Fir Drive Extension), which would extend Fir Drive from Mono Way to the Greenley Road Extension, intersecting with Cabezut Road and Lyons Bald Mountain Road in between, may reduce traffic on this segment of SR 49 by up to 5%.</li> <li>▲ Construct the Western Bypass that would extend from SR 108/49 (south of Jamestown) to Rawhide Road. The Western Bypass is projected to divert traffic away from downtown Sonora and may reduce traffic at this intersection.</li> <li>▲ Improve alternative modes of transportation along this roadway segment, such as transit service, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Intersection 24 - Installation of a Traffic Signal and Restricting Right-Turn Movements</b><br/>                     A traffic signal shall be installed at the intersection of South Washington Street and Church Street. If this is not feasible due to the proximity of another signalized intersection, then the westbound Church Street approach shall be converted to right-turn-only during peak hours. The eastbound approach is currently restricted to right-turn-only during peak hours.</p> |                               |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance before Mitigation      | Mitigation Measures   | Significance after Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| <p>N = No Impact      LTS = Less than significant</p>  | <p>PS = Potentially significant</p> | <p>S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable</p>  |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.16-3: Hazards Due to a Design Feature or Incompatible Uses, including Agritourism Uses</b><br/>                     The implementation of General Plan Update policies relating to traffic calming and enhancing bicycle and pedestrian facilities would help improve safety of the overall circulation network within Tuolumne County. Additionally, any future circulation improvements associated with projected development under the General Plan Update would be subject to all applicable County and Caltrans design and safety standards. Additionally, the General Plan Update contains policies related to the compatibility of future development with existing airport land use compatibility and master plans; thus, ensuring incompatible uses in the vicinity of the existing airports would not occur. However, agritourism-related special events that would be allowed under the proposed text changes to the County Ordinance Code could result in temporary traffic hazards. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.</p> | <p>PS</p>                           | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.16-3: Revise proposed Title 17 text to require traffic mitigation plans.</b><br/>                     The proposed text changes to Title 17 of the Ordinance Code shall be revised as follows:<br/> <b>17.52.220 Commercial events on agricultural land</b><br/>                     Commercial events are the use of land and/or facilities for meetings, gatherings and events, including, but not limited to, weddings, parties and similar uses, for which a fee is charged.<br/>                     A. <u>An annual ministerial permit may be acquired from the County to allow up to 40 commercial events may to be held per calendar year for up to 300 guests on a parcel zoned AE-37, AE-80 or AE-160 subject to the standards in paragraph C.</u><br/>                     B. <u>An annual ministerial permit may be acquired from the County to allow up to two commercial events may to be held per calendar year for up to 500 guests on a parcel zoned AE-37, AE-80 or AE-160 subject to the standards in paragraph C.</u><br/>                     C. Standards for commercial events:<br/>                     1. The event venue shall be located on a parcel that complies with the cul-de-sac road standards specified in Section 11.12.040 of this code.<br/>                     2. The event venue, excluding parking areas, shall be located at least 200 feet from the boundary of the nearest parcel zoned R or RE.<br/>                     3. The event parking areas shall be located at least 20 feet from the boundary of any parcel zoned R or RE.<br/>                     4. <u>Prior to issuance of the annual special event permit, a traffic management plan (TMP) shall be submitted and approved by the Community Resources Agency for events exceeding 100 guests. The TMP shall be prepared by a qualified transportation engineer/consultant and shall include appropriate techniques to provide safe ingress and egress from event facilities without resulting in substantial congestion of roadways, or otherwise cause traffic-related hazards. Such techniques may include (but may not be limited to):</u><br/>                     ▸ <u>Temporary caution and directional signage;</u><br/>                     ▸ <u>Clearly defined points of ingress/egress;</u><br/>                     ▸ <u>Cones or other clear markers placed to help direct vehicle flow define parking areas and driveways; and</u><br/>                     ▸ <u>Flag persons to help direct vehicle flow and minimize congestion.</u><br/>                     [subsequent items to be renumbered]</p> | <p>LTS</p>                    |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation      | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>N = No Impact      LTS = Less than significant</p>   | <p>PS = Potentially significant</p> | <p>S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable</p> |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.16-4: Impacts to Alternative Transportation</b><br/>Implementation of the General Plan Update and the associated circulation improvements and policies is expected to improve the availability of, and access to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Additionally, while the County’s population would increase as projected development under the General Plan Update occurs, the policies and planned improvements under the General Plan Update would improve transit options within Tuolumne County, including efficiency and capacity of the transit system. Therefore, impacts related to alternative transportation would be less than significant.</p>  | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>Impact 3.16-5: Impacts to Emergency Access</b><br/>Projected development under the General Plan Update would be subject to review by the County and responsible emergency service agencies; thus, ensuring any future development under the General Plan Update would be designed to meet all County emergency access and design standards. Therefore, adequate emergency access would be provided and impacts to emergency access would be less than significant.</p>  | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>3.17 Utilities and Service Systems</b></p>  |                                     |  |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.17-1: Exceed Water Supply Infrastructure Capacity or Entitlements such that New or Expanded Infrastructure or Entitlements would be Required</b><br/>Projected development under the General Plan Update would result in an increase in water demand. Although areas served by TUD would have adequate supplies of water without new or expanded infrastructure or entitlements, it is inconclusive with available data to determine if areas served by other water purveyors would have adequate capacity to serve new connections. Further, new development or expanded service encouraged through the General Plan Update may require new or expanded water supply infrastructure. However, with implementation of policies that require the provision of water prior to development, and because subsequent infrastructure expansion projects would be subject to separate environmental review, impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.</p> | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>Impact 3.17-2: Prevent Achievement of Water Quality Treatment Standards or Result in Significant Environmental Effects due to the Construction of New or Expanded Wastewater Capacity</b><br/>Projected development under the General Plan Update would increase wastewater generation above existing conditions. However, existing wastewater treatment facilities have adequate capacity to accommodate new development, and General Plan Update policies would further reduce potential impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>  | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance before Mitigation      | Mitigation Measures  | Significance after Mitigation |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>N = No Impact      LTS = Less than significant</p>   | <p>PS = Potentially significant</p> | <p>S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable</p> |                               |
| <p><b>Impact 3.17-3: Result in Significant Environmental Effects due to the Construction of New or Expanded Storm Water Infrastructure</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would incrementally increase the amount of impervious surfaces within the County, which could result in increased storm water runoff and the need for additional storm water infrastructure. However, the County's existing Water Quality Plan and policies and implementation programs in the General Plan Update would require adequate facilities and minimize the potential for adverse effects. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |
| <p><b>Impact 3.17-4: Result in Need for Additional Landfill Capacity</b><br/>                     Projected development under the General Plan Update would result in an overall increase in the amount of solid waste generated in the County. However, existing landfills would adequately serve development throughout the planning horizon of the General Plan Update, and policies in the Utilities Element would further reduce solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | <p>LTS</p>                          | <p>No mitigation is required.</p>                            | <p>LTS</p>                    |

# 1 INTRODUCTION

This Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (Recirculated Draft EIR) is part of the ongoing environmental review process for the Tuolumne County General Plan Update (proposed project) and was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the project (State Clearinghouse Number 2015082027). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.). For purposes of clarity, this document is referred to as the Recirculated Draft EIR, and the previously circulated Draft Environmental Impact Report is referred to as the Draft EIR.

Tuolumne County (County) circulated the Draft EIR on December 4, 2015. During its review of comments on the Draft EIR, the County identified potentially significant new information that would need to be added to the Draft EIR. Additionally, the General Plan Update was revised to reduce redundancies in policies and programs and improve the organization of the document. Policies were clarified where appropriate in response to comments received during the circulation of the Draft EIR, such as in the Natural Resources Element. In order to provide a comprehensive analysis of potentially significant impacts from the updated version of the General Plan Update and to fully address areas of concern raised in public comments on the Draft EIR, the County has prepared this Recirculated Draft EIR. As explained in more detail in Section 1.3, the County decided to recirculate the Draft EIR pursuant to Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

This Recirculated Draft EIR evaluates the potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the draft Tuolumne County General Plan Update (also called the “General Plan Update” within this Recirculated Draft EIR). The General Plan Update encompasses revisions to the existing General Plan Elements including changes to the Land Use diagrams. The General Plan Update includes goals, policies and implementation programs that will guide the development of Tuolumne County through the year 2040.

This section: (1) provides an overview of the background behind the existing 1996 General Plan; (2) summarizes the process involved in developing the General Plan Update; (3) describes the purpose of and legal authority of the EIR document; (4) summarizes the scope and content of the EIR; (5) lists lead, responsible, and trustee agencies for the EIR; (6) describes the intended uses of the EIR; and (7) provides a synopsis of the environmental review process required under CEQA.

The contents of other EIR sections are as follows:

- ▲ Chapter 2, “Project Description,” provides a detailed discussion of the General Plan Update.
- ▲ Chapter 3, “Environmental Impact Analysis,” describes the potential environmental effects associated with the preferred land use scenario.
- ▲ Chapter 4, “Cumulative,” includes an analysis of the potential cumulative environmental effects associated with the preferred land use scenario for each of the resources analyzed in Chapter 3.
- ▲ Chapter 5, “Other CEQA Discussions,” discusses issues such as growth inducement and significant irreversible environmental effects.
- ▲ Chapter 6, “Alternatives,” discusses alternatives to the General Plan Update, including the CEQA-required “no project” alternative.
- ▲ Chapter 7, “References,” lists informational sources for the EIR.
- ▲ Chapter 8, “List of Preparers,” lists persons involved in the preparation of the document.

## 1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE GENERAL PLAN

The existing Tuolumne County General Plan was adopted on December 26, 1996. The Tuolumne County General Plan Update is a comprehensive effort to update the existing 1996 General Plan and respond to current local and regional conditions, as well as changes in state law that may not have been in place when the General Plan was last updated.

State law (Government Code Section 65300) requires that each city and county adopt a comprehensive general plan. The General Plan Update fulfills this requirement by updating the County's existing General Plan. The General Plan Update defines the framework by which the County's physical and economic resources are to be managed and used in the future. The General Plan Update's planning horizon is the year 2040. County decision-makers will use the plan as a road map for:

- ▲ choices about the use of land;
- ▲ protection of environmental resources;
- ▲ conservation of existing, and development of new, housing;
- ▲ provision of supporting infrastructure and public and human services; and
- ▲ protection of people and property from natural and human-made hazards.

The General Plan Update clarifies and articulates the County's intentions with respect to the rights and expectations of the various communities, including residents, property owners, and businesses. Through the General Plan, the County informs these groups of its goals, policies, and standards, thereby communicating expectations of the public and private sectors for meeting community objectives. In addition, the General Plan includes Community Plans that specifically address growth and resource concerns within five of the County's identified communities.

Since the General Plan and Community Plans are the constitution for all future development in a municipality, any decision by a county affecting land use and development must be consistent with the respective plan. This includes any development projects proposed in the future. An action, program, or project is consistent with the General Plan if, considering all its aspects, it will further the objectives and policies of the General Plan and will not inhibit or obstruct their attainment (Governor's Office of Planning and Research 2017:255).

Each of the General Plan Elements and Community Plans contain statements of goals, policies, and implementation programs, which constitute Tuolumne County's policies for land use, development and environmental quality. These statements are defined as follows:

- ▲ Goal - The ultimate purpose of an effort stated in a way that is general in nature and immeasurable.
- ▲ Policy - A specific statement in text or diagram guiding action and implying clear commitment to a goal.
- ▲ Implementation Program - An action, procedure, program, or technique that carries out General Plan policy.

## 1.2 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

Since 2007, the County of Tuolumne has been participating in Tuolumne Tomorrow, a Regional Blueprint planning process for directing future growth and enhancing the quality of life in the County over the planning horizon of 2040. Through this coordinated effort, the City of Sonoma, Tuolumne County, Tuolumne County Transportation Council, and community members developed Guiding Principles for growth and development, and studied the potential effects of the likely land use development pattern and possible alternative growth scenarios on the transportation system, housing, local economy, quality of life, natural resources, and the environment. As a result of this effort, the Distinctive Communities Growth Scenario was selected and adopted

by the Board of Supervisors in August 2012 as the preferred growth scenario for Tuolumne County (see Chapter 2, “Project Description,” for a further explanation of the Distinctive Communities Growth Scenario).

Tuolumne County’s General Plan Update has been formulated to reflect this preferred growth scenario. Within the Distinctive Communities Growth Scenario each community contains a well-defined, cohesive, and compact community built around an appropriately-scaled urban core and community gathering places.

The General Plan Update includes the update of the seven mandatory General Plan elements. Government Code Sections 65302 and 65301(a) require a General Plan to have both a Conservation Element and an Open Space Element, but also authorize these elements to be combined. Due to the similar themes of these elements, they have been combined in the General Plan Update as the Natural Resources Element to minimize redundancy. The mandatory elements included in the General Plan Update are as follows:

- ▲ Community Development and Design Element (equivalent to a land use element),
- ▲ Transportation Element (equivalent to a circulation element),
- ▲ Housing Element,
- ▲ Natural Resources Element (equivalent to a combined open space and conservation element),
- ▲ Noise Element, and
- ▲ Natural Hazards Element (equivalent to a safety element).

In addition to the mandatory elements discussed above, the comprehensive update of Tuolumne County’s General Plan includes the following optional elements:

- ▲ Utilities Element,
- ▲ Economic Development Element,
- ▲ Managed Resources Element,
- ▲ Agriculture Element,
- ▲ Healthy Communities Element,
- ▲ Parks and Recreation Element,
- ▲ Education and Libraries Element,
- ▲ Cultural Resources Element,
- ▲ Water Supply Element,
- ▲ Air Quality Element,
- ▲ Public Safety Element, and
- ▲ Climate Change Element.

Finally, there are plans for five of Tuolumne County’s individual communities, which include:

- ▲ Jamestown Community Plan,
- ▲ Columbia Community Plan,
- ▲ East Sonora Community Plan,
- ▲ Tuolumne Community Plan, and
- ▲ Mountain Springs Community Plan.

The key features of each Element of the General Plan Update are further summarized in Chapter 2, “Project Description.”

Public participation is a necessary element to a comprehensive general plan update, and public involvement meetings were held throughout the General Plan Update process. The Board of Supervisors Planning Committee has been designated by the Board of Supervisors to serve as the steering committee for the General Plan Update project. The Board of Supervisors Planning Committee conducted 10 meetings, all of which were open to the public. In February 2015, the County held two public workshops (scoping meetings), one in the City of Sonora with the Board of Supervisors and another in the community of Groveland with County staff. At the workshops, the various elements of the General Plan were presented and the Board had an opportunity to discuss the various elements and provide direction to staff for any additional amendments.

In addition, the public was invited to provide initial comments on the General Plan Update and the Tuolumne County Planning Commission conducted a workshop on April 15, 2015 where the public was also invited to provide comments on the General Plan Update. In addition, property owners on those properties with proposed land use designation changes were notified by County Staff by written notice and Staff was available to discuss questions and clarifications regarding proposed land use changes with individual property owners. As part of the written notice, Staff informed property owners how to utilize the General Plan Update website, including a tool that enables property owners to view an interactive map that shows the proposed changes to the land use diagrams, including individual property, as well as the proposed text changes to the General Plan Elements.

Beginning in 2017, County staff met with stakeholder groups, which included Tuolumne County Farm Bureau, Farms of Tuolumne County, Tuolumne County Business Council, Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, Chicken Ranch Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians, Tuolumne Heritage Committee, Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center, Tuolumne-Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water Management Group, and Citizens for Responsible Growth. In the spring of 2018, Community Resources Agency staff sent notices to over 4,000 property owners with parcels that may be impacted by land use changes as well as notifying them of a series of informational sessions that were planned for Board of Supervisors meetings. These sessions were also advertised on the County's General Plan website and in the Union Democrat. These information sessions discussed the following topics:

- ▲ General Plan/EIR 101,
- ▲ Community Plans,
- ▲ General Plan Implementation, and
- ▲ How to comment on the General Plan/EIR.

Community Resources Agency staff also made presentations at the Tuolumne Rural Action Coalition, the Tuolumne County Board of Realtors, and several town hall meetings.

## 1.3 OVERVIEW OF THE CEQA PROCESS

### 1.3.1 Legal Authority and Recirculation

In response to the public comments received and to clarify and expand upon the analysis in the Draft EIR, circulated on December 4, 2015, the County has decided to prepare a Recirculated Draft EIR.

A lead agency must recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review, but before certification (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5). The term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- (4) The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

As required under CEQA, the County submitted a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to the State Clearinghouse on August 12, 2015. In February 2015, the County held two public workshops (scoping meetings), one in the City of Sonora with the Board of Supervisors and another in the community of Groveland with County staff. At the workshops, the various elements of the General Plan were presented and the Board had an opportunity to discuss the various elements and provide direction to staff for any additional amendments. In addition, the public was invited to provide initial comments on the General Plan Update. The Tuolumne County Planning Commission conducted a workshop on April 15, 2015 where the public was also invited to provide comments on the General Plan Update. The Draft EIR was released on December 7, 2015 for a 60-day public comment period, which concluded on February 5, 2016. A total of 57 written comments were received.

Additionally, the General Plan Update was revised to reduce redundancies in policies and programs and improve the organization of the document. Policies were clarified where appropriate in response to comments received during the circulation of the Draft EIR, such as in the Natural Resources Element. In order to provide a comprehensive analysis of potentially significant impacts from the updated version of the General Plan Update and to fully address areas of concern raised in public comments on the Draft EIR, the County has prepared this Recirculated Draft EIR.

The environmental impacts of the General Plan Update are analyzed in this Recirculated Draft EIR to the degree of specificity appropriate, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15146. As with the original Draft EIR, the Recirculated Draft EIR addresses the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that may be directly or indirectly associated with implementation of the General Plan Update. CEQA does not require the EIR to be as detailed as an EIR on specific projects that might follow. This EIR is intended to serve as an informational document for the County decision makers and the public regarding the possible future implications of projected development under the General Plan Update.

### 1.3.2 Type and Use of This EIR

This EIR fulfills the requirements for a Program EIR. Although the legally required contents of a Program EIR are the same as those of a Project EIR, Program EIRs typically cover broad programs or large projects, such as a general plan, and contain a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures than a Project EIR. As provided in Section 15168 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, a Program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that may be characterized as one large project. Impacts may be generally characterized, and mitigation measures may include programs and performance standards that address the impacts. Use of a Program EIR provides the County (as Lead Agency) with the opportunity to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures and provides the County with greater flexibility to address environmental issues and/or cumulative impacts on a comprehensive basis. Agencies generally prepare Program EIRs for programs or a series of related actions that are linked geographically, are logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program, or are individual activities carried out under the same authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways. By its nature, a Program EIR considers the overall effects associated with implementing a program (such as a General Plan) and does not, and is not intended to, examine individual projects that may be implemented pursuant to the General Plan.

Once a Program EIR has been prepared, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine if additional CEQA documentation is required to address the significant impacts of such activities. Subsequent activities could be found to be within the Program EIR scope and additional environmental

documents may not be required (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15168(c)). When a Program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the Lead Agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the Program EIR into the subsequent activities (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15168(c)(3)). If a subsequent activity could result in effects not within the scope of the Program EIR, including new or more severe significant impacts than identified in the Program EIR, the Lead Agency must prepare a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or a project-level EIR. An initial study checklist (See *CEQA Guidelines* Appendix G for an example) is used to determine if a subsequent activity is within the scope of the Program EIR and if not, what type of CEQA document is needed to address its effects. The *CEQA Guidelines* (Section 15168(b)) encourage the use of Program EIRs, citing five advantages:

1. Provide an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR on an individual action.
2. Ensure consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis.
3. Avoid duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations.
4. Allow the lead agency to consider broad policy alternatives and program wide mitigation measures at an early time when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts.
5. Allow reduction in paperwork.

It should be noted that as a program-level environmental document, the General Plan EIR uses appropriately programmatic thresholds as compared to the project-level thresholds that might be used for an EIR on a specific development project. Because the General Plan Update EIR is broad and general, it may not be ripe for consideration of environmental impacts that may occur on individual parcels or in connection with other projects that may be consistent with the General Plan. The process described above, initiated with preparation of an initial study, provides a road map for consideration of subsequent projects and the associated CEQA documentation.

## 1.4 SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THIS EIR

### 1.4.1 Response to Public Comments

In accordance with the *CEQA Guidelines*, an NOP of a Draft EIR was circulated to the public on August 12, 2015. Tuolumne County has reviewed and considered all comments received on the NOP for the proposed project and submitted on the Draft EIR. As relevant and appropriate, this Recirculated Draft EIR also addresses those comments.

The NOP, included in Appendix A, indicated that the following issues would be further evaluated in the Draft EIR:

- |                                  |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| ▲ Aesthetics,                    | ▲ Land Use/Planning,                  |
| ▲ Agricultural Resources,        | ▲ Noise,                              |
| ▲ Air Quality,                   | ▲ Population/Housing,                 |
| ▲ Biological Resources,          | ▲ Public Services,                    |
| ▲ Cultural Resources,            | ▲ Recreation,                         |
| ▲ Geology/Soils,                 | ▲ Transportation and Circulation, and |
| ▲ Hazards & Hazardous Materials, | ▲ Utilities/Service Systems.          |
| ▲ Hydrology/Water Quality,       |                                       |

The County received 12 written responses to the NOP. The responses, included in Appendix A, are addressed as appropriate in the analysis contained in the various subsections of Chapter 3, “Environmental Impact Analysis.” In February 2015, the County held two public workshops (scoping meetings), one in City of Sonora with the Board of Supervisors and another in the community of Groveland with County staff. Input from those meetings is also reflected in the EIR analysis.

On December 4, 2015, the County sent the Draft EIR to the State Clearinghouse. Although it was only required to circulate the Draft EIR for a 45-day period, the County circulated the 2015 Draft EIR for a 60-day public review period, which concluded on February 5, 2016. The County received 57 written responses to the Draft EIR.

## 1.4.2 Document Format

This document is a complete recirculation of the previous Draft EIR. The format is similar to the previous Draft EIR, with additional information and changes to analysis included, as appropriate. Due to the comprehensive nature of this document, changes and additions have not been marked with underline and strikethrough typeface. Thus, this recirculated Draft EIR may be considered anew by commenters.

## 1.5 LEAD, RESPONSIBLE, AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

The County of Tuolumne is the Lead Agency under CEQA for this EIR because it has discretionary authority to determine whether or how to approve the General Plan Update.

“Responsible Agencies,” are other agencies that are responsible for carrying out or implementing a specific component of the General Plan or for approving a project (such as an annexation) that implements the goals and policies of the General Plan. Section 15381 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* defines a “responsible agency” as:

a public agency which proposes to carry out or approve a project, for which a Lead Agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or Negative Declaration. For the purposes of CEQA, the term “Responsible Agency” includes all public agencies other than the Lead Agency which have discretionary approval power over the project.

The following two agencies may be responsible agencies, particularly for upgrades to State Highways and for potential annexations to cities and special districts within the County.

- ▲ The California Department of Transportation has responsibility for approving future improvements to the state highway system, including State Routes 49, 132, 108, and 120.
- ▲ The Local Agency Formation Commission of Tuolumne County has responsibility for approving any annexations within the County that might occur over the life of the General Plan.

Trustee agencies have jurisdiction over certain resources held in trust for the people of California but do not have a legal authority over approving or carrying out the project. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife is a trustee agency for the General Plan Update EIR due to the potential impacts to biological resources; California Department of Parks and Recreation is a trustee agency due to the presence of State Parks in the County; and California State Lands Commission if development were to occur on school lands or any beds of navigable waters such as the Tuolumne River or Stanislaus River.

## 1.6 EIR PROCESS

The environmental review process, as required under CEQA, is summarized below:

1. **Notice of Preparation.** After deciding that an EIR is required, the lead agency must file an NOP soliciting input on the EIR scope to the State Clearinghouse, other concerned agencies, and parties previously requesting notice in writing (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15082; Public Resources Code Sections 21080.4 and 21092.2). The NOP must be posted in the County Clerk's office for 30 days.
2. **Draft EIR.** The Draft EIR must contain: (a) table of contents or index; (b) summary; (c) project description; (d) environmental setting; (e) discussion of significant impacts (direct, indirect, cumulative, growth-inducing and unavoidable impacts); (f) a discussion of alternatives; (g) mitigation measures; and (h) discussion of irreversible changes.
3. **Notice of Completion.** Upon completion of a Draft EIR, the lead agency must file a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Clearinghouse and prepare a Public Notice of Availability of a Draft EIR. The lead agency must place the notice in the County Clerk's office for 30 days (Public Resources Code Section 21092.3) and send a copy of the notice to anyone requesting it (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15087; Public Resources Code Section 21092.2). In addition, public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR must be given through at least one of the following procedures: (a) publication in a newspaper of general circulation; (b) posting on and off of the project site; or (c) direct mailing to owners and occupants of contiguous properties and others who have requested such notification. The lead agency must solicit comments from the public, responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and other relevant public agencies, and respond in writing to all written comments received (Public Resources Code Sections 21091 and 21153). The minimum public review period for a Draft EIR is 30 days. When a Draft EIR is sent to the State Clearinghouse for review, the public review period must be 45 days (Public Resources Code Section 21091).
4. **Final EIR.** Following the close of the Draft EIR review period, a Final EIR is prepared. The Final EIR must include: (a) the Draft EIR; (b) copies of comments received during public review; (c) a list of persons and entities commenting; and (d) responses to comments.
5. **Final EIR Certification.** Prior to making a decision on a proposed project, the lead agency must certify that: (a) the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; (b) the Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency; and (c) the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the Final EIR prior to approving the project (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15090).
6. **Lead Agency Project Decision.** Upon certification of an EIR, the lead agency makes a decision on the project analyzed in the EIR. A lead agency may: (a) disapprove a project because of its significant environmental effects; (b) require changes to a project to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects; or (c) approve a project despite its significant environmental effects, if the proper findings and statement of overriding considerations are adopted (*CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15042 and 15043).
7. **Findings/Statement of Overriding Considerations.** In approving a project, for each significant impact of the project identified in the EIR, the lead or responsible agency must find, based on substantial evidence, that either: (a) the project has been changed to avoid or substantially reduce the magnitude of the impact; (b) changes to the project are within another agency's jurisdiction and such changes have or should be adopted; or (c) specific economic, social, or other considerations make the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091). If an agency approves a project with unavoidable significant environmental effects, it must prepare a written Statement of Overriding Considerations that sets forth the specific social, economic, or other reasons supporting the agency's decision and explains why the project's benefits outweigh the significant environmental effects.

8. Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program. When an agency makes findings on significant effects identified in the EIR, it must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of project approval to mitigate significant effects.

### 1.6.1 Review of the Recirculated Draft EIR

As discussed above, Tuolumne County has elected to prepare a Recirculated Draft EIR to address refinements to the General Plan Update that have occurred since publication of the 2015 Draft EIR and to provide additional analysis. Upon completion of this Recirculated Draft EIR, Tuolumne County filed an NOC with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (Public Resources Code Section 21161). Concurrent with the NOC, this Recirculated Draft EIR has been distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding counties, and interested parties, as well as to all parties requesting a copy of the Recirculated Draft EIR, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092(b)(3).

During the 45-day public review period, the Recirculated Draft EIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the Tuolumne County offices, located at the address provided below, and online at: <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/889/General-Plan-Update>. All agencies, organizations, and interested parties, have the opportunity to comment on the Recirculated Draft EIR during the public review period on the Recirculated Draft EIR. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that when an agency recirculates an entire EIR, the agency need not respond to comments received during the earlier circulation period. Although comments received during the earlier circulation period are part of the administrative record, CEQA does not require a written response to those comments in the Final EIR. New comments must be submitted for the revised EIR.

Written comments on this Recirculated Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Quincy Yaley, AICP  
Community Resource Agency  
Assistant Director – Development  
2 S. Green Street  
Sonora, CA 95370

Phone: (209) 533-5633  
Fax: (209) 533-5616  
Email: [qyaley@co.tuolumne.ca.us](mailto:qyaley@co.tuolumne.ca.us)

Submittal of electronic comments in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF format is encouraged. Upon completion of the public review period, written responses to comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR will be prepared and made available for review, as required by CEQA, as well as at web address identified above, by the commenting agencies at least 10 days before the decision hearing at which the certification of the Final EIR will be considered.

This page intentionally left blank.