

# YOSEMITE UNDER CANVAS

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared for  
Tuolumne County Community Resources  
Agency

February 2019



UNDER CANVAS®



# YOSEMITE UNDER CANVAS

## Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared for  
Tuolumne County Community Resources  
Agency

February 2019

2600 Capitol Avenue  
Suite 200  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
916.564.4500  
[www.esassoc.com](http://www.esassoc.com)



Bend	Oakland	San Diego
Camarillo	Orlando	San Francisco
Delray Beach	Pasadena	Santa Monica
Destin	Petaluma	Sarasota
Irvine	Portland	Seattle
Los Angeles	Sacramento	Tampa

**OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY** | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

## Yosemite Under Canvas Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Initial Study</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Introduction .....	2
Project Location .....	2
Proposed Project .....	2
Components of the Project .....	6
Project Approvals and Permits .....	10
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected.....	12
Environmental Checklist.....	13
Aesthetics .....	13
Agricultural and Forest Resources.....	15
Air Quality .....	18
Biological Resources .....	22
Cultural Resources .....	42
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity .....	48
Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	52
Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	55
Hydrology and Water Quality.....	59
Land Use and Land Use Planning .....	65
Mineral Resources.....	67
Noise .....	68
Population and Housing.....	74
Public Services .....	75
Recreation .....	77
Transportation and Traffic.....	78
Utilities and Service Systems .....	83
Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	86
 <b>Appendices</b>	
A. Project Design .....	A-1
B. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Modeling .....	B-1
C. USFWS, CDFW, and CNPS Species Lists .....	C-1

**List of Figures**

Figure 1	Regional Location .....	4
Figure 2	Project Site .....	5
Figure 3	Project Site Plan .....	7
Figure BIO-1	Aquatic Resources .....	27

**List of Tables**

Table 1	Proposed Water Use .....	8
Table 2	Peak Daily Wastewater Disposal .....	9
Table 3	Construction Equipment .....	10
Table 4	Permits and Approvals Needed .....	11
Table AIR-1	Maximum Annual Criteria Pollutant Emissions (tons/year) .....	20
Table BIO-1	Aquatic Resources .....	26
Table BIO-2	Regionally Occurring Special-Status Species.....	30
Table GHG-1	Operational GHG Emissions (metric tons per year).....	53
Table NOI-1	Vibration Velocities for Construction Equipment.....	70
Table NOI-2	Traffic Noise Increases in the Project Area.....	71
Table NOI-3	Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels.....	72

# ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

## Initial Study

1. **Project Title:** Yosemite Under Canvas
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Tuolumne County Community Resources Agency  
2 S. Green Street  
Sonora, CA 95370
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Natalie Rizzi, Planner  
(209) 533-5936
4. **Project Location:** Tuolumne County
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Under Canvas Inc.  
1172 Happy Lane  
Belgrade, MT 59714
6. **General Plan Designation(s):** Parks and Recreation (R/P)
7. **Zoning:** Commercial Recreation (C-K) and Open Space-1 (O-1)
8. **Description of Project**  
See Project Description below.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting.**  
See Project Description below.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required.**  
See Project Approvals and Permits below.
11. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?**  
See Cultural Resources section below.

## Introduction

Under Canvas Inc. is proposing the Yosemite Under Canvas Project (project), which is a 99-tent luxury campground with supporting facilities located in Hardin Flat, east of the community of Groveland and west of Yosemite National Park, in Tuolumne County, California. Yosemite Under Canvas is a transient tent (no fixed structures) camp for guests to stay March to October as weather allows. Under Canvas Inc. specializes in “glamping” camps and currently has eight operational camps within the United States. “Glamping” is a growing trend in camping accommodations where the host provides all the provisions necessary to camp out in a particular location. Under Canvas camps provide an opportunity for individuals and families to experience nature without the substantial investment in tents or recreational vehicles (RVs), as is typically required. Under Canvas camps provide guests with canvas tents, beds, bathroom facilities, meals, and community fire pits. Potable water and sanitary sewer are provided by on-site public systems owned by Under Canvas. A total of 99 tents are proposed for the Yosemite Under Canvas camp along with an office/guest check-in tent, commercial kitchen, communal bathrooms and a number of support tents.

## Project Location

The proposed project site is east of the town of Groveland and west of Yosemite National Park in southern Tuolumne County and is located on the Ascension Mountain, CA 7.5' U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Quadrangle (**Figures 1 and 2**). It falls within the southeastern portion of Section 26, Township 1 South, Range 18 East, Mount Diablo Baseline and Meridian. The proposed project site is located within unincorporated Tuolumne County, totaling approximately 80.1 acres. Access to the site is provided by Hardin Flat Road via State Route (SR) 120. The site consists of open land and was previously used for forestry and logging. Adjacent land uses include scattered private residences, recreation facilities, and open space. The nearest building is a Caltrans snow plow garage approximately 1,250 feet north of the nearest project facilities. The nearest residence is approximately 1,300 feet southeast of the nearest project facilities. Elevation in the project site ranges from 3,740 feet above mean sea level in the east to 4,050 feet above mean sea level in the west.


## Proposed Project

Yosemite Under Canvas is proposed to be built on two parcels (APNs 68-120-62 and -63) totaling approximately 80.1 acres, located in Hardin Flat, California. The parcels are zoned Commercial Recreation (C-K) and Open Space-1 (O-1). The project would be located within the C-K zoning portion of the project site, which requires a site development permit for a campground use. No development will occur on land with O-1 designation. A total of 99 tents are proposed for the camp along with an office/guest check-in, commercial kitchen, communal bathrooms and a number of support tents.

The following is a summary of the camp amenities and water/wastewater quantity requirements:

- There are a total of 99 tents proposed for the camp. Average occupancy is 2.5 people per tent.

- There are 77 Deluxe/Suite tents proposed that will each have a wash basin, shower, and toilet. Four of these sites will be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.
- There are 22 Safari tents proposed that will use a communal bathroom centrally located near the Safari tents.
- There are two communal bathroom facilities; these will be manufactured off-site and have six stalls, with each stall consisting of a toilet, sink, and shower.
- There is one large reception/dining tent with an adjacent commercial kitchen trailer, and a number of support (housekeeping and maintenance) temporary storage containers.
- The proposed bath cabins and commercial kitchen are mobile facilities on wheels and are manufactured off-site and assembled on-site.
- An in-ground swimming pool is proposed near the reception/dining tent.
- ADA accessibility is taken into consideration at all Under Canvas camps. Under Canvas will ensure that there are parking spaces, camping tents, and bathroom facilities that are built to ADA standards included in the finalized camp plans.
- Single service meals are proposed to be prepared and served on-site from the commercial kitchen and will only be offered to guests staying at the camp.
- Drinking and potable water at the camp is proposed to be provided by ground water source well(s). The source will be developed as a Public Water Supply.
- All water fixtures use minimal water. The wash facilities have shower heads and faucets that turn on by pulling a handle or pushing a knob; as soon as the handle or knob is released the water turns off. Water use at Under Canvas camps is typically under 12 gallons per day (gpd)/person.
- The toilets will use 0.8 to 1.2 gallons of water per flush.
- Yosemite Under Canvas water and wastewater systems will be winterized after closing for the season. The systems would be tested by a State Water Board Division of Drinking Water certified laboratory prior to being placed in use each season.
- Drinking water will be provided from a certified source in compliance with State and Tuolumne County standards for a proposed well.
- Potable water samples are to be tested the first Tuesday of each month for bacteria.
- The wastewater and water use quantities will be monitored and submitted to the Tuolumne County Community Resources Agency, Environmental Health Division, or as directed.
- Water usage monitoring is proposed to verify water use of 20 gpd per person or less. Water use is metered or measured in all Under Canvas Camps.
- Power for the camp will provided by a local utility company and supplemented with solar systems.
- Quiet hours at Yosemite Under Canvas will be from 9PM to 6AM. Operation of the facility will not employ any sources of amplified noise.



SOURCE: Esri, 2015; ESA, 2018

Yosemite Under Canvas Project

**Figure 1**  
Regional Location





SOURCE: USDA, 2016; ESA, 2018

Yosemite Under Canvas Project

**Figure 2**  
Project Site

## Components of the Project

### Project Design

See **Figure 3** and **Appendix A** for details on project design.

#### ***Project Facilities***

There are no traditional buildings (with concrete foundations) proposed for the Yosemite Under Canvas Project; however, there are communal bathrooms, a commercial kitchen, laundry and housekeeping, and a lobby tent with dining area. These facilities would not be permanent fixtures on the land. Improvements to support the camp include wastewater treatment, a water supply well, power to the kitchen, laundry, and communal bathrooms. Solar systems provide small electrical needs in guest tents and for trail lighting.

There are 99 tents proposed for the project. The approximate tent footprints range from 200 – 400 square feet. The guest tents are constructed on wood decks and have beds, wood/or pellet stoves (with spark arrestors), hot water for shower, sink, and a water closet. The proposed layout for the tents sites is shown on Figure 3 and in the project design plans in Appendix A. These tent sites are approximate locations; exact tent locations will not be determined until final engineering design is completed.


Lighting for the lobby, common areas, and tents are proposed to be low voltage solar lighting. All lighting will meet dark sky standards while still providing safety and guidance for guests.

#### ***Internal Traffic and Circulation***

There is existing public access to the property by way of Hardin Flat Road via SR 120. Bus stops for the Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS) are proposed on each side of Hardin Flat Road at the entrance to the Yosemite Under Canvas facility. The bus stops are designed to accommodate a 45-foot YARTS coach. These stops will provide Yosemite Under Canvas guests with the option to use the regional public transit system to access Yosemite National Park and other regional destinations. The YARTS operates between May and September and offers three round trips a day into Yosemite National Park. Internal circulation will be provided by a main access road (Under Canvas Way) and internal loop roads. Parking will be provided along proposed camp roads and will be located near the deluxe and suite tents. The safari tents will have a common parking area. Approximately 130 parking spaces will be provided for guests and employees. All of the tents will be accessed via lighted paths and trails.

#### ***Bridges***

The proposed main access roadway (Under Canvas Way) will require the crossing of two ephemeral drainages. Bridges are proposed to completely span these drainages. Bridge design will be based on ASHTO bridge standards for low volume traffic standards. The two lane bridge width will be 24 feet designed for HS-20 loading. The bridges will be designed to pass 100-year flood flows and will avoid direct impacts to the channels.



SOURCE: USDA, 2016; ESA, 2018

Yosemite Under Canvas Project

**Figure 3**  
Project Site Plan

## Water Supply and Treatment

Designs and documents for the proposed Public Water Supply (PWS) will be submitted for agency approvals. The PWS is classified as a Transient Non-Community water system. Preliminary analysis of water use is based on the proposed uses listed in **Table 1**.

**TABLE 1  
PROPOSED WATER USE**

Proposed Use	Design GPD	Unit Per	Number of Units	GPD	Notes
Tents (99), occupancy 2.5 guests/tent	20	Person	247.5	4,950	20 gpd/camper
Employees	10	Person	40	400	10 gpd/employee
Laundry Facility	550	Machine	2	1,100	550 gpd/machine
Food Preparation	4	Service	375	1,500	4.0 gpd/single service
Swimming Pool	100	Pool	1	100	Will require approximately 70,000 gallons to fill at start of season
<b>Total Water Use</b>				<b>8,050</b>	

Based on this analysis, the water source will need to be developed to supply an average demand of 8,050 gpd. The proposed groundwater source wells should be developed to supply 20 to 30 gallons per minute (gpm).

Water distribution includes water storage cisterns, small diameter distribution lines, repressure pumps, source development, and services to the laundry, lobby tent, bath cabins and deluxe and suite tents. Under Canvas Camps typically do not have large water storage tanks and infrastructure to support fire hydrants and large water demands, and none are proposed for this project. Estimated instantaneous flows for the distribution system are 80 gpm. General PWS layout will be finalized pending development of a ground water source.

Wastewater will be treated on-site through the use of a septic tank for storage and settling and a leach field for disposal. A sewer main will be installed to collect the effluent and transport it to the septic tank for settling. The settled effluent will then be pressure dosed to a leach field with sand trenches for disposal. The water treatment system capacity has been preliminarily designed to utilize two disposal areas located where there may be acceptable soils and to allow for gravity wastewater collection and disposal. The two disposal areas compliment the tent area zones/layout on this site and are shown on Figure 3 and Appendix A. One of the two disposal areas serves as a replacement area if ever required. A detailed low impact wastewater system will be designed based on-site conditions and a soils analysis.

Preliminary soils information is indicative that the disposal is viable in the areas shown on Figure 3. A soils evaluation will be completed by a qualified consultant to determine the viability of the proposed septic system. Specific treatment designs will be based on percolation rates, soils analysis, ground water, and other considerations for complete treatment to minimize impacts to the natural

environment. The following table (**Table 2**) is a calculation of the peak daily disposal for the two disposal areas.

**TABLE 2  
PEAK DAILY WASTEWATER DISPOSAL**

Proposed Use	Design GPD	Unit Per	Number of Units	GPD
<b>Disposal Area 1</b>				
Tents (77 – tents # 23-99), occupancy 2.5 guests/tent	20	Person	192.5	3,850
Employees	10	Person	40	400
Laundry	550	Machine	2	1,100
Food Preparation	4	Service	375	1,500
<b>Total Wastewater Area 1</b>				<b>6,850</b>
<b>Disposal Area 2</b>				
Tents (22 – tents # 1-22), occupancy 2.5 guests/tent	20	Person	55	1,100
<b>Total Wastewater Area 2</b>				<b>1,100</b>

NOTES:

- 1) Percolation and absorption rates will be based on soils mapping.
- 2) Septic tanks are to have an Orenco 8" bio-tube filler or equal prior to the disposal area.
- 3) Food preparation kitchen will have a grease trap.
- 4) Wastewater system design is to meet or exceed CA OWTS Requirements.

The analysis of wastewater disposal has been completed in consideration of the viability of an on-site wastewater disposal system. Disposal Area 1 includes wastewater coming from tents and the kitchen, lobby, and laundry facilities. The laundry facility has different wastewater characteristics than the tents; however, it will be treated as black water for disposal purposes. Disposal Area 2 includes wastewater coming from a six stall bath cabin, and will have capacity to handle Disposal Area 1 if necessary. Wastewater treatment will be designed to meet the “guidelines for design and evaluation of special design on-site sewage treatment and disposal systems.” These minimum design and evaluation standards have been developed pursuant to Tuolumne County Ordinance Code (TCOC), Section 13.08.270A, August 4, 2009, Tuolumne County Environmental Health Division.

### **Fires**

Camp fires are only allowed in common areas managed by camp staff. The tents may have wood burning or pellet stoves with code compliant chimney spark arrestors. The spark arrestors will be constructed of woven or welded wire screening of 12 USA standard gage wire (0.1046 inch) having openings not exceeding 1/2-inch. The net free area of the spark arrestor will not be less than four times the net free area of the outside of the chimney outlet. The ashes are removed by staff in metal containers and disposed of in a steel container. Firewood and combustible materials will not be stored in unenclosed spaces beneath tents or on decks under eaves, canopies or other projections or overhangs. When required by the County code official, storage of fire wood and combustible material stored in the defensible space will be located a minimum of 20 feet from structures and separated from the crown of trees by a minimum horizontal distance of 15 feet. Under Canvas will

prepare a Fire Protection and Evacuation Plan for submittal to the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau for review and approval.

## Construction Methods and Design

Construction of the Yosemite Under Canvas Project will employ currently accepted typical construction methods. The contractor will establish access routes and staging areas for travel within the site and storage of materials and equipment. If needed, dust control will employ a standard water truck equipped with spray nozzles. The Yosemite Under Canvas plans are based on minimal site disturbance based on seasonal occupancy. Tent pads will require minimal excavation. Access roads and paths have been designed and will be constructed to minimize cut and fill requirements. The project follows Low Impact to Hydrology (LITH) Design Guidelines for the design of roads and paths. These guidelines have been developed to minimize erosion using out-sloped roads. Infrastructure for wastewater collection and water distribution has been designed and will be constructed to minimize trenching depths and disturbance. Wherever possible, lines are placed in roads, paths, or disturbed areas.

## Schedule and Work Hours

Construction of the project is expected to take one construction season, starting in April 2019 and extending to August 2019, for a total of five months of construction activity. Construction activities would generally take place during normal working hours, 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

## Equipment

Anticipated construction equipment for the construction of the proposed project is shown in **Table 3**. The actual equipment used during construction would be determined by the contractor and the construction schedule.

**TABLE 3  
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT**

<b>Equipment</b>	<b>Construction Purpose</b>
Bulldozer	Earthwork construction and clearing and grubbing
Grader	Ground leveling
Mini Excavator	Soil manipulation
Skid Steer Loader	Soil or gravel manipulation
Trencher	Trench digging

## Project Approvals and Permits

The Tuolumne County Community Resources Agency would adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) as the lead agency. Additionally, the following permits, reviews, consultations, and approvals (see **Table 4**, below) would be required to be completed or approved prior to the commencement of project construction.

**TABLE 4**  
**PERMITS AND APPROVALS NEEDED**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Permit/Approval</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>State</b>		
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	California Fish and Game Code Section 1600-1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement	Applied January 2019.
California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Stormwater Permit	Not yet applied. Anticipated application date of early 2019.
<b>Local</b>		
Tuolumne County	Tuolumne County Grading Permit	Not yet applied. Anticipated application date of early 2019.

## Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources       | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning               | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic          | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems                | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

### DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial study:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature 

Date 2-6-2019

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

# Environmental Checklist

## Aesthetics

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>1. AESTHETICS — Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Aesthetic or visual resources include the “scenic character” of a particular region and site. Scenic features can include both natural features, such as vegetation and topography, and manmade features (e.g. historic structures). Areas that are more sensitive to potential effects are usually readily observable, such as land found adjacent to major roadways and hilltops.

### Visual Environment

Located in a relatively undeveloped area of Tuolumne County, the project area is characterized by mixed conifer forest, the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range, and SR 120. Adjacent land uses include scattered private residences, recreation facilities, and open land. Approximately 20.1 acres of the site were completely burned in 2013 during the Rim Fire. Burned trees in these areas have been cleared. In addition to areas that were completely burned, individual trees and small stands of trees outside of those areas were also damaged or burned. The landscape is still recuperating from these fires and the vegetation of the project area is recovering. Topography of the project area is relatively undisturbed, with the exception of SR 120 and a few graded local roads. The nearest residence is located approximately 1,300 feet southeast and downhill of the nearest project facilities. Views of the project site from off-site residences and roadways are obscured by living trees and topography. Potential viewer groups include vehicle occupants on SR 120 and Hardin Flat Road.

## Discussion

- a, c) The project site is designated as Parks and Recreation (R/P) by the Tuolumne County General Plan. There are no State or locally designated scenic vistas or notable geographic features identified in the vicinity of the project site in the Tuolumne County General Plan; as a result, the proposed project would not have an effect on a scenic vista (Tuolumne County, 1996).

Construction of the proposed project would involve grading, clearing of vegetation, and the presence of equipment within the project site. These impacts would be temporary in

nature and would not extend beyond the anticipated single season of construction activity. Additionally, the tree line surrounding the northern and eastern projects boundaries would be maintained which would block views from surrounding roadways and residences. Given the relatively short-term nature of these construction-related activities and screening from trees along the project boundaries, construction-related visual impacts are considered **less than significant**.

Operation of the proposed project includes the use of 99 luxury campsites and associated infrastructure. However, the visual character of the site would be minimally impacted, as the surrounding mountainous terrain and presence of dense trees would obscure direct views of the proposed project from SR 120, Hardin Flat Road, and residences. For these reasons, visual impacts from the proposed project are considered a **less-than-significant** impact.

- b) A review of the current California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Map of Designated Scenic Routes indicates that there are no officially designated state scenic highways within Tuolumne County, although portions of SR 49 and SR 108 from on the western side of the County are Eligible State Scenic Highways (approximately 15 miles west of the project site) and a portion of SR 120 through Yosemite National Park is designated as a National Scenic Byway (approximately five miles east of the project site; Caltrans, 2011). Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact**.
  
- d) The project site is located within a rural setting where lighting is minimal. Scattered rural residential land uses and passing vehicles generate the primary sources of nighttime light and daytime glare in the project vicinity. The proposed project includes lighting for the lobby, common areas, pathways, signage, and tents. However, all light sources will utilize low voltage lighting. Additionally, all lighting would meet International Dark-Sky Association (IDA) dark sky standards. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

## References

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 2011. California Scenic Highway Mapping System, Tuolumne County. Available: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16\\_livability/scenic\\_highways/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/). Accessed June 29, 2018.
- Tuolumne County, 1996. Tuolumne County General Plan. Available: <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/185/General-Plan-Policy>. Accessed June 27, 2018.
-

## Agricultural and Forest Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES —</b>				
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) has not prepared a map of Tuolumne County (CDC, 2015). However, based on soil types, there is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance in Tuolumne County (CDC, 2018). Additionally, the project site and surrounding parcels are not currently under a Williamson Act contract (CDC, 2017a). The project site is zoned as Commercial Recreation (C-K) and Open Space-1 (O-1) under the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code and designated as Parks and Recreation (R/P) by the Tuolumne County General Plan. The project site is not zoned as forestland, timberland, or Timberland Production.

The majority of the project site consists of mixed conifer forest. The 2013 Rim Fire, which burned approximately 257,000 acres in Tuolumne and Mariposa counties, burned portions of the project site and surrounding area. The landscape is still recuperating from these fires and the much of the vegetation of the project area is still recovering. Approximately 20.1 acres of the site were completely burned in 2013 during the Rim Fire. Burned trees in these areas have been cleared. In addition to areas that were completely burned, individual trees and small stands of trees outside of those areas were also damaged or burned. Due to the recent wildfire history of the project site, much of the mixed conifer forest community in the project site is disturbed and does not support

plant densities and diversity typical of undisturbed examples of this community type. Many trees within the project site were burned during the wildfires. Many saplings are found throughout the project site; unburned mature trees are located in healthy stands left untouched by the fire.

According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's (CAL FIRE) Fire and Resource Assessment Program, the project site is not within a mapped Priority Landscape (CAL FIRE, 2010).

## Discussion

- a) The project site is not listed as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance pursuant to the FMMP. Additionally, the nearest important farmland that is mapped by the FMMP is located approximately 35 miles to the west in Stanislaus County (CDC, 2017b). Therefore, there would be **no impact**.
- b) The project site is not currently used for agricultural purposes and is not designated for agricultural use by the Tuolumne County General Plan or zoned for exclusive agricultural use under Title 17 of the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code. Additionally, as stated above, the project site and surrounding parcels are not currently under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact** relating to existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.
- c) The project is located on lands zoned Commercial Recreation (C-K) under the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code and designated as Parks and Recreation (R/P) by the Tuolumne County General Plan (the project site also includes land zoned Open Space-1 under the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code; however, no development will occur on land with the Open Space-1 designation). The Commercial Recreation zoning includes recreational facilities such as campgrounds as an allowable land use subject to first securing a Site Development Permit. As the proposed project is an allowable use and the site zoning will not change, there would be no conflict with existing zoning for, or cause for rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.
- d, e) There would be no changes to the existing environment that would result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The proposed project would result in the loss of some mixed conifer forest habitat. However, due to the nature of the project and the proposed project design, the project will remove the minimum number of trees possible in order to minimize impacts to forest lands. Additionally, prior to the conversion of land to a land use other than growing timber, a Timberland Conversion permit must be reviewed and approved by CAL FIRE. A less than three-acre conversion exemption may be used for a one-time exemption for up to three acres of timberland to be converted to another use. Due to the abundance of mature trees and forest land in the project area and immediate vicinity, the minimal amount of forest land impacted by the proposed project, and the requirement to secure a timberland conversion permit from CAL FIRE, this is a **less-than-significant** impact.

---

## References

- California Department of Conservation (CDC), 2015. California Farmland Conversion Report. Available: [http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Documents/fmmp/pubs/2010-2012/FCR/FCR%202015\\_complete.pdf](http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Documents/fmmp/pubs/2010-2012/FCR/FCR%202015_complete.pdf). Accessed June 27, 2018.
- CDC, 2017a. State of California Williamson Act Contract Land. Available: [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/2016%20Statewide%20Map/WA\\_2016\\_11X17.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/2016%20Statewide%20Map/WA_2016_11X17.pdf). Accessed June 27, 2018.
- CDC, 2017b. Stanislaus County Important Farmland. Available: [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/sta16\\_no.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/sta16_no.pdf). Accessed June 27, 2018.
- CDC, 2018. Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program. Available: <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/>. Accessed June 27, 2018.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), 2010. California's Forests and Rangelands: 2010 Assessment. Available: <http://frap.fire.ca.gov/assessment/2010/document>. Accessed October 30, 2018.
-

## Air Quality

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>3. AIR QUALITY —</b>				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Under amendments to the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has classified air basins or portions thereof as either “attainment” or “non-attainment” for each criteria air pollutant, based on whether or not the national standards have been achieved. The California CAA, which is patterned after the federal CAA, also requires areas to be designated as “attainment” or “non-attainment” for the state standards. Thus, areas in California have two sets of attainment/non-attainment designations: one set with respect to the national standards and one set with respect to the state standards. The Mountain Counties Air Basin is currently designated as a nonattainment area for the state ozone standard and unclassified for state particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) standards based on a lack of available monitoring data.

The Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District (TCAPCD) is the regional air quality authority in the project area. The TCAPCD has established thresholds of significance for assessing potential air quality impacts under CEQA (TCAPCD, 2013). Specifically, a project would have a significant impact on air quality if, pursuant to TCAPCD regulations, it would result in emissions in excess of:

- 100 tons per year or 1,000 pounds per day of reactive organic gases (ROG);
- 100 tons per year or 1,000 pounds per day of oxides of nitrogen (NOx);
- 100 tons per year or 1,000 pounds per day of particulate matter (PM10); or
- 100 tons per year or 1,000 pounds per day of carbon monoxide (CO).

## **Sensitive Receptors**

Some receptors are considered more sensitive than others to air pollutants. Reasons for greater sensitivity include pre-existing health problems, proximity to an emissions source, or duration of exposure to air pollutants. Schools, hospitals, and convalescent homes are considered to be relatively sensitive to poor air quality because children, elderly people and the infirm are more susceptible to respiratory infections and other air quality-related health problems than the general public. Residential areas are also sensitive to poor air quality because people usually stay home for extended periods of time. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project is a residence located approximately 1,300 feet southeast and downhill of the nearest project facilities.

## **Discussion**

- a) Although designated as a non-attainment area for state ozone standard, Tuolumne County does not currently have a Clean Air Plan that addresses efforts to reduce ozone precursors within the County. However, the County General Plan does contain an Air Quality Element that was updated in March of 2014. The following General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures are identified with respect to land development projects:

**Policy 12.A.1:** Accurately determine and fairly mitigate the local and regional air quality impacts of land development projects proposed in the county.

**Implementation Measure 12.A.a:** Work with other agencies to develop a consistent and effective approach to air quality planning and management.

**Implementation Measure 12.A.b:** Require significant air quality impacts identified during CEQA review to be consistently and fairly mitigated.

**Implementation Measure 12.A.c:** Require all air quality mitigation measures to be feasible, implementable and verifiable.

As discussed below in response to Air Quality questions b) and c), the proposed project would generate emissions that the TCAPCD would consider to be a less-than-significant air quality impact. Consequently, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable policies and implementation measures of the County's Air Quality Element with respect to land use development and would therefore not conflict or obstruct implementation of the goals of the County General Plan with respect to air quality. This impact would be **less than significant**.

- b) In order to determine whether the proposed project would result in a violation of air quality standards or exacerbate existing ozone violations, project related emissions are estimated and compared to the thresholds of significance established by TCAPCD. Project construction-related and operational emissions were conservatively estimated using the CalEEMod model version 2016.3.2. As the model does not have land use estimates specific to recreational camping developments, a motel land use was conservatively assumed as a proxy for the proposed campground. This is a conservative assumption because it assumes operational emissions from mobile sources (vehicle trips) and natural gas combustion 12 months per year, while the proposed campground would only operate March through

October. Additionally, natural gas combustion associated with the campground would likely be substantially less than that associated with a motel land use.

Estimated construction-related emissions are presented in **Table AIR-1** below. These emissions assume off-road equipment operation excavation and grading for the proposed campground and septic system as well as building construction, which is also likely conservative as a majority of the proposed structures would be constructed off-site and transported and installed prefabricated. These emissions also consider vehicle trips by construction workers and vendor truck trips bringing concrete and other materials to the project site over the course of ten months. As can be seen from Table AIR-1, construction-related emissions of the proposed project would be well below the significance thresholds established by TCAPCD. Grading for the proposed improvements may create fugitive dust. Therefore, the project will be conditioned to mitigate dust during construction through the use of a watering truck or other dust suppressant device, as required by Section 12.20.370 of the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code.

**Table AIR-1** also presents the operational emissions associated with vehicle trips and natural gas combustion. In addition, a separate CalEEMod model run was performed to estimate emissions associated with wood burning and pellet stoves proposed for the tents. This additional model run conservatively assumes that all 99 tents would operate a woodstove at the default model usage rate of 82 days per year. As can be seen from Table AIR-1, operational emissions of the proposed project would be well below the significance thresholds established by TCAPCD. Consequently, both construction-related emissions and operational emissions associated with the proposed project would be **less than significant**. In addition, the presence of the YARTS bus stops at the entrance to the Yosemite Under Canvas facility will provide guests with the option to use the regional public transit system to access Yosemite National Park and other regional destinations. This has the potential to further reduce operational emissions through trip reductions.

**TABLE AIR-1**  
**MAXIMUM ANNUAL CRITERIA POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (TONS/YEAR)**

Emissions Category	ROG	NOx	PM10	CO
<b>Construction Emissions</b>				
Maximum Annual Construction Emissions	1.62	3.24	0.32	2.96
TCAPCD Thresholds	100	100	100	100
Exceed Thresholds?	No	No	No	No
<b>Operational Emissions</b>				
Annual Operational Emissions	0.89	0.61	0.21	1.79
Woodstove Emissions	1.14	0.59	0.93	6.13
Maximum Annual Operational Emissions	2.03	1.20	1.14	7.92
TCAPCD Thresholds	100	100	100	100
Exceed Thresholds?	No	No	No	No

SOURCE: ESA, 2018 (Appendix B)

- c) The thresholds of significance applied to project emission in air quality question b), above, were developed by TCAPCD based on the trigger levels for the federal New Source Review Program and TCAPCD's Regulations for new or modified sources to represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to air quality including ozone precursors ROG and NOx. Consequently, the analysis in air quality question b), above, which identified a less than significant impact also applies to the project's potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in non-attainment pollutants. This impact would be **less than significant**.
- d) The proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants (TACs) in the form of diesel particulate matter during construction activities. Some California Air Districts such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) have developed methodologies for analyzing health risk impacts and in doing so have established a 1,000-foot zone of influence from a source beyond which impacts from TAC exposure in most common instances are assumed to be less than significant. Given the absence of the TAC threshold for Tuolumne County, this analysis uses the BAAQMD methodology for assessing TAC impacts. Because construction areas of the proposed project would be further than 1,000 feet from the nearest existing sensitive receptor, construction related impacts from localized TAC emissions would be **less than significant**. While operation of the proposed project would not result in emissions of TACs, proposed wood or pellet stoves in the tents would emit fine particulate matter (PM2.5). However off-site sensitive receptors would be located beyond a 1,000 feet zone of influence and thus localized impacts from operational PM2.5 concentrations would be less than significant. The proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact with regard to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- e) There would be no odor sources installed as part of the proposed project. Toilets would be flush toilets and would discharge into the proposed septic system and leach field. Consequently, potential odor impacts would be **less than significant**.

## References

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2017. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines. May, 2017. Available: [http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa\\_guidelines\\_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en). Accessed July 18, 2018.
- Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District, 2013. CEQA Thresholds of Significance, July 11, 2013, Available: [https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1072/TCAPCD\\_Significance\\_Thresholds\\_\\_2\\_?bidId=](https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1072/TCAPCD_Significance_Thresholds__2_?bidId=). Accessed July 18, 2018.

## Biological Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Affected Environment

### Data Sources/Methodology

Biological resources within the project site were identified by an ESA biologist through field reconnaissance and an aquatic resources delineation conducted in June 2018. Prior to the surveys, a review of pertinent literature and database queries were conducted for the project site and surrounding area. The surveys were conducted on foot and existing habitat types, plants, and wildlife species within and adjacent to the project site were recorded. The biological surveys focused on identifying and delineating habitat for special-status plant and wildlife species, although general habitat conditions were noted and incidental species observations were recorded. A formal aquatic resource delineation was also conducted (ESA, 2018).

During the biological surveys, ESA biologists walked meandering transects through the entire project site, spaced closely to obtain maximum visual coverage of the habitats present. Habitats present at the project site were compared to the habitat requirements of the regionally occurring special-status species and used to determine which of these species had the potential to occur at or adjacent to the project site. Potentially jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. were delineated according to methods outlined in the *Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory, 1987) and the *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland*

*Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region (Version 2.0)* (USACE, 2010). Plant nomenclature follows *The Jepson Manual: Vascular Plants of California (Second Edition)* (Baldwin et al., 2012).

The primary sources of data referenced for this section include the following:

- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) list of Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that occur in the project area (USFWS, 2018a) (see **Appendix C**);
- USFWS Critical Habitat for Threatened and Endangered Species (online mapping program) (USFWS, 2018b);
- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), Rarefind 5 computer program (v5.2.14) (California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW], 2018a) (see Appendix C);
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (v8-03) (CNPS, 2018) (see Appendix C);
- CDFW Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List (CDFW, 2018b);
- CDFW Special Animals List (CDFW, 2018c);
- *Yosemite Under Canvas Project Aquatic Resources Delineation* (ESA, 2019); and
- *Tuolumne County Wildlife Handbook* (Tuolumne County, 1987).

### **Regional Setting**

Regionally, the project site is located in the central portion of the Sierra Nevada, within the central High Sierra Nevada district of the California Floristic Province (Baldwin et al., 2012). Regional natural plant communities in the vicinity of the properties include montane hardwood-conifer forests, mixed conifer forests, ponderosa pine forests, oak woodlands, riparian woodlands, perennial grasslands, wetlands, and riverine habitat. Within the project site plant communities include mixed conifer forest, seasonal wetland, seep, ephemeral drainage, and disturbed. Land use immediately surrounding the project site is characterized by open space, rural residences, and recreation facilities. Elevation in the project site ranges from 3,740 feet above mean sea level in the east to 4,050 feet above mean sea level in the west.

### **Project Site Setting**

#### **Plant Communities and Wildlife Habitats**

Wildlife habitats are generally described in terms of dominant plant species and plant communities along with landform, disturbance regime, and other unique environmental characteristics. The wildlife habitats described in this section are based on the CDFW's *A Guide to Wildlife Habitats* (Mayer and Laudenslayer, 1988) that is used in CDFW's California Wildlife Habitat Relationships System. The California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) habitat classification scheme has been developed to support the CWHR System, a wildlife information system and predictive model for California's regularly occurring birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians.

Wildlife habitats generally correspond to plant communities. Plant communities are assemblages of plant species that occur together in the same area and are repeated across landscapes. Both

species composition and relative abundance define them. Plant communities within the project site were identified using field reconnaissance and aerial photography. Within CDFW's current vegetation classification system, vegetation alliances are the scientifically derived hierarchical class that corresponds best with plant communities and are designed to be the unit for conservation of rare or threatened plant communities (Sawyer et al., 2009). Vegetation alliances typically represent a much finer scale of vegetation description than wildlife habitats but correspond appropriately with one or several wildlife habitat types. CDFW provides crosswalks to help correlate vegetation alliances with wildlife habitats and the descriptions below make use of the crosswalk.

A description of each habitat type is presented below. Related vegetation alliances are listed following the wildlife habitat description and are based on the alliance descriptions presented by Sawyer et al. (2009).

Of note, the 2013 Rim Fire, which burned approximately 257,000 acres in Tuolumne and Mariposa counties, burned portions of the project site and surrounding area. The landscape is still recuperating from these fires and the much of the vegetation of the project area is still recovering.

#### Mixed Conifer

The majority of the project site consists of mixed conifer forest. Dominant overstory vegetation includes incense cedar (*Calocedrus decurrens*), ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), white fir (*Abies concolor*), Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii*), and black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*). Dominant shrubs include deer brush (*Ceanothus integerrimus*) and manzanita (*Arctostaphylos manzanita*). Dominant understory species includes blue grass (*Poa bulbosa*), ripgut grass (*Bromus diandrus*), sanicula (*Sanicula crassicaulis*), tall sock-destroyer (*Torilis arvensis*), silver hair grass (*Aira caryophyllea*), winter vetch (*Vicia villosa*), nemophila (*Nemophila heterophylla*), and Sierran gooseberry (*Ribes roezlii*).

Approximately 20.1 acres of the site were completely burned in 2013 during the Rim Fire. Burned trees and snags in these areas have been cleared. In addition to areas that were completely burned, individual trees and small stands of trees outside of those areas were also damaged or burned. Due to the recent wildfire history of the project site, much of the mixed conifer forest community in the project site is disturbed and does not support plant densities and diversity typical of undisturbed examples of this community type. Many trees within the project site were burned during the wildfires. Many saplings are found throughout the project site; unburned mature trees are located in healthy stands left untouched by the fire.

#### Vegetation Alliances

- *Pinus ponderosa* – *Calocedrus decurrens* – *Quercus kelloggii* (mixed conifer forest) Association

#### Disturbed

Disturbed habitat includes graded haul roads and a landing constructed for dead tree removal. The disturbed areas lack vegetation.

#### Vegetation Alliances

- None

### Seasonal Wetland

A seasonal wetland occurs within the central portion of the project site. Dominant vegetation within the seasonal wetland consists entirely of small-fruited bulrush (*Scirpus microcarpus*).

#### Vegetation Alliances

- *Scirpus micorcarpus* (small-fruited bulrush marsh) Alliance

### Seep

A seep occurs within the central portion of the project site. The seep receives groundwater from the surrounding land and drains to an ephemeral drainage. Dominant vegetation includes small-fruited bulrush and nutsedge (*Cyperus eragrostis*).

#### Vegetation Alliances

- *Scirpus micorcarpus* (small-fruited bulrush marsh) Alliance

### Ephemeral Drainage

An ephemeral drainage system occurs within the project site, draining towards the southeast and eventually to the South Fork Tuolumne River, approximately 0.6 miles south of the project site. The main ephemeral drainage enters begins in the northwestern portion of the project site and extends east then southeast, exiting at the southeastern corner of the project site. A number of small ephemeral drainages drain to this main drainage. Dominant vegetation along the banks of the drainage includes mostly upland plant species including ponderosa pine, white fir, Brewer's bittercress (*Cardamine breweri*), lupine (*Lupinus* sp.), and bristly dogtail grass (*Cynosurus echinatus*).

#### Vegetation Alliances

- None

### **Aquatic Resources**

Wetlands are ecologically complex habitats that support a variety of both plant and animal life. In a jurisdictional sense, the federal government defines wetlands in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) as “areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support (and do support, under normal circumstances) a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions” (33 CFR 328.3[b] and 40 CFR 230.3). Under normal circumstances, the federal definition of wetlands requires three wetland identification parameters be present: wetland hydrology, hydric soils, and hydrophytic vegetation. Examples of wetlands include freshwater marsh, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pool complexes that have a hydrologic link to other waters of the U.S (see definition below for “other waters of the U.S.”). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is the responsible agency for regulating wetlands under Section 404 of the CWA, while the U.S Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has overall responsibility for the CWA. The CDFW does not normally have direct jurisdiction over wetlands unless they are subject to regulation under Streambed Alteration Agreements or they support state-listed endangered species; however, CDFW has trust responsibility for wildlife and habitats pursuant to California law.

“Other waters of the U.S.” refers to those hydric features that are regulated by the CWA but are not wetlands (33 CFR 328.4). To be considered jurisdictional, these features must exhibit a defined bed and bank and an ordinary high-water mark. Examples of other waters of the U.S. include rivers, creeks, intermittent and ephemeral channels, ponds, and lakes.

An aquatic resources delineation was conducted for the project site by ESA in June 2018 and February 2019 (ESA, 2019). The aquatic resources delineation identified 0.725 acre of potentially jurisdictional wetlands within the project site that are expected to be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the CWA (see **Figure BIO-1**). Aquatic resources within the project site consist of seasonal wetland, seep, and ephemeral drainage. Aquatic community and habitat were classified using the *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Cowardin Classification) (Federal Geographic Data Committee, 2013). Potentially jurisdictional features within the project site are summarized in **Table BIO-1**. The aquatic resources delineation has not yet been verified by the USACE and should be considered preliminary until verification in writing is received from the USACE.


**TABLE BIO-1  
AQUATIC RESOURCES**

Aquatic Resource Type – Cowardin Classification	Total Acres
<b>Wetlands</b>	
<b>Seasonal Wetland</b>	
Seasonal Wetland – Palustrine Emergent Wetland (Seasonally Flooded)	0.093
<b>Seep</b>	
Seep – Palustrine Emergent Wetland (Seasonally Flooded)	0.013
<b>Other Waters of the U.S.</b>	
<b>Ephemeral Drainage</b>	
Ephemeral Drainage – Riverine Intermittent	0.619
<b>Total Area of Jurisdictional Features:</b>	<b>0.725</b>

SOURCE: ESA, 2019

### **Seasonal Wetland (Palustrine Emergent Wetland – Seasonally Flooded)**

Seasonal wetlands are ephemeral wetlands that pond water or remain saturated for extended periods during a portion of the year, often throughout the wet season, then dry up in spring or early summer. The seasonal wetland within the project site is classified as *Palustrine Emergent Wetland (Seasonally Flooded)* using the *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Federal Geographic Data Committee, 2013). Dominant vegetation within the seasonal wetland consists entirely of small-fruited bulrush. Surface water was present in the seasonal wetland at the time of the field survey.



SOURCE: USDA, 2016; ESA, 2018

Yosemite Under Canvas Project

**Figure BIO-1**  
Aquatic Resources

### **Seep (Palustrine Emergent Wetland – Seasonally Flooded)**

Seeps are wet places where groundwater reaches the surface from an underground source, usually only during portions of the year. The seep in the project site is classified as *Palustrine Emergent Wetland (Seasonally Flooded)* using the *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Federal Geographic Data Committee, 2013). The seep in the project site receives groundwater from the surrounding land and drains to the main ephemeral drainage. Dominant vegetation includes small-fruited bulrush and nutsedge (*Cyperus eragrostis*). Surface water was not present in the seep at the time of the field survey; however, a high water table was present as water was present in the soil pit at a depth of one inch.

### **Ephemeral Drainage/Riverine Intermittent**

Ephemeral channels are classified as “riverine intermittent” using the *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Federal Geographic Data Committee, 2013). An ephemeral channel has flowing water only during, and for a short duration after, precipitation events in a typical year. Ephemeral stream beds are located above the water table year-round. Groundwater is not a source of water for the stream. Runoff from rainfall is the only source of water for stream flow.

### **Sensitive Natural Community**

A sensitive natural community is a biological community that is regionally rare, provides important habitat opportunities for wildlife, is structurally complex, or is in other ways of special concern to local, state, or federal agencies. Most sensitive natural communities are given special consideration because they perform important ecological functions, such as maintaining water quality and providing essential habitat for plants and wildlife. Some plant communities support a unique or diverse assemblage of plant species and therefore are considered sensitive from a botanical standpoint. CEQA may identify the elimination of such communities as a significant impact.

Sensitive natural communities include: a) areas of special concern to federal, state, or local resource agencies; b) areas regulated under Section 404 of the CWA; c) areas protected under Section 402 of the CWA; and d) areas protected under state and local regulations and policies. Habitat types on the project site that would be considered sensitive by regulatory agencies include wetlands and ephemeral drainages, which are regulated under Section 404 of the CWA.

The CDFW’s *California Natural Community List* (CDFW, 2018d) ranks vegetation alliances in California according to their degree of rarity imperilment (as measured by rarity, trends, and threats). All alliances are listed with a G (global) and S (state) rank. Alliances with State ranks of S1-S3 are considered of special concern by the CDFW, and all associations within them are also considered to be highly imperiled. CDFW guidance recommends all alliances with State ranks of S1-S3 be considered and analyzed under CEQA.

*Scirpus microcarpus* (small-fruited bulrush) alliance, which occurs in the project site, has a state rank of S2 and is considered a sensitive natural community.

### **Wildlife Movement Corridors**

Wildlife movement corridors are considered an important ecological resource by various agencies (CDFW and USFWS) and under CEQA. Movement corridors may provide favorable locations for wildlife to travel between different habitat areas such as foraging sites, breeding sites, cover areas, and preferred summer and winter range locations. They may also function as dispersal corridors allowing animals to move between various locations within their range. Topography and other natural factors, in combination with urbanization, can fragment or separate large open-space areas. Areas of human disturbance or urban development can fragment wildlife habitats and impede wildlife movement between areas of suitable habitat. This fragmentation creates isolated “islands” of vegetation that may not provide sufficient area to accommodate sustainable populations, and can adversely affect genetic and species diversity. Movement corridors mitigate the effects of this fragmentation by allowing animals to move between remaining habitats, which in turn allows depleted populations to be replenished and promotes genetic exchange between separate populations.

The project area could potentially be used by a variety of wildlife species for dispersal and seasonal migration, including black-tailed deer (*Odocoileus hemionus columbianus*).

### **Special-Status Species**

Special-status species are legally protected under the state and federal Endangered Species Acts or other regulations or are species that are considered sufficiently rare by the scientific community to qualify for such listing. These species are classified under the following categories:

1. Species listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (50 Code of Federal regulations [CFR] 17.12 [listed plants], 17.11 [listed animals] and various notices in the Federal Register [FR] [proposed species]);
2. Species that are candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (61 FR 40, February 28, 1996);
3. Species listed or proposed for listing by the State of California as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 670.5);
4. Plants listed as rare or endangered under the California Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code, Section 1900 et seq.);
5. Animal species of special concern to CDFW;
6. Animals fully protected under Fish and Game Code (California Fish and Game Code, Sections 3511 [birds], 4700 [mammals], and 5050 [reptiles and amphibians]);
7. Species that meet the definitions of rare and endangered under CEQA. CEQA Section 15380 provides that a plant or animal species may be treated as “rare or endangered” even if not on one of the official lists (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15380); and
8. Plants considered under the CNPS and CDFW to be “rare, threatened or endangered in California” (California Rare Plant Rank [CRPR] 1A, 1B, and 2 in CNPS, 2018).

A list of special-status species that have the potential to occur within the vicinity of the project site was compiled based on data contained in the CNDDDB (CDFW, 2018a), the USFWS list of Federal

Endangered and Threatened Species that Occur in or may be Affected by the proposed project (USFWS, 2018a), and the CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS, 2018). A list of special-status species, their general habitat requirements, and an assessment of their potential to occur within and adjacent to the project site is provided below in **Table BIO-2**.

The “Potential to Occur” categories are defined as follows:

- **Unlikely:** The project site does not support suitable habitat for a particular species and/or the project site is outside of the species known range.
- **Low Potential:** The project site only provides limited and low quality habitat for a particular species. In addition, the known range for a particular species may be outside of the immediate project area.
- **Medium Potential:** The project site and/or immediate project area provides suitable habitat for a particular species.
- **High Potential:** The project site and/or immediate project area provide ideal habitat conditions for a particular species and/or known populations occur in the immediate project area or within the project site.

**TABLE BIO-2  
REGIONALLY OCCURRING SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES**

<b>Scientific Name Common Name</b>	<b>Listing Status USFWS/ CDFW/CNPS</b>	<b>General Habitat</b>	<b>Potential to Occur in the Project Area</b>
<b>Fish</b>			
<i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i> Delta smelt	FT/SE/--	Found in the Sacramento-San Joaquin delta, Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait, and San Pablo Bay.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site. Project site outside of geographic range.
<b>Amphibians</b>			
<i>Anaxyrus canorus</i> Yosemite toad	FT/CSC/--	In the vicinity of wet meadows in the central High Sierra, 6,400 to 11,300 feet in elevation. Primarily montane wet meadows; also in seasonal ponds associated with Lodgepole pine and subalpine conifer forest.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site. Project site outside of elevation range of the species.
<i>Hydromantes brunus</i> limestone salamander	--/ST,CFP/--	Limestone outcrops in foothill-pine-chaparral belt along the Merced River and its tributaries, from 800 to 2,600 feet in elevation. California buckeye ( <i>Aesculus californica</i> ) is an indicator of optimal habitat. Seeks cover in limestone caverns, talus, rock fissures, and surface objects.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site. Project site outside of elevation range of the species.
<i>Rana boylei</i> Foothill yellow-legged frog	--/SCT,CSC/--	Partly shaded, shallow streams and riffles with a rocky substrate in a variety of habitats. Need at least some cobble-sized substrate for egg-laying.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site. Drainages on-site are ephemeral, seasonally dry, and have no in-stream vegetation to provide cover and breeding habitat.

**TABLE BIO-2  
REGIONALLY OCCURRING SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES**

<b>Scientific Name Common Name</b>	<b>Listing Status USFWS/ CDFW/CNPS</b>	<b>General Habitat</b>	<b>Potential to Occur in the Project Area</b>
<i>Rana draytonii</i> California red-legged frog	FT/CSC/--	Breeds in slow moving streams, ponds, and marshes with emergent vegetation and an absence or low occurrence of predators.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site. Drainages on-site are ephemeral, seasonally dry, and have no in-stream vegetation to provide cover and breeding habitat.
<i>Rana sierrae</i> Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog	FE/ST/--	Streams, lakes, and ponds in montane riparian habitats. Always encountered within a few feet of water. Tadpoles may require 2–4 years to complete their aquatic development.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site. Perennial water features are not present within the project site.
<b>Reptiles</b>			
<i>Emys marmorata</i> western pond turtle	--/CSC/--	Ponds, marshes, rivers, streams, and irrigation ditches with aquatic vegetation. Requires basking sites and suitable upland habitat for egg-laying. Nest sites most often characterized as having gentle slopes (<15%) with little vegetation or sandy banks.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site. Perennial water features are not present within the project site.
<b>Birds</b>			
<i>Accipiter gentilis</i> northern goshawk	--/CSC/--	Within, and in vicinity of, coniferous forest. Uses old nests, and maintains alternate sites. Usually nests on north slopes, near water. Red fir, lodgepole pine, Jeffrey pine, and aspens are typical nest trees.	<b>Medium.</b> The project site provides suitable habitat for this species.
<i>Empidonax traillii</i> willow flycatcher	--/SE/--	Inhabits extensive thickets of low, dense willows ( <i>Salix</i> spp.) on edge of wet meadows, ponds, or backwaters, from 2,000 to 8,000 feet. Requires dense willow thickets for nesting/roosting. Low, exposed branches are used for singing posts/hunting perches.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i> American peregrine falcon	--/CFP/--	Near wetlands, lakes, rivers, or other water; on cliffs, banks, dunes, and mounds as well as human-made structures. Nest consists of a scrape or depression or ledge in an open site.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> Bald eagle	BEPA/ SE,CFP/--	Found at lakes, reservoirs, river systems, and coastal wetlands. The breeding range is generally in mountainous areas near lake or river margins, where they find large trees (usually conifers) with open branches for nesting.	Low. The South Fork Tuolumne River is approximately 0.6 mile south of the project site. Marginal nesting trees within the project site.

**TABLE BIO-2  
REGIONALLY OCCURRING SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES**

<b>Scientific Name Common Name</b>	<b>Listing Status USFWS/ CDFW/CNPS</b>	<b>General Habitat</b>	<b>Potential to Occur in the Project Area</b>
<i>Strix nebulosa</i> great gray owl	--/SE/--	Occurs within old growth red-fir, mixed conifer, and lodgepole pine habitats above 4,500 feet. Most occurrences along the Tuolumne River and the Merced River in Yosemite Valley. Requires large diameter snags in a forest with high canopy closure, which provide a cool sub-canopy micro-climate.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Strix occidentalis occidentalis</i> California spotted owl	--/CSC/--	Mixed conifer forest, often with an understory of black oaks and other deciduous hardwoods. Canopy closure greater than 40%. Most often found in deep-shaded canyons, on north-facing slopes, and within 300 meters of water.	<b>Medium.</b> The project site provides suitable habitat for this species.
<b>Mammals</b>			
<i>Antrozous pallidus</i> Pallid bat	--/CSC/--	A wide variety of habitats is occupied, including grasslands, shrublands, woodlands, and forests from sea level up through mixed conifer forests. The species is most common in open, dry habitats with rocky areas for roosting. Roosts in buildings, caves, tree hollows, crevices, mines, and bridges.	<b>Medium.</b> Mature trees in the project site may provide suitable roosting habitat, and open areas within and adjacent to the project site provide suitable foraging habitat.
<i>Aplodontia rufa californica</i> Sierra Nevada mountain beaver	--/CSC/--	Dense growth of small deciduous trees and shrubs, wet soil, and an abundance of forbs in the Sierra Nevada and east slope. Needs dense understory for food and cover. Burrows into soft soil. Needs abundant supply of water.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i> Townsend's big-eared bat	--/CSC/--	Found throughout California in a wide variety of habitats. Roost in caves, mines, tunnels with minimal disturbance but can also be found in abandoned open buildings or other human made structures. Extremely sensitive to human disturbance.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Euderma maculatum</i> spotted bat	--/CSC/--	Forages over water and along washes within a wide variety of habitats including grasslands, deserts, and mixed conifer forests. Roosts on rock crevices in caves or on cliffs.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable foraging habitat present within the project site. Suitable roost sites are absent.
<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i> western mastiff bat	--/CSC/--	Many open, semi-arid to arid habitats, including conifer and deciduous woodlands, coastal scrub, grasslands, chaparral etc. Isolated occurrences in northern California. Roosts primarily in crevices within cliffs and canyons, occasionally in buildings. Primarily feeds on moths. Maternity colonies active May through July.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable foraging habitat present within the project site. Suitable roost sites are absent.

**TABLE BIO-2  
REGIONALLY OCCURRING SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES**

<b>Scientific Name Common Name</b>	<b>Listing Status USFWS/ CDFW/CNPS</b>	<b>General Habitat</b>	<b>Potential to Occur in the Project Area</b>
<i>Lasiurus blossevillii</i> western red bat	--/CSC/--	Forages in a wide range of habitats but prefers habitat edges and mosaics with large trees that have open understories. Roosts primarily in trees.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable roosting habitat is present in the mixed conifer forest. Suitable foraging habitat is present in areas of open understory of mixed conifer forest.
<i>Pekania pennanti</i> fisher – West Coast DPS	--/ST,CSC/--	Intermediate to large-tree stages of coniferous forests and deciduous-riparian areas with high percent canopy closure. Uses cavities, snags, logs, and rocky areas for cover and denning. Needs large areas of mature dense forest.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Vulpes vulpes necator</i> Sierra Nevada red fox	FC/ST/--	Historically found from the Cascades down to the Sierra Nevada. Found in a variety of habitats from wet meadows to forested areas. Use dense vegetation and rocky areas for cover and den sites. Prefer forests interspersed with meadows or alpine fell-fields.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<b>Plants</b>			
<i>Agrostis humilis</i> mountain bent grass	--/--/2B.3	Meadows, seeps, and alpine boulder and rock fields in subalpine coniferous forest. Sometimes on carbonate soils. 8,750 – 10,500 feet. Blooms July to September.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site. Project site outside of elevation range of the species.
<i>Allium tribracteatum</i> three-bracted onion	--/--/1B.2	Volcanic slopes in coniferous forest and chaparral. 3,600 – 9,850 feet. Blooms April to August.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Allium yosemitense</i> Yosemite onion	--/--/1B.3	Rocky, metamorphic, or granitic soils in broadleafed upland forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, and lower montane coniferous forest. 1,750 – 7,200 feet. Blooms April to July.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Balsamorhiza macrolepis</i> big-scale balsamroot	--/--/1B.2	Open grassy or rocky slopes in chaparral, cismontane woodland, and grasslands. Often on serpentine soils. 295 – 5,085 feet. Blooms March to June.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Brasenia schreberi</i> watershield	--/--/2B.3	Freshwater marshes and swamps. 100 – 7,200 feet. Blooms June to September.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Carex limosa</i> med sedge	--/--/2B.2	Freshwater bogs, fens, marshes, swamps, meadows, and seeps in montane coniferous forest. 3,900 – 8,850 feet. Blooms June to August.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Carex viridula</i> subsp. <i>viridula</i> green yellow sedge	--/--/2B.3	Freshwater bogs, fens, marshes, and swamps. Also found in North Coast mesic forests. 0 – 5,250 feet. Blooms June to November.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.

**TABLE BIO-2**  
**REGIONALLY OCCURRING SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES**

<b>Scientific Name Common Name</b>	<b>Listing Status USFWS/ CDFW/CNPS</b>	<b>General Habitat</b>	<b>Potential to Occur in the Project Area</b>
<i>Cinna bolanderi</i> Bolander's woodreed	--/--/1B.2	Streambanks and other mesic sites such as meadows and seeps in upper montane coniferous forest. 5,500 – 8,000 feet. Blooms July to September.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Clarkia australis</i> Small's southern clarkia	--/--/1B.2	Open, rocky sites in Sierra Nevada yellow pine forest. 2,625 – 6,800 ft. Blooms May to August.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Clarkia biloba</i> subsp. <i>australis</i> mountain bent grass	--/--/1B.2	Chaparral and woodlands of the Sierra Nevada Foothills. Sometimes on serpentine. 985 – 4,790 ft. Blooms May to July.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Clarkia lingulata</i> Mariposa clarkia	--/--/1B.1	Chaparral and cismontane woodland. 1,300 – 1,500 feet. Blooms May to June.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Diplacus pulchellus</i> yellow-lip pansyflower	--/--/1B.2	Vernally mesic, often disturbed sites on clay soils. Meadows and seeps within lower montane coniferous forest. 2,000 – 6,500 feet. Blooms April to June.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Eriophyllum congdonii</i> Congdon's woolly sunflower	--/--/1B.2	Rocky, metamorphic soils in chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest, and grasslands. 1,650 – 6,250 feet. Blooms April to June.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Eriophyllum nubigenum</i> Yosemite woolly sunflower	--/--/1B.3	Gravelly, granitic soils in chaparral and montane coniferous forest. 5,000 – 9,000 feet. Blooms May to August.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Erythranthe filicaulis</i> slender-stemmed monkeyflower	--/--/1B.2	Vernally mesic sites such as meadows and seeps in woodland and coniferous forest. 2,950 – 5,750 feet. Blooms April to August.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Erythronium taylorii</i> Pilot Ridge fawn lily	--/--/1B.2	Metamorphic, rocky soils on cliffs in lower montane coniferous forest. 4,400 – 4,600 feet. Blooms April to May.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Erythronium tuolumnense</i> Tuolumne fawn lily	--/--/1B.2	Broadleaf upland forests, chaparral, cismontane woodland, coniferous forests 1,675 – 4,475 feet. Flowering period: Mar–June.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Horkelia parryi</i> Parry's horkelia	--/--/1B.2	Open chaparral on lone formation and limestone soils. 260 – 3,510 feet. Blooms April–September.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.

**TABLE BIO-2**  
**REGIONALLY OCCURRING SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES**

<b>Scientific Name Common Name</b>	<b>Listing Status USFWS/ CDFW/CNPS</b>	<b>General Habitat</b>	<b>Potential to Occur in the Project Area</b>
<i>Hulsea brevifolia</i> short-leaved hulsea	--/1B.2	Granitic, volcanic, gravelly, or sandy soils in coniferous forest. 4,900 – 10,500 feet. Blooms May to August.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Lewisia congdonii</i> Congond's lomatium	--/1B.2	Granitic and metamorphic soils on rocky, mesic sites in chaparral, woodland, coniferous forest, and grassland. 1,650 – 9,200 feet. Blooms April to June.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Lomatium congdonii</i> Congdon's lomatium	--/1B.2	Serpentine soil in chaparral, cismontane woodland. 985 – 6,890 feet. Blooms Mar-Jun.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Lupinus spectabilis</i> shaggyhair lupine	--/1B.2	Serpentine soil in chaparral and woodland of the Sierra Nevada foothills. 855 – 2,700 ft. Blooms Apr-May.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Mielichhoferia elongata</i> Shevock's copper moss	--/1B.2	Found on metamorphic rock, usually acidic, usually vernal mesic, sometimes carbonate. 0 – 6,450 feet.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Orthotrichum holzingeri</i> Holzinger's orthotrichum moss	--/1B.3	Usually on rocks in and along streams, rarely on tree limbs. 2,350 – 5,900 feet.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Plagiobothrys torreyi</i> var. <i>torreyi</i> Yosemite popcornflower	--/1B.2	Meadows and seeps in lower montane coniferous forest. 3,950 – 4,500 feet. Blooms April to June.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Potamogeton epihydrus</i> Nuttall's ribbon-leaved pondweed	--/2B.2	Marshes and swamps and assorted shallow freshwater habitats. 1,200 – 7,125 feet. Blooms June to September.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Potamogeton robbinsii</i> Robbin's pondweed	--/2B.3	Deep water in lakes, marshes, and swamps. 5,000 – 10,800 feet. Blooms July to August.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.
<i>Rhynchospora californica</i> California beaked rush	--/1B.1	Bogs, fens, marshes, swamps, meadows, and seeps in coniferous forests. 150 – 3,300 feet. Blooms May to July.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Rhynchospora capitellata</i> brownish beaked rush	--/2B.2	Mesic sites such as meadows, seeps, marshes, and swamps in coniferous forest. 150 – 6,500 feet. Blooms July to August.	<b>Medium.</b> Suitable habitat is present within the project site. However, species not observed during biological surveys conducted in 2018.
<i>Schoenoplectus subterminalis</i> water bulrush	--/2B.3	Montane lake margins. 2,450 – 7,400 feet. Blooms June to September.	Unlikely. No suitable habitat within the project site.

**TABLE BIO-2  
REGIONALLY OCCURRING SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES**

<b>Scientific Name Common Name</b>	<b>Listing Status USFWS/ CDFW/CNPS</b>	<b>General Habitat</b>	<b>Potential to Occur in the Project Area</b>
<b>STATUS CODES:</b>			
<b>FEDERAL (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service):</b>			
BEPA = Bald Eagle Protection Act			
FE = Listed as Endangered by the Federal Government			
FT = Listed as Threatened by the Federal Government			
FC = Candidate for Federal Listing			
<b>STATE (California Department of Fish and Wildlife):</b>			
SE = Listed as Endangered by the State of California			
ST = Listed as Threatened by the State of California			
SCT = Candidate for State Listing (Threatened)			
CSC = California species of special concern			
CFP = California fully protected bird species			
<b>California Native Plant Society (CNPS):</b>			
Rank 1A = Plants presumed extirpated in California and either rare or extinct elsewhere			
Rank 1B = Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere			
Rank 2A = Plants presumed extirpated in California but common elsewhere			
Rank 2B = Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California but more common elsewhere			
Rank 3 = Plants about which more information is needed			
Rank 4 = Plants of limited distribution			
<b>CNPS Code Extensions</b>			
.1 = Seriously threatened in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat)			
.2 = Fairly threatened in California (20-80% occurrences threatened)			
.3 = Not very threatened in California (less than 20% of occurrences threatened or no current threats known)			
SOURCE: CNPS, 2018; CDFW, 2018a; USFWS, 2018a			

### ***Critical Habitat***

Critical habitat is defined in Section 3(5)A of the Federal Endangered Species Act as the specific portions of the geographic area occupied by the species in which physical or biological features essential to the conservation of the species are found and that may require special management considerations or protection. Specific areas outside of the geographic area occupied by the species may also be included in critical habitat designations upon a determination that such areas are essential for the conservation of the species.

There is no critical habitat designated within or adjacent to the project site.

### **Discussion**

- a) Special-status species and their habitats that may be affected either directly or indirectly through implementation of the proposed project include special-status bats, nesting raptors and migratory birds, and special-status plant species. Each of these potentially affected species is described below.

#### ***Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds***

Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), migratory bird species and their nests and eggs are protected from injury or death. California Fish and Game Code Subsections 3503, 3503.5, and 3800 prohibit the possession, incidental take, or needless destruction of birds, their nests, and eggs.

The project site and the immediate vicinity have the potential to support nesting raptors, including northern goshawk and California spotted owl, as well as migratory birds on suitable nest trees. Direct impacts on nesting raptors or migratory birds or their habitat such as removal of trees could result in substantial lowered reproductive success or habitat loss, thereby potentially adversely affecting local population levels. The raptor or bird species could be adversely affected if active nesting, roosting, or foraging sites are either removed or exposed to a substantial increase in noise or human presence during project activities. The impact would be less than significant if construction activities occur during the non-breeding season (i.e., from September 1<sup>st</sup> through January 31<sup>st</sup>). However, construction activities conducted during the breeding season between February 1<sup>st</sup> and August 31<sup>st</sup> could affect the species adversely and result in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** would mitigate the impact to **less than significant**.

### ***Special-Status Bats***

Forest habitats within the project site provide suitable roosting and foraging habitat for special-status bat species, including pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), spotted bat (*Euderma maculatum*), western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*), and western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*). These and other bat species could use trees with suitable cavities, crevices, exfoliating bark and/or bark fissures on and near the project site for roosting. The proposed project could result in the removal of trees potentially used for roosting by special-status bats or other modifications to bat habitat. In addition, construction-related activities would temporarily elevate noise levels in areas on and surrounding the construction zone. Special-status bat species may be adversely affected if roosting sites are physically disturbed or are exposed to a substantial increase in noise or human presence during project activities. If construction activities occur during the bat breeding season (April 1<sup>st</sup> to August 31<sup>st</sup>), disturbance to roosting sites could have a significant effect on special-status bat species if active maternity roosts are present. Because project implementation could adversely affect these species, this impact would be considered potentially significant. Implementation of pre-construction surveys consistent with **Mitigation Measure BIO-2** will reduce potential impacts to special-status bats to **less than significant**.

### ***Special-Status Plants***

Suitable habitat for a number of special-status plants occurs on the project site. Based on surveys conducted on the project site, a review of available databases and literature, and an on-site habitat suitability assessment, 14 special-status plant species were determined to have the potential to occur on the project site (see Table BIO-2). The reconnaissance-level survey conducted for this project did not record the presence of any special-status plant species; however, this survey does not constitute a full botanical inventory of the site and does not meet the requirements outlined in the *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities* (CDFW, 2018e). Therefore, it is not known whether the project site supports any special-status plant species. Implementation of the proposed project could potentially result in direct or indirect impacts to special-status plant populations if they are located on the

- project site. **Mitigation Measure BIO-3** will reduce potential impacts to special-status plants to **less than significant**.
- b) The project site supports wetlands and other waters of the U.S., habitat types that are considered to be a sensitive natural community by CDFW and USACE. As designed, the proposed project will not result in any direct impacts to these communities. However, the proposed access roadway will require a crossing of two ephemeral drainages. The proposed access roadway will completely span both of these drainages, avoiding any direct impacts within the ordinary high water mark. However, the construction and use of the spans could result in indirect impacts to the drainages including increased erosion potential and shading. As discussed in the Project Description (see Table 4), Under Canvas will obtain a Streambed Alternation Agreement from CDFW for the proposed crossings of ephemeral drainages and implement all measures outlined in the agreement. In addition, implementation of **Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1** (see Hydrology and Water Quality section) will reduce potential indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities to **less than significant**.
- c) The project site supports wetlands and other waters of the U.S. subject to USACE jurisdiction under Section 404 of the CWA. However, as proposed the project will not impact these features. Additionally, much of the areas subject to USACE jurisdiction under Section 404 of the CWA will be conserved with Open Space zoning. Therefore, there would be a **less-than-significant** impact to aquatic features under the jurisdiction of the USACE under Section 404 of the CWA.
- d) The project site is located in the central Sierra Nevada mountain range, which is an important wildlife migration corridor for a variety of common and special-status species. Project site habitats may potentially function as a migration corridor for a variety of terrestrial species. While some local disturbance would occur in the project site as a result of project construction, these activities would be limited to a small area. They are not expected to interfere with any movement corridors or the movement of any wildlife or native resident or migratory fish species through the area. In addition, similar habitat types are abundant in the local area. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.
- e) Mature oak trees are protected in rural Tuolumne County according to Chapter 9.24 of the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code entitled “Premature Removal of Oak Trees.” This ordinance affords protection to any “old growth” oak trees (“old growth” denotes any native oak tree that is 24” or greater diameter at breast height [DBH]); any valley oak (*Quercus lobata*) 5” or greater DBH; or protection against any removal of native oak trees resulting in a 10% or more average decrease in native oak canopy cover within an oak woodland. Protection is granted as well within the existing Tuolumne County General Plan Policy 4.J.a and the Tuolumne County Wildlife Handbook, describing that a project would have a significant impact on biological resources if it resulted in a net loss of the habitat value of a Second Priority Habitat. Although black oak trees occur sporadically throughout the project site, no oak trees or oak woodland areas protected under the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code, the Tuolumne County General Plan, or the Tuolumne County Wildlife

Handbook would be removed by implementation of the project. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

- f) The proposed project is not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

## Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Perform Pre-Construction Surveys for Nesting Special-Status and Common Migratory Birds.** For construction activities expected to occur during the nesting season of raptors (February 1 to August 31) and migratory birds, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted to determine if active nests are present on or within 500 feet of the project site where feasible. Areas that are inaccessible due to private property restrictions shall be surveyed using binoculars from the nearest vantage point. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than seven days prior to the onset of construction. If no active nests are identified during the pre-construction survey, no further mitigation is necessary. If construction activities begin prior to February 1, it is assumed that no birds will nest in the project site during active construction activities and no pre-construction surveys are required. If at any time during the nesting season construction stops for a period of two weeks or longer, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted prior to construction resuming.

If active nests are found on or within 500 feet of the project site, then Under Canvas shall notify CDFW and explain any additional measures that a qualified biologist plans to implement to prevent or minimize disturbance to the nest while it is still active. Depending on the conditions specific to each nest, and the relative location and rate of construction activities, it may be feasible for construction to occur as planned within the 500-foot buffer without impacting the breeding effort. Appropriate measures may include restricting construction activities within 500 feet of active raptor nests, and having a qualified biologist with stop work authority monitor the nest for evidence that the behavior of the parents have changed during construction. Nests that are inaccessible due to private property restrictions shall be monitored using binoculars from the nearest vantage point. Appropriate measures would be implemented until the young have fledged or until a qualified biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. Construction activities may be halted at any time if, in the professional opinion of the biologist, construction activities are affecting the breeding effort.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Perform Pre-Construction Surveys for Special-Status Bats.** For construction activities expected to occur during the breeding season of special-status bat species (April 1 to August 31), a field survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine whether active roosts are present on-site or within 100 feet of the project boundaries. Field surveys shall be conducted early in the breeding season before any construction activities begin, when bats are establishing maternity roosts but before pregnant females give birth (April through early May). If no roosting bats are found, then no further mitigation is required. If roosting bats are found, then disturbance of the maternity roosts shall be avoided by halting construction until the end of the breeding season or a qualified bat biologist excludes the roosting bats in consultation with CDFW. If construction activities begin prior to April 1, it is assumed that no bats will roost in the project site during active construction activities and no pre-construction surveys are required. If at any time during the roosting season construction stops for a period of two

weeks or longer, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted prior to construction resuming.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Perform Pre-Construction Surveys for Special-Status Plants.** A qualified plant biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey in the appropriate season(s) for the plant species identified as having a medium to high potential to occur within the construction disturbance area (see Table BIO-2). If special-status plant species are found, Under Canvas shall consult with CDFW to provide preservation and avoidance measures commensurate with the standards provided in applicable CDFW protocols for the affected species. The preservation and avoidance measures may include appropriate buffer areas clearly marked during project activities, monitoring by a qualified plant biologist, the evaluation of relocating project facilities that would impact special-status plant species populations, the evaluation of Open Space zoning to protect special-status plant species populations, and the development and implementation of a replanting plan (collection of seeds, revegetation, and management and monitoring of the habitat to ensure success) for any individuals of the species that cannot be avoided.

## References

- Baldwin, B.G., D.H. Goldman, D.J. Keil, R. Patterson, T.J. Rosatti, and D.H. Wilken, editors, 2012. *The Jepson manual: Vascular plants of California, second edition*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), 2018a. *California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) Rarefind 5 computer program (v5.2.14)*. California Department of Fish and Wildlife Biogeographic Data Branch. Sacramento, CA.
- CDFW, 2018b. *Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List*. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Natural Diversity Database. Sacramento, CA. Quarterly publication. 127 pp. Data dated August 2018.
- CDFW, 2018c. *Special Animals List*. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Natural Diversity Database. Sacramento, CA. Periodic publication. 66 pp. Data dated August 2018.
- CDFW, 2018d. *California Natural Community List*. Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program. Sacramento, CA. Available: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities/List>.
- CDFW, 2018e. *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities*. Sacramento, CA.
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS), 2018. *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants* (online edition, v8.03). California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, CA.
- Environmental Laboratory, 1987. *Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual (Technical Report Y-87-1)*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experimental Station. Vicksburg, Mississippi.
- Environmental Science Associates (ESA), 2019. *Yosemite Under Canvas Project Aquatic Resources Delineation Report*. February 2019.

- 
- Federal Geographic Data Committee, 2013. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. FGDC-STD-004-2013. Second Edition.* Wetlands Subcommittee, Federal Geographic Data Committee and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC.
- Mayer, K. E., and W.F. Laudenslayer, Jr., 1988. *A Guide to Wildlife Habitats of California.* State of California Resources Agency, California Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, CA.
- Sawyer, J. O., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J. M. Evens, 2009. *A Manual of California Vegetation.* California. 2nd Edition. Native Plant Society Press. Sacramento, CA.
- Tuolumne County, 1987. *Wildlife Handbook – Tuolumne County Wildlife Inventory and Evaluation Project.*
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), 2010. *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region (Version 2.0) ERDC/EL TR-10-3.* Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), 2018a. *List of Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that may occur in the Project Area.* Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Endangered Species Division.
- USFWS, 2018b. Critical Habitat for Threatened and Endangered Species. Critical Habitat Portal Online Mapper. Available: <http://ecos.fws.gov/crithab/>.
-

## Cultural Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code §21074	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

### Background Research

ESA staff conducted a review of online maps and aerial photography and reviewed literature in ESA’s Northern California cultural resources library. Staff members at the Central California Information Center (CCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System at California State University Stanislaus conducted a records search on June 1, 2018 (File No. 10723-O). The review included the project site and a 0.5-mile radius. Previous surveys, studies, and site records were accessed. Records were also reviewed in the Historic Property Data File that contains information on sites of recognized historical significance including those evaluated for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), the California Inventory of Historical Resources, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest. CCIC records indicate that two built environment historic-period resources have been previously recorded within 0.5 miles of the project site, but none within the project site.

The Golden Rock Water Ditch (CA-TUO-001751H) is a historic-era water supply ditch constructed between 1855 and 1860 that diverted part of the South Fork Tuolumne River to serve mining, irrigation, and drinking water needs for the district, and is located approximately 0.5 miles south of the project site. Big Oak Flat Road (CA-TUO-003146H) was originally constructed in the 1870s and is located adjacent to the northern boundary of the project site.

Results of the CCIC records search also identified five previously recorded archaeological resources within 0.5 mile of the project site, none of which are in the project site. One of these resources, P-55-007892, was recorded approximately 250 feet southwest of the project site and is a dirt roadbed of indeterminate age. The four other resources consist of: P-41-000307 (CA-TUO-3554/H), a multi-component archaeological site containing a Native American obsidian and chert lithic scatter and a historic-era glass and ceramic scatter located approximately 0.25 miles southeast of the project site; P-41-002574 (CA-TUO-1583), a Native American archaeological site consisting of two bedrock mortar outcrops located 0.5 miles north of the project site; P-41-002579 (CA-TUO-1588), a Native American archaeological site containing bedrock mortars, obsidian lithic artifacts,

and two steatite artifacts located 0.5 miles northwest of the project site; and P-41-007893 (CA-TUO-5067), a Native American archaeological site containing bedrock mortars, obsidian lithic artifacts, and groundstone artifacts located 0.2 miles northeast of the project site. Additionally, the CCIC has record of 29 previous cultural resources studies that have been conducted within 0.5 mile of the project site. Two of these studies included small portions of the project site.

None of the ethnographic literature reviewed for this project described or depicted any ethnographic place names in or in close proximity to the project site. Levy (1978: Fig 2) depicts the closest place names as *Pigliku* and *Sala*, approximately 10 miles west of the project site in the vicinity of Groveland.

On May 30, 2018, ESA contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by email to request a records search of their Sacred Lands File (SLF) and a list of Native American representatives with cultural affiliation to the project area and vicinity. ESA received a response from the NAHC on June 14, 2018 stating that the SLF has no record of any resources in the project site. The reply also included a list of two Native American representatives affiliated with the project area. The County is currently conducting outreach to relevant California Native American tribes, pursuant to PRC § 21080.3.1.

### **Cultural Survey**

On June 11, 2018, an ESA archaeologist conducted an archaeological pedestrian survey of the project site. Intensive pedestrian survey methods were used, consisting of walking parallel transects and inspecting the surface for cultural material or evidence thereof. Transects were spaced no more than 10-15 meters apart in areas subject to proposed project ground disturbance; transects in portions of the project site not subject to ground disturbance were spaced at 30-meter intervals. Due to the steep terrain, transects were oriented perpendicular to slope. Where present, flat areas, drainages, and bedrock outcrops were subjected to more intensive scrutiny.

A modern, unfinished cabin and a modern woodshed were observed within the project site, but no historic-period built environment resources were identified within the project site as a result of the field survey.

Two potentially historic-period roads were identified during survey. The first road is a dirt track accessed from Big Oak Flat Road north of the project site across from Forest Route 1S03. The dirt track proceeds from the northwestern corner of the project site in a southeasterly direction approximately 2,000 feet along the southern bank of a stream drainage. The road serves as access for the modern woodshed and has been used for logging access after the 2013 Rim Fire. The dirt track is first recorded on a 1990 U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map (USGS, 1990) and does not appear on earlier maps or aerial photographs.

The second road identified during the survey is an overgrown road cut originating near the center of the project site that proceeds downslope north-northeast along the east bank of an intermittent drainage and connects with the dirt track near the modern wood shed. The road cut is approximately 700 feet long, 10-12 feet wide at the base, 14-16 feet wide at the top of the cut, and 16-32 inches deep. Several runoff control swale-and-berm water bars cross the road cut at oblique angles, spaced

irregularly and oriented to deliver stormwater into the intermittent drainage to the west. No information regarding the construction date or purpose of the road cut segment was identified during the study. The road does not appear on any historic topographic maps or aerial photographs.

## Discussion

- a) A significant impact would occur if the project could cause a substantial adverse change to a historical resource, herein referring to historic-period architectural resources or the built environment, including buildings, structures, and objects. A substantial adverse change includes the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource.

Staff members at the CCIC of the California Historical Resources Information System at California State University Stanislaus conducted a records search on June 1, 2018 (File No. 10723-O). As discussed above, two built environment historic-period resources were previously recorded within 0.5 miles of the project site, but none are within the project site.

A modern, unfinished cabin and a modern woodshed were observed within the project site during a site visit conducted on June 11, 2018, but no historical resources were identified within the project site as a result of the background research and field survey. As the project would not affect any significant historic-period buildings or structures, the project would have **no impact** on historical resources and no mitigation is required.

- b) A significant impact would occur if the project could cause a substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource through physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource.

As discussed above under the Environmental Setting, results of the CCIC records search on June 1, 2018 (File No. 10723-O) identified five previously recorded cultural resources within 0.5 mile of the project site, none of which are in the project site. Additionally, the CCIC has record of two previous cultural resources studies that have been conducted within 0.5 mile of the project site. Two of these studies included small portions of the project site.

On June 11, 2018, an ESA archaeologist conducted an archaeological pedestrian survey of the project site. Two potentially historic-period roads were identified during survey. The first road is a dirt track accessed from Big Oak Flat Road north of the project site across from Forest Route 1S03. The dirt track is first recorded on a 1990 U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map (USGS, 1990) and does not appear on earlier maps or aerial photographs. Accordingly, the road is likely ineligible for listing as an individual historical resource, as defined by CEQA; it does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the California Register. The dirt track does not appear to be associated with an important event (Criterion 1) or significant person (Criterion 2), nor does the road represent a distinctive method or type of construction (Criterion 3) or is likely to yield data important to history (Criterion 4).

The second road identified during the survey is an overgrown road cut originating near the center of the project site that proceeds downslope north-northeast along the east bank of an

intermittent drainage and connects with the dirt track near the modern wood shed. No information regarding the construction date or purpose of the road cut segment was identified during the study. The road does not appear on any historic topographic maps or aerial photographs. Accordingly, the road cut is likely ineligible for listing as an individual historical resource, as defined by CEQA; it does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the California Register. The road cut does not appear to be associated with an important event (Criterion 1) or significant person (Criterion 2), nor does the road cut represent a distinctive method or type of construction (Criterion 3) or is likely to yield data important to history (Criterion 4).

The study concludes that the project would not affect any significant archaeological resources. Although no significant archaeological resources were identified, no subsurface investigations were conducted and there remains the potential that archaeological resources could be encountered during project-related ground-disturbing activities. If any such resources were encountered and found to qualify as a historical resource or unique archaeological resource for CEQA purposes, project-related impacts to the resources could be significant. **Mitigation Measure CUL-1**, which will be implemented in the event of inadvertent discovery of unidentified archaeological cultural resources, requires work to halt and the resources to be thoroughly documented and treated appropriately. Implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that impacts on archaeological resources remain at a **less-than-significant** level.

- c) A significant impact would occur if the project would disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. There is no indication that the project site has been used for burial purposes in the recent or distant past. While it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered in the project site, damage to human remains would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-2** would reduce this potential impact to a **less-than-significant** level by ensuring that if human remains are encountered, the find will be reported to the County Coroner. If the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted and the remains would be treated appropriately.
- d) A significant impact would occur if the project could cause a substantial adverse change to a tribal cultural resource through physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource.

Results of the CCIC records search on June 1, 2018 (File No. 10723-O) identified five previously recorded cultural resources within 0.5 mile of the project site, including four Native American archaeological sites consisting of bedrock mortars and artifact scatters. None of these resources are located in the project site, but are recorded between approximately 0.2 and 0.5 miles from the project site.

None of the ethnographic literature reviewed for this study described or depicted any ethnographic place names in or in close proximity to the project site. Levy (1978: Fig 2)

depicts the closest place names as *Pigliku* and *Sala*, approximately 10 miles west of the project site, in the vicinity of Groveland.

ESA received a response from the NAHC on June 14, 2018 stating that the SLF has no record of any resources in the project site. On June 11, 2018 an ESA archaeologist conducted an archaeological pedestrian survey of the project site. No tribal cultural resources were identified in the project site during the pedestrian survey. The study concludes that no known tribal cultural resources are present in the project site and does not anticipate that the project would impact tribal cultural resources.

Although no tribal cultural resources were identified during the study, no subsurface investigations were conducted and there remains the potential that tribal cultural resources could be encountered during project-related ground-disturbing activities. If any such resources were encountered and found to qualify as a historical resource or unique archaeological resource for CEQA purposes, project-related impacts to the resources could be significant. **Mitigation Measure CUL-1**, which will be implemented in the event of inadvertent discovery of unidentified tribal cultural resources, requires work to halt and the resources to be thoroughly documented and appropriately treated. Implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that impacts on tribal cultural resources remain at a **less-than-significant** level.

## Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure CUL-1:** If prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources are encountered, all construction activities within 100 feet of the find shall halt and Tuolumne County (County) shall be notified. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-era materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. An archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology (qualified archaeologist) shall inspect the findings within 24 hours of discovery. If it is determined that the project could damage a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines), mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) § 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4, with a preference for preservation in place.

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(b)(3), preservation in place may be accomplished through planning construction to avoid the resource; incorporating the resource within open space; capping and covering the resource; or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. If avoidance is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a detailed treatment plan in consultation with the County. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of PRC § 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of (but would not be not limited to) sample excavation, artifact collection, site documentation, and historical research, with the aim to target the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the project. The treatment plan shall

include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner, curation of artifacts and data at an approved facility, and dissemination of reports to local and state repositories, libraries, and interested professionals.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-2:** In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction activities, such activities within 100 feet of the find shall cease until the Tuolumne County Coroner has been contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) will be contacted within 24 hours if it is determined that the remains are Native American. The NAHC will then identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American (PRC § 5097.98), who in turn would make recommendations to the County for the appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated funerary objects [CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(d)].

## References

- Levy, Richard, 1978. "Eastern Miwok", In *California*, pp. 398-413, edited by Robert F. Heizer, Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), 1990. "Ascension Mountain, California", topographic 7.5-minute (1:24,000 scale) quadrangle map, Washington, DC.
-

## Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>6. GEOLOGY and Soils —</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

### Soil Resources

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) mapped two soils units within the project site (NRCS, 2018). A description of each soil unit is provided below.

- Holland family, deep- moderately deep complex, 5 to 35 percent slopes (map unit symbol 130)**, is not listed as hydric by the NRCS. Included in this soil map unit are minor components of Lithic xerumbrepts, Rock outcrop, and Dystric xerochrepts. The map unit composition is 80 percent Holland family and similar soils and 20 percent minor components. The unit consists of well drained soils.
- Josephine family, moderately deep, deep complex, 5 to 35 percent slopes (map unit symbol 159)**, is not listed as hydric by the NRCS. Included in this soil map unit are minor components of Dystric lithic xerochrepts and Sites family. The map unit composition is 70 percent Josephine family and similar soils and 30 percent minor components. The unit consists of well drained soils.

### ***Faults and Seismicity***

A fault is defined as a "fracture or fracture zone in the earth's crust along which there has been displacement of the sides relative to one another." For the purpose of planning there are two types of faults, active and inactive. Active faults have experienced displacement in historic time, suggesting that future displacement may be expected. Inactive faults show no evidence of movement in recent geologic time, suggesting that these faults are dormant. Ground-shaking is motion that occurs as a result of energy released during faulting. The damage or collapse of buildings and other structures caused by ground-shaking is among the most serious seismic hazards. The project site lies in the foothills of the western Sierra Nevada Mountains, an area experiencing relatively low seismic activity. No active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones (Special Studies Zones) are located within or adjacent to the project area (CDC, 2018).

### ***Liquefaction Potential***

Liquefaction is a type of ground failure most likely to occur in water-saturated silts, sands, and gravels, having low to medium density. When a soil of this type is subjected to vibration, it tends to compact and decrease in volume. If the groundwater is unable to drain during the vibration, the tendency of the soil to decrease in volume results in an increase in pore-water pressure. When the pore-water pressure builds up to the point where it is equal to the over-burden pressure (effective weight of overlying soil), the effective stress becomes zero. In this condition, the soil loses its shear strength and assumes the properties of a heavy liquid. Based on the lack of published historic evidence of liquefaction in the area, the liquefaction potential of the site soils is considered low.

### ***Tsunami, Seiche, and Volcanic Hazards***

Tsunamis are earthquake-generated waves within enclosed or restricted bodies of water, such as lakes, channels, and reservoirs. Seiches are waves generated by earthquakes, winds, or landslides that set up oscillatory waves in an enclosed basin. The project site is not located near any enclosed bodies of water; therefore, there is no reasonable danger from tsunamis or seiches at the project site. There is no significant source of volcanism in proximity to the project site; therefore, there is no reasonable danger from volcanic eruption hazards at the project site.

### ***Subsidence***

Subsidence is the gradual settling or sinking of the earth's surface with little or no horizontal motion. Subsidence is caused by groundwater withdrawal, gas withdrawal, hydrocompaction or peat oxidation. Subsidence would not be expected to occur in the bedrock geology that characterizes the project site.

### ***Expansive Soils***

Expansive soils are largely comprised of clays, which greatly increase in volume when water is absorbed and shrink when dried. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures and warping of doors and windows. The soil at the project site has a low shrink-swell potential (NRCS, 2018). Consequently, expansive soils are not likely an issue at the project site.

## Discussion

- a.i-iv) According to the CDC, Division of Mines and Geology, the project site is not located within a delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or Landslide and Liquefaction Zone (CDC, 2018). Because the proposed project is not located in an area considered at high seismic risk, it is not expected to expose people or structures to earthquake risk, including strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides. In addition, slopes in the project area are relatively modest and pose no threat of landslides. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact**.
- b) Construction of the project would require site preparation which would expose surface soil materials to rainfall, potentially resulting in the removal and transport of these materials to ephemeral drainages within the project site. The project area is subject to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) water quality standards. To minimize construction related water quality impacts, Under Canvas will obtain a Storm Water Construction General Permit (General Permit 2009-009-DWQ) from the CVRWQCB, which requires that a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) be prepared for the site in accordance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements (see Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1). The construction contractor will be required to protect surface water quality by preventing eroded material or contaminants from entering waterways during construction through the use of best management practices (BMPs). The SWPPP lists potential sources of impacts to surface waters and BMPs that are being used to minimize the likelihood of those impacts. Conformance with these erosion control measures in addition to **Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1 and HYDRO-2** (see Hydrology and Water Quality Section) and Tuolumne County's Grading Ordinance (Chapter 12.20) will reduce potential impacts to a **less-than-significant** level.
- c) As more fully described above, the proposed project is not located within a delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Additionally, the probability of soil liquefaction actually taking place on the project area is considered to be low. With adherence to all applicable codes and regulations, geologic hazard impacts associated with on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be minimized. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.
- d) Although no subsurface exploration has been conducted to confirm the relative absence or presence of expansive soil materials, the soils types found on-site would be expected to contain higher clay content than that of the surface. Expansive soil materials are encountered throughout the state and are generally addressed through standardized foundation engineering practices. Compliance with state standards and practices, as well as application of the existing regulations identified in the Uniform Building Code would minimize the risk associated with development of the proposed project, therefore this impact is considered **less than significant**.
- e) As discussed in the Project Description, wastewater will be treated on-site through the use of a septic tank for storage and settling and a leach field for disposal. The water treatment

system capacity has been preliminarily designed to utilize two disposal areas located where there are assumed to be acceptable soils and to allow for gravity wastewater collection and disposal. Preliminary soils information is indicative that the disposal is viable in area proposed.

Compliance with the above conditions as well as the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code and **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would result in a **less-than-significant** impact related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

## Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** A soils evaluation will be completed by a soils scientist to determine the viability of the proposed septic system. This evaluation will assess the suitability of the proposed septic system site to ensure the soil is capable of supporting the system. Using the soils evaluation, specific treatments will be designed based on percolation rates, soils analysis, ground water, and other considerations for complete treatment to minimize impacts to the natural environment. Wastewater treatment will be designed to meet the “guidelines for design and evaluation of special design on-site sewage treatment and disposal systems.” These minimum design and evaluation standards have been developed pursuant to Tuolumne County Ordinance Code, Section 13.08.270A, August 4, 2009, Tuolumne County Division of Environmental Health. All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes.

## References

- California Department of Conservation (CDC), 2018. Earthquake Fault Zones Interactive Map. Available: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), 2018. Web Soil Survey. Available: <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>.

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS —</b> <b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) trap heat by preventing some of the solar radiation that hits the earth from being reflected back into space. Some GHGs occur naturally and are needed to keep the earth’s surface habitable. Over the past 100 years, human activities have substantially increased the concentration of GHGs in our atmosphere. This has intensified the natural greenhouse effect, increasing average global temperatures.

Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) are the principal GHGs associated with land use projects. CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O occur naturally, and through human activity. Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion and CH<sub>4</sub> results from off gassing<sup>1</sup> associated with agricultural practices and landfills.

CO<sub>2</sub> is the reference gas for climate change because it is the predominant GHG emitted. The effect that each of the aforementioned gases can have on global warming is a combination of the mass of their emissions and their global warming potential (GWP). GWP indicates, on a pound-for-pound basis, how much a gas contributes to global warming relative to how much warming would be predicted to be caused by the same mass of CO<sub>2</sub>. CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are substantially more potent GHGs than CO<sub>2</sub>, with 100-year GWPs of 28 and 265 times that of CO<sub>2</sub>, respectively.

In emissions inventories, GHG emissions are typically reported as metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e). CO<sub>2</sub>e are calculated as the product of the mass emitted of a given GHG and its specific GWP. While CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O have much higher GWPs than CO<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted in such vastly higher quantities that it accounts for the majority of GHG emissions in CO<sub>2</sub>e.

**Tuolumne County Regional Blueprint Greenhouse Gas Study.** In 2012, the Tuolumne County Transportation Council conducted a regional blueprint planning effort which developed a countywide GHG emissions inventory (including incorporated and unincorporated areas), which evaluated existing (2010) GHG emissions, and projected (2020, 2030, and 2040) emissions for three growth scenarios. It also identified policies and measures Tuolumne County and land use project applicants can implement to reduce GHG emissions consistent with AB 32 and prepare for the potential impacts of climate change. In 2010, Tuolumne County emitted approximately 782,846 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent GHG emissions (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e) as a result of activities and

<sup>1</sup> Off-gassing is defined as the release of chemicals under normal conditions of temperature and pressure.

operations that took place within the transportation, residential (energy consumption), non-residential (energy consumption), off-road vehicles and equipment, agriculture and forestry, wastewater, and solid waste sectors. The transportation sector, which accounts for GHG emissions from fuel used to power the cars and trucks that move goods and people, was the largest contributor with 58 percent of the region's total GHG emissions (Rincon, 2012). Further, the GHG Study identifies a CEQA significance threshold of 4.6 Metric Tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year per service population applicable in Tuolumne County.

## Discussion

- a) Construction of the proposed project would generate GHG emissions from a variety of sources, including off-road construction equipment and on-road worker, vendor, and hauling vehicles. Emissions from all of the construction emission sources were estimated using the CalEEMod emission estimator model version 2016.3.2. Peak construction-related GHG emissions would total 477 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e. These emissions would be temporary and last only for the duration of construction activities, approximately ten months.

**Table GHG-1** summarizes the GHG emissions that would result from operation of uses under the project. The table includes those emission sources such as area sources (wood and pellet stoves), transportation, operational electricity consumption, solid waste disposal, water usage and wastewater generation. These emission estimates are conservative as the modeling effort assumed a motel land use as a proxy for the proposed campground. Energy demand associated with a motel use would consider air conditioning and other sources that would not be present in the campgrounds.

**TABLE GHG-1  
OPERATIONAL GHG EMISSIONS (METRIC TONS PER YEAR)**

Emission Source	Total Emissions (MT/Year)			
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	Total CO <sub>2</sub> e
Area Sources (Pellet/woodstoves)	201	0.93	<1	225
Energy Sources	291	<1	<1	293
Mobile Sources	225	<1	<1	226
Solid Waste	11.0	0.65	0	27.3
Water and Wastewater	1.92	0.57	<1	16.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>731</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>&lt;1</b>	<b>788</b>
Service population 99 tents with 2.5 persons/tent				248
GHG Emissions per service population				3.2
Tuolumne County GHG Threshold				4.6
<b>Exceeds Significance Threshold?</b>				<b>No</b>

NOTE: Columns may not total precisely due to rounding.

SOURCE: ESA, 2018 (Appendix B)

As can be seen from the table, emissions of GHGs would be below the County's CEQA threshold. In addition, the presence of the YARTS bus stops at the entrance to the Yosemite Under Canvas facility will provide guests with the option to use the regional public transit system to access Yosemite National Park and other regional destinations. This has the potential to further reduce operational GHG emissions through trip reductions. Consequently, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact with respect to generation of GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment.

- b) As discussed above, the Tuolumne County Regional Blueprint Greenhouse Gas Study is a regional blueprint planning effort which developed policies and measures Tuolumne County and land use project applicants can implement to reduce GHG emissions consistent with AB 32 and prepare for the potential impacts of climate change. The GHG Study identifies a CEQA significance threshold of 4.6 Metric Tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year per service population applicable in Tuolumne County which was used to assess the quantitative impact of greenhouse gas emissions above in response to question a).

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5 address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project's GHG emissions and allow for projects that are consistent with an adopted GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the project's GHG impact is less than significant. Because, as demonstrated in the analysis in response to question a), above, the project's emissions would be below the threshold established in the Tuolumne County Regional Blueprint Greenhouse Gas Study which was prepared to develop a GHG emission reduction target consistent with the goals of AB32, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. This impact is **less than significant**.

## References

Rincon Consultants, 2012. *Tuolumne County Regional Blueprint Greenhouse Gas Study*.  
January 2012.

---

## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS —</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Materials and waste may be considered hazardous if they are poisonous (toxicity), can be ignited by open flame (ignitability), corrode other materials (corrosivity), or react violently, explode or generate vapors when mixed with water (reactivity). The term “hazardous material” is defined in law as any material that, because of quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment (State of California, Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.95, Section 25501(o)). In some cases, past industrial or commercial uses can result in spills or leaks of hazardous materials and petroleum to the ground, resulting in soil and groundwater contamination. Federal and state laws require that soils having concentrations of contaminants such as lead, gasoline, or industrial solvents that are higher than certain acceptable levels must be handled and disposed as hazardous waste during excavation, transportation, and disposal. The California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Section 66261.20-24 contains technical descriptions of characteristics that would cause a soil to be

classified as a hazardous waste. The use of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes are subject to numerous laws and regulations at all levels of government.

Information about hazardous materials sites in the project area was collected by conducting a review of the California Environmental Protection Agency's (Cal EPA) Cortese List Data Resources (Cortese List). The Cortese list includes the following data resources that provide information regarding the facilities or sites identified as meeting the Cortese list requirements: the list of Hazardous Waste and Substances sites from Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database; the list of Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites from GeoTracker database; the list of solid waste disposal sites identified by Water Board; the list of active Cease and Desist Orders and Cleanup and Abatement Orders from Water Board; and the list of hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code identified by DTSC. The Cortese List is a reporting document used by the state, local agencies, and developers to comply with CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. The Cortese List is updated at least annually, in compliance with California regulations (California Code Section 65964.6(a)(4)). The Cortese List includes federal superfund sites, state response sites, non-operating hazardous waste sites, voluntary cleanup sites, and school cleanup sites. Based on a review of the Cortese List conducted in May 2018, no listed active sites are located within 0.5 miles of the project site (DTSC, 2018; SWRCB, 2018).

There are no public airports or private airstrips near the project site. The project site is located within an area that is designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone on the Tuolumne County Fire Hazard Severity Zone maps (CAL FIRE, 2007; CAL FIRE, 2008).

## Discussion

- a, b) Activities associated with the proposed project would utilize potentially hazardous materials associated with construction and operation of vehicles and construction equipment during proposed project implementation including diesel, gasoline, solvents, hydraulic fluid, grease, and oil. These materials are similar to those routinely used for other types of construction projects throughout Tuolumne County. Because federal, State, and County laws and regulations govern the transport, use, storage, handling and disposal of hazardous materials, use of hazardous materials associated with the proposed project's construction would be minimized and/or avoided. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.
- c) The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or require handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school is Tenaya Elementary School, located approximately 14 miles west of the project site. Therefore, the project would result in **no impact**.
- d) As discussed above, research of the California Environmental Protection Agency website determined that the project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites pursuant to Government Code Section 6592.5. Therefore, there would be no significant hazard to

- the public or the environment related to hazardous materials sites. The project would result in **no impact**.
- e, f) The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public or private airport or airstrip. The nearest airport to the project site is Pine Mountain Lake Airport, approximately 12 miles northwest of the project site. Accordingly, the project site is not located within an airport land use plan. Therefore, there would be no safety hazard for people residing or working in the project resulting from a public or private airport. The project would result in **no impact**.
- g) The project site will be accessed from Hardin Flat Road which is a two lane roadway. According to the County's Emergency Response Plan, the project site does not contain any emergency facilities, nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route (Tuolumne County, 2012). During construction, Hardin Flat Road would remain open. During operation of the proposed project, adequate access for emergency vehicles via Hardin Flat Road and connecting roadways will remain available. Additionally, the proposed project would not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any public road and nor would it impair or interfere with evacuation procedures. Therefore, there would be a **less-than-significant** impact relating to the interference of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h) According to the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the project site is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone on the Tuolumne County Fire Hazard Severity Zone maps. Construction activities, which include the use of spark-producing equipment, could present a significant risk to igniting wildfires. Therefore, development of the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of **Mitigation Measure HM-1** would reduce the risk of wildland fire during construction to a **less-than-significant** level and ensure the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Operation of the proposed project could present a significant risk to igniting wildfires. The operation of the proposed project would incorporate fire pits and wood burning stoves. However, as described under **Mitigation Measure HM-2**, Under Canvas will prepare a Fire Protection and Evacuation Plan to be submitted to the Tuolumne County Fire Marshal's office. Accordingly, development of the proposed project would comply with State and local fire codes and regulations. Additionally, applicable fire protection features would be incorporated into the design of the proposed project, including storing combustible material in a defensible location located a minimum of 20 feet from structures and trees. Furthermore, all tents would be built with CAL FIRE registered flame resistant materials (see Appendix A for details). Therefore, operation of the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

## Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure HM-1:** During construction, staging areas or areas slated for development using spark-producing equipment shall be cleared of dried vegetation or other materials that could serve as fire fuel. To the extent feasible, the contractor shall keep these areas clear of combustible materials in order to maintain a firebreak. Any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester shall be equipped with an arrester in good working order. This includes, but is not limited to, vehicles and heavy equipment. In addition, the Contractor will be required to enforce a Fire Plan, which requires adherence to the USFS Project Activity Level minimum requirements and restrictions for construction activity during wildfire season.

**Mitigation Measure HM-2:** Under Canvas will prepare a Fire Protection and Evacuation Plan to be submitted to the Tuolumne County Fire Marshall's office. This plan will detail actions to be taken in the event of a fire and will include, but not be limited to, a fire evacuation strategy, fire prevention measures, employee training, and on-site equipment.

## References

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), 2007. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA, Tuolumne County. November, 2007. Available: [http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/tuolumne/fhszs\\_map.55.pdf](http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/tuolumne/fhszs_map.55.pdf). Accessed June 28, 2018.

CAL FIRE, 2008. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA. Tuolumne County September, 2008. Available: [http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/tuolumne/fhszl\\_map.55.pdf](http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/tuolumne/fhszl_map.55.pdf). Accessed June 28, 2018.

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), 2018. EnviroStor. Available: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=46-200+Harrison+Place+Coachella%2C+California+92236>. Accessed May 18, 2018.

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), 2018. GeoTracker. Available: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=46-200+Harrison+Place+Coachella%2C+California+92236>. Accessed May 18, 2018.

Tuolumne County, 2012. Emergency Operations Plan for Tuolumne County. Available: <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/6165/Tuolumne-County-EOP>. Accessed June 28, 2018.

---

## Hydrology and Water Quality

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY —</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

An ephemeral drainage system occurs within the project site. The main ephemeral drainage on-site is tributary to the South Fork Tuolumne River. The South Fork Tuolumne River lies approximately 0.6 miles to the south of the project site and is part of the Upper Tuolumne River Watershed. The South Fork Tuolumne River drains a small portion of the western edge of Yosemite National Park. The headwaters begin between White Wolf and Yosemite Valley at elevations between 8,000 feet and 8,500 feet. The South Fork Tuolumne River exits the park at an elevation of 4,500 feet, just north of Hodgdon Meadow and upstream of its confluence with the main Tuolumne River. The confluence of the Middle Fork and South Fork occurs approximately five miles downstream of the proposed project.

Surface water quality in the region is generally considered very good. For example, most of the water from the Tuolumne River is usable for human consumption with disinfection alone, although additional treatment is required by law (Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM Plan, August 2013). The majority of the surface water quality issues identified within the County can be linked back to current or historical land use practices such as mining, septic systems, livestock grazing and water based recreation activities.

The County is located within the foothills and higher elevations of the Sierra Nevada where the subsurface material consists primarily of impermeable granitic and greenstone bedrock which can result in a low groundwater yield. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Bulletin 118 provides a detailed description of groundwater basins in California; however, the bulletin does not identify any groundwater basins within Tuolumne County. Groundwater is the primary source of water for most small water systems in Tuolumne County. The characteristics of the fractured rock and weather fluctuations have led to some wells providing unreliable sources of water.

The proposed project is not located in an area designated as a 100-year flood zone. As described in the Tuolumne County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, the physical geography of the County impacts and limits the flooding potential. The overall slope of the watersheds is relatively steep and the rivers and streams move run off away quickly and therefore very little flood plain has been formed (Tuolumne County, 2017). In addition, the Tuolumne County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan lists the project area as Zone X which is for areas of minimal flood hazard.

Dam failure, which is the collapse or failure of an impoundment that causes significant downstream flooding, is not a concern for the project area. Although Tuolumne County has multiple large and small dams, only the O'Shaughnessy Dam poses a risk for significant flooding; however, the dam is located on the Middle Fork Tuolumne River and the proposed project is located near the South Fork Tuolumne River and inundation would not reach the project area.

## Discussion

- a, f) Exposed slopes and graded contours during construction could be subject to rainfall and erosion and could cause temporary discharges of sediment and other contaminants in stormwater runoff to surrounding areas. Even though soils within the project site are characterized as having a low erosion potential, sediments and other pollutants could result in degradation of receiving water quality in the South Fork Tuolumne River and downstream creeks at levels above applicable water quality standards. However, as discussed in the Geology, Soils, and Seismicity section, the proposed project would be subject to the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit from the SWRCB prior to initiating earth disturbing activities. Among other things, the conditions of the Permit include mandatory implementation of BMPs concerning erosion control and preparation of a SWPPP. Conformance with these water quality standards, in addition to **Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1 and HYDRO-2**, will reduce water quality impacts to a **less-than-significant** level and ensure that the project will not generate substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

- b) The proposed project would provide drinking water from a certified source in compliance with California Department of Environment and Natural Resources standards from a proposed on-site well. The water source will be developed to supply an average demand of 8,050 gallons per day (gpd). The proposed groundwater well will be developed to supply 20 to 30 gallons per minute (gpm). A test well will be constructed to determine if groundwater at the project site will meet demand of the proposed project. If the test well is not successful, then Under Canvas will consider purchasing water from a licensed facility and hauling water. The proposed project also includes water storage cisterns. Water use will be metered and measured throughout the camp. In addition, water and supply designs and documents will be submitted for approval from the Tuolumne County Community Resources Agency (CRA). During the operation of the proposed project, water use will be monitored and use data will be submitted to the CRA to verify use of 20 gpd per person or less. The County has the authority to issue permits for new wells while also functioning as a groundwater sustainability agency that may regulate groundwater extraction to maintain sustainable groundwater use. These precautions and approvals by the County will ensure there is adequate groundwater supply and effects of the proposed project will be monitored to minimize impacts to groundwater supply.

The project site is 80.1 acres in total. The camp area total footprint, including roads, trails, tents, support facilities, and parking areas, is approximately 3.0 acres. This leaves approximately 96% of the project site as pervious open space and available for groundwater recharge. In addition, no paved areas are proposed (parking, roads, and bus stop will be gravel) and the tents would be situated on decks which would allow for groundwater recharge underneath them. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact related to the depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge.

- c, d) The proposed project would result in changes to the existing drainage pattern of the project site. As discussed below in **Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3**, the proposed project will include implementation of a Drainage Plan for disposing of runoff in such a manner as to protect adjacent property. General drainage patterns have been reviewed and locations for potential stormwater treatment areas (consisting of grass buffers and detention ponds) are shown in Appendix A. In addition, in order to minimize erosion or siltation on- or off-site post-construction, the proposed project shall implement **Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2**. Through implementation of a drainage pattern and plan and **Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2**, drainage would be contained on-site and erosion would be minimized. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.
- e) The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces; however, as described previously the vast majority of the project site would still remain as pervious open space and would not increase the amount or rate of runoff. The proposed project will include drainage plans and patterns to divert runoff to on-site grass buffers/detention areas. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- g, h) The proposed project is not located within a designated 100-year flood hazard area. As described previously, the Tuolumne County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan lists the project area as Zone X which is for areas of minimal flood hazard. There would be no housing constructed in a 100-year flood hazard area as part of the proposed project, nor would there be a change in the 100-year flood hazard area or impediment of flows. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.
- i) As described in checklist items g) and h), the proposed project would not place any new structures in a flood hazard zone. In addition, the proposed project is not located within a dam inundation area. Therefore, no persons or structures would be exposed to a significant risk associated with flooding due to levee failure or dam inundation and **no impact** would occur.
- j) The 1996 Tuolumne County General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR) states that Tuolumne County is not at risk from tsunamis, seiches, mudflows, or flooding as a result of levee failure. Therefore, no persons or structures would be exposed to a significant risk associated with inundation by a seiche, tsunami or mudflow and **no impact** would occur.

## Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1: Prepare and Implement a SWPPP.** Subject to requirements of Section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act, and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process, all construction projects that disturb more than one acre of land are required to prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP is incorporated into all project plans and specifications. The restoration construction contractor(s) will be required to post a copy of the SWPPP at the project location, file a notice of intent to discharge stormwater with the CVRWQCB, and implement all measures required by the SWPPP. A component of the SWPPP is a dewatering plan for in-channel activities. A Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP) will be responsible for construction monitoring to ensure that the provisions of the SWPPP are effectively enforced. In the event of noncompliance, the QSP will have the authority to shut down the construction-site or fine the responsible party or parties.

- The SWPPP will include the following information and Best Management Practices (BMPs).
- A description of site characteristics, including runoff and drainage characteristics and soil erosion hazard.
- A description of proposed construction procedures and construction-site housekeeping BMPs, including prohibitions on discharging or washing potentially harmful materials into roads, drainages, or the creek.
- A description of BMPs that will be implemented for erosion and sediment control, including requirements to:
  - Conduct major construction activities involving excavation and spoils haulage during the dry season, to the extent possible.

- Conduct all construction work in accordance with site-specific construction plans that minimize the potential for increased sediment inputs to surface waters.
- Grade and stabilize spoils sites to minimize erosion and sediment input to surface waters and generation of airborne particulate matter.
- Implement erosion control measures as appropriate to prevent sediment from entering surface waters to the extent feasible, including the use of silt fencing or fiber rolls to trap sediments.
- A Spill Prevention and Response Plan that identifies any hazardous materials to be used during construction; describes measures to prevent, control, and minimize spillage of hazardous substances; describes transport, storage and disposal procedures for these substances; and outlines procedures to be followed in case of a spill of a hazardous material. The Spill Prevention and Response Plan will require that hazardous and potentially hazardous substances stored on-site be kept in securely closed containers located away from drainage courses and areas where stormwater is allowed to infiltrate. Spill prevention kits will be required to be kept in close proximity to construction areas and workers will be trained in their use. It will also stipulate procedures, such as the use of spill containment pans, to minimize hazard during on-site fueling and servicing of construction equipment. Finally, the Spill Prevention and Response Plan will require that all agencies listed in the Spill Prevention and Response Plan be notified immediately of any substantial spill or release.

**Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2: Prepare and Implement an Erosion Control Plan.**

Contractors shall prepare an Erosion Control Plan for implementation for any construction to occur between October 15 and May 15 of any year. In the absence of such an approved plan, all construction shall cease on or before October 15, except that necessary to implement erosion control measures. If necessary, the plan shall be submitted to the Engineering Development Division of the Community Resources Agency of Tuolumne County for review and approval.

**Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3: Prepare and Implement a Drainage Plan.** A Drainage Plan for the site shall be prepared that specifies how runoff on the site will be managed in order to protect water quality and surrounding property. The plans will be developed with detailed runoff calculations to appropriately size culverts, bridges, retention ponds/areas, and road side ditches to meet the drainage requirements of the project site. The purpose of the plan will be to prevent the creation of localized on- or off-site flooding and to prevent any negative water quality effects off-site. As envisioned, stormwater would be collected through grass buffers and detention ponds, where it would settle, then be metered out to the groundwater of the on-site ephemeral drainages. If necessary, the plan shall be submitted to the Engineering Development Division of the Community Resources Agency of Tuolumne County for review and approval.

## References

Tuolumne County, 2017. Tuolumne County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2018 Update. December, 2017.

Tuolumne Utilities District, 2013. Tuolumne-Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. August, 2013.

---

## Land Use and Land Use Planning

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>10. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING —</b> <b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

The project site is located in an unincorporated area approximately 15 miles west of the community of Groveland, within the Stanislaus National Forest in Tuolumne County, on an approximately 80-acre site at the corner of Highway 120 and Hardin Flat Road. The project site is currently undeveloped forest and rural land. Land uses within the area surrounding the project site are predominately rural in nature, consisting of open land, recreation facilities, and dispersed rural residences to the west, south and east of the project site.

The project is located on lands zoned Commercial Recreation (C-K) under the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code and designated as Parks and Recreation (R/P) by the Tuolumne County General Plan (the project site also includes land zoned Open Space-1 under the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code; however, no development will occur on land with Open Space-1 designation). Commercial Recreation and Parks and Recreation both include hotels and motels and recreational facilities such as campgrounds as an allowable land use, subject to the approval of a Site Development Permit.

## Discussion

- a) The project site is surrounded by undeveloped land with no residences in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact** related to physically dividing an established community.
- b) The purpose of the R/P land use designation is to provide for recreational uses of commercial nature to serve the tourist industry as well as provide leisure activities to the County's residents. Allowed land uses include parks, camping facilities, recreational vehicle parks, ski and other resort facilities, marinas, and commercial uses in support of facilities and public utility and safety facility (Tuolumne County, 1996).

The purpose of the C-K district is to encourage well-planned and integrated resort and vacation-oriented commercial complexes in which the developer may incorporate innovative design techniques. Additionally, development in the C-K district must comply with fire safety standards, Title 15 of the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code. Recreational

structures and developments as well as hotels and motels are permitted within the C-K zoning district. In addition, within any C-K district, recreational vehicle parks and campgrounds are permitted uses subject to first securing a Site Development Permit (Tuolumne County, 2018). Because the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code does not specifically mention “glamping” as a land use, it has been determined that the proposed project most closely matches the land use of a hotel or motel. The luxury tents operate similar to a hotel or motel and provide guests with beds and linens and 77 of the tents will each have a wash basin, shower, and toilet, and operate similar to a hotel/motel. Hotels and motels are a permitted use within the C-K zoning district.

The purpose of the O-1 district is to preserve and protect areas of valuable wildlife habitat consistent with the wildlife policies of the general plan or areas with significant cultural resources. No development will occur on land zoned O-1.

Section 17.68.100 of the ordinance code requires a Site Development Permit prior to construction or expansion of building projects in the C-K district to insure that certain types of proposed developments will serve to achieve a design which is desirable. The applicant has therefore applied for Site Development Permit SDP18-002.

As described in the project description, the project proposes to develop 99 luxury campsites and associated infrastructure. Accordingly, the project does not involve a change in land use and is consistent with the County General Plan land use designations as well as the County Ordinance Code zoning designations. Additionally, the proposed project would not conflict with any policies or regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact relating to applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations.

- c) The proposed project is not within a habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP). The nearest HCP is the PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operation and Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan, located approximately ten miles south, in Mariposa County (CDFW, 2017). Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact**.

## References

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), 2017. California Regional Conservation Plan. Available: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68626&inline>. Accessed June 26, 2018.

Tuolumne County, 1996. Tuolumne County General Plan. Available: <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/185/General-Plan-Policy>. Accessed June 27, 2018.

Tuolumne County, 2018. Tuolumne County Code of Ordinances. Available: <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/165/Tuolumne-County-Ordinance-Code#top>. Accessed June 27, 2018.

## Mineral Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>11. MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Discussion

- a, b) Tuolumne County contains a wide variety of mineral resources. Both the USGS and the California Geological Survey (CGS) have evaluated the potential locations and production capacity of various types of extractive resources throughout the area. No known mineral resource recovery sites have been identified in the immediate project vicinity (USGS, 2017). Additionally, policy 4.E.1 of the Conservation Element of the Tuolumne County General Plan directs the County to protect lands classified as significant Mineral Resource Zone-2 (MRZ-2) by the State Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, and meeting the criteria established in the General Plan for Mineral Preserve Zone (-MPZ) overlay, from conflicts, such as incompatible development on surrounding land, which might prevent future mining activities. The State of California Division of Mines and Geology surveyed Tuolumne County for the presence of economically important mineral resources. The project site does not contain areas classified as MRZ-2. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or affect a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, resulting in **no impact** to mineral resources.

## References

- United States Geological Survey (USGS), 2017. Mineral Resources Online Spatial Data. Available: <http://mrdata.usgs.gov/mineral-resources/mrds-us.html>. Accessed June 28, 2018.

## Noise

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>12. NOISE — Would the project result in:</b>				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

### ***Acoustics Fundamentals and Terminology***

Sound is mechanical energy transmitted by pressure waves through a medium such as air. Noise is defined as unwanted sound. Sound is characterized by various parameters that include the rate of oscillation of sound waves (frequency), the speed of propagation, and the pressure level or energy content (amplitude). Sound pressure level is measured in decibels (dB), with zero dB corresponding roughly to the threshold of human hearing, and 120 dB to 140 dB corresponding to the threshold of pain. Typically, sound does not consist of a single frequency, but rather a broad band of frequencies varying in levels of magnitude. Given that the typical human ear is not equally sensitive to all frequencies of the audible sound spectrum, when assessing potential noise impacts, sound is measured using an electronic filter that de-emphasizes low and extremely high frequencies, referred to as A-weighting, and is expressed in units of A-weighted decibels (dBA).<sup>2</sup>

### ***Noise Exposure and Community Noise***

Noise levels rarely persist consistently over a long period of time. Rather, noise levels at any one location vary with time. Specifically, community noise is the result of many distant noise sources that constitute a relatively stable background noise exposure where the individual contributors are unidentifiable. Throughout the day, short duration single-event noise sources (e.g., aircraft flyovers, motor vehicles, sirens) that are readily identifiable to the individual add to the existing background noise level. The combination of the slowly changing background noise and the single-event noise events give rise to a constantly changing community noise environment.

<sup>2</sup> All noise levels reported herein reflect A-weighted decibels unless otherwise stated.

To legitimately characterize a community noise environment and evaluate cumulative noise impacts, community noise levels must be measured over an extended period of time. This time-varying characteristic of environmental noise is described using statistical noise descriptors, including the ones described below:

$L_{eq}$ : The equivalent sound level is used to describe noise over a specified period of time, typically one hour, in terms of a single numerical value. The  $L_{eq}$  is the constant sound level that would contain the same acoustic energy as the varying sound level, during the same time period (i.e., the average noise exposure level for the given time period).

$L_{max}$ : The instantaneous maximum noise level measured during the measurement period of interest.

DNL: The day-night average sound level (DNL) is the energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period, accounting for the greater sensitivity of most people to nighttime noise by weighting (“penalizing”) nighttime noise levels by adding 10 dBA to noise between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

CNEL: Similar to the DNL, the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) adds a 5-dBA “penalty” for the evening hours between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. in addition to the 10-dBA penalty between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

In general, the more a new noise exceeds the previously existing ambient noise level, the less acceptable the new noise would be judged by those hearing it. With regard to increases in A-weighted noise level, the following relationships occur:

- except in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, a change of 1 dBA cannot be perceived;
- outside of the laboratory, a 3-dBA change is considered a just-perceivable difference;
- a change in level of at least 5 dBA is required before any noticeable change in human response would be expected; and
- a 10-dBA change is subjectively heard as approximately a doubling in loudness, and can cause adverse response.

These relationships occur in part because of the logarithmic nature of the decibel system. Because the decibel scale is based on logarithms, two noise sources do not combine in a simple additive fashion, but rather logarithmically. For example, if two identical noise sources produce noise levels of 50 dBA, the combined sound level would be 53 dBA, not 100 dBA.

The noise environment surrounding the project site is influenced by vehicle traffic along SR 120. The ambient noise environment at the project site was estimated using the traffic noise model of the Federal Highway Administration and highway volumes published by Caltrans. Based on an estimated setback of approximately 1,000 feet from SR 120, noise at the project site would be approximately 44 dBA during peak traffic hours (U.S. Department of Transportation, 2018). This is a conservative estimate which does not account for intervening topography and trees.

## Sensitive Receptors

Noise concerns are described in terms of sensitive receptors, or noise sensitive land uses within hearing range of the activity. Noise sensitive receptors include areas where an excessive amount of noise would interfere with normal activities. For this assessment, noise sensitive receptors would include residential uses, public and private educational facilities, hospitals, convalescent homes, and daycare facilities. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project is a residence located approximately 1,300 feet southeast and downhill of the nearest project facilities.

## Discussion

- a) Tuolumne County does not have a noise ordinance in its County Code (Tuolumne County, 2018). However, the County does have a noise element in its General Plan. The General Plan establishes a maximum allowable exterior noise level from transportation sources of 60 dBA Ldn and an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn for land uses where people sleep (e.g., residential, lodging). Given that the worst case estimated noise level for the project site is 44 dBA during the peak traffic hour on SR 120 (U.S. Department of Transportation, 2018), proposed campsite lodging would be consistent with the noise levels standards established in the General Plan and the impact would be **less than significant**.

Operation of Yosemite Under Canvas will result in minor increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity due to activities such as outdoor dining, community campfire events, and vehicle movement. Operation of the camp would not include activities producing amplified sound or other significant noise producing sources, and as such, would not adversely affect the surrounding environment. In addition, the camp will impose quiet hours from 9PM to 6AM. The nearest residence is approximately 1,300 feet southeast of the nearest project facilities; at this distance, operation of the camp is not expected to produce noise impacts to this residence. Operational impacts to the noise environment would be **less than significant**.

- b) Ground-borne vibration from construction activities at the project site would produce vibration. Typical reference vibration levels for various pieces of equipment, including drilling, are listed below in **Table NOI-1**. The nearest building is a Caltrans snow plow garage approximately 1,250 feet from potential construction areas and would not experience significant vibration resulting in building damage (exceeding 0.2 peak particle velocity (PPV)) or human annoyance (exceeding 0.04 PPV) at the nearest receptor. The nearest residential receptor is approximately 1,300 feet away and at this distance would be unaffected by construction related vibration. This would be a **less-than-significant** impact.

**TABLE NOI-1**  
**VIBRATION VELOCITIES FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT**

Equipment/Activity	PPV at 25 ft (inches/second) <sup>a</sup>	PPV at nearest building (1,250 feet)	FTA Structural Damage Criterion in PPV	Caltrans Annoyance Criterion
Large Bulldozer	0.089	0.001	0.5	0.04
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.001	0.5	0.04

SOURCE: ESA, 2018; Federal Transit Administration, 2006a.

- c) The proposed project would contribute to increased traffic volumes on local roadways. Noise level projections were made using traffic data and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Noise Prediction Model. The model is based on reference noise factors for automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks, with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The traffic analysis indicates that the project would generate 25 additional vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour and 25 additional vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour. For the modeling effort, a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic volumes during weekdays were analyzed.

The results of the modeling effort are shown in **Table NOI-2** for the baseline (2018) and baseline plus project scenarios. Modeled existing noise levels shown in Table NOI-2 correspond to a distance of 100 feet from the centerline of SR 120. As can be seen from Table NOI-2, the proposed project would increase existing local roadway noise levels by 0.1 dBA which is a nominal increase and undetectable by the human ear. Therefore, the project would have a **less-than-significant** roadway noise impact.

**TABLE NOI-2**  
**TRAFFIC NOISE INCREASES IN THE PROJECT AREA<sup>A</sup>**

Road Segment	Baseline Traffic Noise	Baseline Plus Project	Project Increase
Highway 120 AM Peak Hour	63.8	63.9	0.1

NOTE:

<sup>a</sup> These listed values represent the modeled existing noise levels from mobile sources along specified roadways and are based on traffic data from Caltrans and the Transportation Section. Road center to receptor distance is assumed to be 30 meters (approximately 10 feet). Vehicle mix on these road segments is assumed to be 95 percent auto, 2.5 percent medium trucks, and 2.5 percent heavy truck based on Caltrans estimates. The speed for the roadway is assumed to be 55 miles per hour.

SOURCE: ESA, 2018.

- d) Temporary noise increases would occur from off-road equipment operation for excavation and grading for the proposed campground and septic system as well as concrete for building pads (buildings would be pre-constructed off-site). As discussed above Tuolumne County does not have a noise ordinance that addresses construction noise, nor is construction noise specifically addressed in the Noise Element of the County's General Plan.

Construction of the proposed project would generate temporary and intermittent noise at and near the project site. Noise levels would fluctuate depending on the particular type, number, and duration of use of various pieces of construction equipment. Typical noise levels generated by the construction activities that would be required for construction of the proposed project are shown in **Table NOI-3**. The noisiest construction activity would be expected to range from 77 dBA to 85 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The nearest sensitive land uses would be over 1,000 feet away and noise levels from each piece of equipment would be reduced to 48 dBA to 55 dBA at this distance. These noise levels would be below the County's 60 dBA exterior noise exposure standards if they were to apply to construction equipment.

**TABLE NOI-3  
TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NOISE LEVELS**

Construction Phase	Average Noise Level (dBA, Leq at 50 feet)	Average Noise Level (dBA, Leq at 1,000 feet)
Backhoe	78	48
Grader	85	55
Loader	79	49
Paver	77	48
Excavator	81	51

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Transportation, 2006b.

In order to minimize these potential impacts, the noise levels generated by the project will be restricted at the receiving property line as directed by the General Plan. These noise levels will be monitored through complaints received regarding any violations and will be investigated and resolved through established code compliance procedures. Additionally, the hours of construction will be limited to only allow construction from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Exterior construction shall be prohibited on Sunday and County Holidays.

The implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** and **Mitigation Measure NOI-2** would bring the impact of temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project to a **less-than-significant** level.

- e, f) The nearest airport to the project site is Pine Mountain Lake Airport, approximately 12 miles to the northwest. “Noise Sensitive Areas” of the airport have been established by the County and are over 10 miles from the project site. The nearest private airstrip to the project site is the Hermitage Landing Strip, approximately 12 miles to the northwest. Consequently, the proposed project would have **no impact** with respect to exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in the vicinity of an airport or private airstrip.

## Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1:** The noise levels generated by activities on the project site must adhere to the following General Plan exterior noise limits as measured at the property lines:

Zoning Classification of Receiving Property	Noise Level (dB) of Sound Source	
	Daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.)	Nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.)
MU, R-3, R-2, R-1, RE-1, RE-2, RE-3, RE-5, RE-10, C-O, C-1, C-S, BP	50 L <sub>eq</sub> . (1 hour)	45 L <sub>eq</sub> . (1 hour)

**Mitigation Measure NOI-2:** Hours of exterior construction on the project site shall be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Exterior construction shall be prohibited on Sunday and County Holidays.

## References

- Tuolumne County, 2018. Website FAQ. Available:  
<https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/faq.aspx?qid=164>. Accessed July 18, 2018.
- U.S. Department of Transportation, 2006a. Federal Highway Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. April 2006.
- U.S. Department of Transportation, 2006b. Federal Highway Administration. FHWA Roadway Noise Construction Model. August 2006.
- U.S. Department of Transportation, 2018. Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning. Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5.
-

## Population and Housing

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:</b>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- a) The project proposes to develop 99 luxury campsites and associated infrastructure and does not include a residential component intended for permanent occupation. Although tourist use will increase, operation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. The proposed project would provide temporary employment for several people during construction, and up to 40 seasonal employees during operation of the campground. The proposed project would not result in the permanent creation of a significant number of new jobs that would induce substantial population growth. The utilities and services associated with the project will only serve on-site uses and will not be available to other development in the area. Additionally, the proposed project would not indirectly result in supporting population growth. The project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on population growth.
- b) The proposed project would be constructed on undeveloped land and would not displace any housing. Accordingly, replacement housing would not be required. There is **no impact**.
- c) The project proposes to develop 99 luxury campsites and is anticipated to attract recreational visitors to the area. The campsite could employ as many as 40 full time workers. Workers employed for the proposed project are expected to come from the local work force. The proposed project would not result in the displacement of any existing housing. Accordingly, the proposed project would have **no impact** relating to the displacement of people and replacement housing would not be necessary.

## Public Services

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14. PUBLIC SERVICES — Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Fire protection is provided to the project site by the Tuolumne County Fire Department (TCFD), a cooperative fire department with CAL FIRE. TCFD and CAL FIRE, along with eight fire districts, provide life and property emergency response within the county. Groveland Station 78 is the nearest fire station, located at 18930 Main Street in Groveland, approximately 15 miles to the west of the project site (Tuolumne County, 2018a).

The Tuolumne County Sheriff's Department (TCSD) provides law enforcement services in Tuolumne County, including the project site. The nearest station to the site is located at N. 28 Lower Sunset Drive in Sonora, approximately 25 miles northwest of the project site (Tuolumne County, 2018b).

The project site is located within the Big Oak Flat-Groveland Unified School District (TCSS, 2018).

## Discussion

- a.i) The Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau of the Tuolumne County Fire Department has reviewed the proposed project and provided recommendations and conditions for the proposed project to ensure consistency with the National Fire Code, California Fire Code, California Building Code, the Tuolumne County General Plan and Ordinance Code. Application and enforcement of the above-mentioned code requirements would reduce impacts related to fire hazard and fire protection. As discussed in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials Section, construction activities, which include the use of spark-producing equipment, could present a significant risk to igniting wildfires. Similarly, operation of the proposed project would incorporate fire pits and wood burning stoves, which are a potential source of wildfire ignition. Therefore, the short-term impact associated with wildland fire potential and behavior could result in a significant impact to

- fire protection services. However, implementation of **Mitigation Measure HM-1** would reduce the potential for wildfire associated with construction of the proposed project to a less-than-significant impact through active management of surrounding landscaping and brush. Impacts resulting from operation of the proposed project would be reduced with incorporation of fire protection features described in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials Section as well as **Mitigation Measure HM-2**. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact, with mitigation incorporated, on fire protection services.
- a.ii) Construction of the proposed project may result in accidents or emergency incidents that would require police services; however, construction activities would be short-term and limited in scope. Operation of the proposed project may result in accidents or emergency incidents requiring police services; however, these are expected to be infrequent and minor in nature. The TCSD provides law enforcement for all unincorporated areas of Tuolumne County, including the project site. The TCSD was notified of the proposed project for review, but no comments were received. The proposed project is expected to have a **less-than-significant** impact on police protection.
- a.iii-v) The proposed project would develop luxury campsites and associated infrastructure and would not generate any additional demand for schools, parks, or other public facilities because no permanent residential population would be created. The proposed project will not generate any additional residential population that will increase demand on other public services in the project area. There is **no impact**.

## References

- Tuolumne County, 2018a. Fire Department. Available: <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/717/Fire-Department>. Accessed June 28, 2018.
- Tuolumne County, 2018b. Sheriff's Office. Available: <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/341/Sheriffs-Office>. Accessed June 28, 2018.
- Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools (TCSS), 2018. Tuolumne County School and District Boundaries. Available: <https://www.tcsos.us/tuolumne-county-schools-and-district-boundaries/>. Accessed June 28, 2018.
-

## Recreation

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>15. RECREATION:</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Tuolumne County and the project vicinity are primarily rural. Existing recreation in the vicinity of the project site includes Yosemite National Park, the Stanislaus National Forest as well as recreational facilities operated by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the State of California. The proposed project would develop 99 luxury camp sites to facilitate expanded recreational opportunities in the region. Following construction, the campsites and associated facilities will be open to the public to provide additional recreation for County residents and the area's tourist population.

## Discussion

- a) The proposed project would increase the area's tourist population and number of visitors at Yosemite National Park, the Stanislaus National Forest, and associated facilities. However, the proposed project has been designed to provide visitors with recreational opportunities within the designated campground areas. The proposed project will provide facilities to enhance the area as well as increase the number of visitors, and would not significantly increase the usage or the physical deterioration of surrounding recreational areas or facilities. The proposed project is intended to accommodate visitors and tourists that are already in the project vicinity. Accordingly, impacts would be **less than significant**.
- b) On-site recreation facilities proposed by the project include 99 luxury camp sites and associated facilities. No additional off-site parks or recreational improvements are proposed or required as part of the proposed project. Construction and operation of the proposed recreational features would have a physical effect on the environment, which are analyzed throughout this Initial Study Checklist. Furthermore, mitigation measures have been included to reduce all identified significant impacts to **less-than-significant** levels. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

## Transportation and Traffic

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC —</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

As discussed in the Project Description, the proposed project would include construction of a new 24-foot-wide, two-way gravel road (Under Canvas Way); a 12-foot-wide, one-way loop gravel road (cart path); two 24-foot-wide, two-lane bridges along the access road (Under Canvas Way); bus stops/pullouts on Hardin Flat Road; and approximately 130 parking spaces. The new two-lane, 24-foot wide bridges would be designed for HS-20 loading and would be based on American Association of State Highway and Transportation’s (AASHTO) low-volume bridge traffic standards.

Under Canvas Way would connect with Hardin Flat Road near its western terminus at SR 120, which is also known as Big Oak Flat Road in the vicinity of the project site. Project traffic would access the project site by way of the one-way stop-controlled intersection of SR 120/Hardin Flat Road. SR 120 is a two-lane rural expressway that serves as the primary recreational route for tourists visiting Yosemite National Park. SR 120 in the vicinity of the project site is classified as an Other Principal Arterial, and is a High Emphasis interregional roadway. Although the highway allows for bicycle use, bike and pedestrian facilities are not provided, nor planned for, on this highway segment (Caltrans, 2011). The average annual daily traffic (AADT) on SR 120 in the vicinity of the project site is approximately 3,900 vehicles (Caltrans, 2017).

Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS) offers a public shuttle during the summer months (seven days a week from May through September) on SR 120 and makes stops in Buck Meadows, Groveland, and Sonora. The nearest stop to the project site is approximately 1.5 miles east at the Yosemite Lakes Campgrounds at Yosemite Lakes Drive (Yarts, 2018). Bus stops for YARTS are proposed on each side of Hardin Flat Road at the entrance to the Yosemite Under Canvas facility. These stops will provide Yosemite Under Canvas guests with the option to use the regional public transit system to access Yosemite National Park and other regional destinations.

During construction of the proposed project, trucks would access the site daily. Based on trip generation data for similar Under Canvas facilities that are already operational, the project Applicant estimates that the proposed project would generate approximately 135 round trips per day (including guests, employees, and deliveries) once operational. The presence of the YARTS bus stops at the entrance to the Yosemite Under Canvas facility has the potential to reduce daily trip generation.

Peak period traffic would typically be between 7:30 and 10:30am and 5:00 and 10:00pm. During these periods there could be up to 25 vehicles per hour leaving in the morning and up to 25 vehicles per hour arriving in the evening.

For a Traffic Study to be required, the project must generate more than 500 vehicle trips per day or 50 vehicle trips at peak times (Tuolumne County, 2013). Therefore, a traffic study was not required for the proposed project.<sup>3</sup> As such, the discussion of potential transportation and traffic impacts provided below is largely qualitative.

## Discussion

- a) The proposed project would not increase the number of travel lanes on SR 120 or Hardin Flat Road, and would not result in a substantial long-term increase in traffic levels. The proposed project would not conflict with any plan or policy established for measuring the performance of the circulation system. Additionally, the proposed project would not result in impacts to level of service (LOS) along SR 120 or Hardin Flat Road.<sup>4</sup> SR 120 in the vicinity of the proposed project currently operates at LOS C (Caltrans, 2011). As noted above, the proposed project trips would generate a total of approximately 135 vehicle trips per day. These project-generated vehicle trips would represent about three percent of traffic volumes on SR 120, which is within the range of typical daily variation in traffic levels (usually on the order of  $\pm$  five percent) that might be expected on these facilities, such that roadway operating conditions would remain substantially similar to current conditions and the LOS would not deteriorate.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Caltrans threshold for a facility operating at LOS C or D, such as SR 120, is 50-100 peak hour trips (Caltrans, 2002).

<sup>4</sup> LOS is a qualitative measure of traffic operating conditions. LOS A through F are assigned to an intersection or roadway segment, with LOS A indicating very good operations with little congestion and LOS F indicating poor operations with heavy congestion.

Compliance with Tuolumne County Ordinance Code, State regulations, and conditions of approval would result in the project having **less-than-significant** impacts. The Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors has determined that projects may contribute cumulatively to the significant adverse impacts on the County's circulation system. As a condition of approval for the project, the project proponent shall pay an appropriate Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee (TIMF) during the construction process of new development resulting from approval of the project. TIMFs will be determined as permit applications are received. TIMFs will be calculated using the recreational project type rate. The recreational project type TIMF rate is currently \$1,519 per parking space (Tuolumne County, 2018). Because the Yosemite Under Canvas camp would not be open every day of the year, the TIMF would be prorated for the number of days a year Yosemite Under Canvas would be open. The project will be conditioned to pay all applicable TIMFs prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy from the Building and Safety Division of the Community Resource Agency to reduce the traffic and circulation and impacts associated with the project. The payment of TIMFs and the moderate increase in the use of vehicles on the roads would result in a less-than-significant impact on traffic and LOS on SR 120. Because the payment of applicable TIMF would reduce the proposed project impacts to a **less-than-significant** level, no additional mitigation measures are necessary.

- b) The proposed project would maintain traffic on existing roadways throughout construction. There would be a temporary increase in traffic volumes during construction and operation of the project, but such levels are not expected to conflict with any congestion management programs. The proposed project would maintain traffic access on Hardin Flat Road throughout construction, and would generate only a temporary increase in traffic volumes. While impacts to area congestion could occur during construction, these impacts would be minor because access would be maintained and the construction traffic volume would be small. The project would not create a conflict with adopted alternative transportation policies, plans, or programs adopted by Tuolumne County. Since there are no known significant impacts on transportation and traffic, the project will not require mitigation measures, and would have a **less-than-significant** impact on area congestion.
- c) The nearest public airport is the Pine Mountain Lake Airport, located approximately 12 miles northwest of the project site in Groveland. The project is not located within any airport influence area as identified by the Tuolumne County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Tuolumne County, 2003). The project proposes only vehicular access to the site. Therefore, there would be **no impact** resulting in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.
- d) The proposed project would not involve redesign or reconfiguration of existing roadways, and there would be no incompatible types of vehicles introduced. In addition, the project would not result in the introduction of any obstacles to nor would it otherwise impede pedestrian and bicycle movements in the area. The new roadway, cart path, and bridge would be designed to avoid potential hazards. The new YARTS bus stops/pullouts on Hardin Flat Road at the entrance to the Yosemite Under Canvas facility would be designed

- according to the specifications provided by the Tuolumne County Transportation Council, which would avoid any potential hazards to roadway users.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.
- e) As described above, the proposed project would not alter the physical configuration of the existing roadway network serving the area, and would have no effect on access to local streets or adjacent uses (including access for emergency vehicles). Internal roadways (i.e., Under Canvas Way and the bridges) would be 24-foot-wide, which meets CAL FIRE requirements for vehicle access. Furthermore, as noted above under impact discussion a), increased project-related operational traffic would not cause a significant increase in congestion and would not significantly affect the existing LOS on area roads. Although some campsites would not be immediately adjacent to Under Canvas Way, all Under Canvas staff will be trained in emergency procedures for inclement weather (severe storms) and fire hazards, and as first responders for medical emergencies to guests. Therefore, emergency responders will have access to each site. The impact to emergency vehicle access would be **less than significant**.
- f) The Circulation Element of the Tuolumne County General Plan has numerous policies and implementation programs regarding alternative transportation (non-motorized transportation, public transportation, and rail). These programs are geared towards improvements to facilitate movement to and from urban and high density areas. Due to the location and nature of this project, these programs are not applicable. However, the project would include new bus stops/pull outs on each side of Hardin Flat Road at the entrance to the Yosemite Under Canvas facility, to be served by YARTS. The bus stops would be designed to accommodate a 45-foot YARTS coach and would provide guests with the option to use the regional public transit system to access Yosemite National Park and other regional destinations. It is unlikely that development of the Under Canvas site would result in a significant increase of ridership on the YARTS shuttle that could not be accommodated by existing service. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant** on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation for the proposed project.

## References

- Caltrans Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 2002. Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies. December 2002.
- Caltrans, 2011. Transportation Concept Route State Route 120. Caltrans Department of Transportation, District 10 Office of System Planning and Goods Movement. January 2011.
- Caltrans, 2017. 2016 Traffic Volumes on California State Highways. Caltrans Department of Transportation, Division of Traffic Operations. 2017.

<sup>5</sup> Correspondence from the Tuolumne County Transportation Council to the Tuolumne County Community Resources Agency, dated November 5, 2018.

Tuolumne County, 2003. Tuolumne County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Tuolumne County, California. Adopted by Tuolumne County Airport Land Use Commission. January 22, 2003. Prepared by: Shutt Moen Associates.

Tuolumne County, 2013. Tuolumne County General Plan and Regional Transportation Plan Evaluation and Analysis. Prepared for County of Tuolumne. Submitted by Rincon Consultants, Inc. July 2013.

Tuolumne County, 2018. Chapter 3.54 Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees. Accessed July 23, 2018.

Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS), 2018. YARTS Public Transit to Yosemite. Sonora, Groveland, Yosemite Valley Highway 120 Bus Schedule. Available: <https://yarts.com/routes-and-schedules/sonora-buck-meadows-yosemite-valley/>. Accessed July 23, 2018.

---

## Utilities and Service Systems

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS —</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Water quality within Tuolumne County is regulated by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board's Central Valley Region 5. As discussed in the Project Description, an on-site well would provide potable water and fire protection for the campground. Yosemite Under Canvas plans to implement water efficient fixtures and washing machines, and follow efficient water use practices for applicable operations and maintenance. Wastewater will be treated on-site through the use of a septic tank for storage and settling and a leach field for disposal. The Moore Bros Scavenger Co., Inc. provides solid waste service for southern Tuolumne County, including the project site (Tuolumne County, 2018). Electricity would be provided by Pacific Gas and Electric, with various propane/gas providers also serving the area.

## Discussion

- a) The proposed project would develop a campground on a currently vacant site; therefore, all wastewater generated by the project is expected to be domestic sewage. Additionally, the proposed project will comply with all the wastewater requirements of the CVRWQCB (refer to the Hydrology and Water Quality section for more information); therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.
- b, d) The proposed project would provide potable water from a certified source in compliance with California Department of Environment and Natural Resources standards from a

proposed on-site well. The proposed on-site well would be developed to supply an average demand of 8.050 gpd. The proposed groundwater source well will be developed to supply 20 to 30 gallons per minute (gpm). Potable water supplied from the on-site well would be stored in water storage cisterns on the project site and be distributed via small diameter distribution lines.

Wastewater will be treated on-site through the use of a septic tank for storage and settling and a leach field for disposal. A sewer main will be installed to collect the effluent and transport it to the septic tank for settling. The settled effluent will then be pressure dosed to a leach field with sand trenches for disposal. The water treatment system capacity has been preliminarily designed to utilize two disposal areas located where there may be acceptable soils and to allow for gravity wastewater collection and disposal.

Development of the water and wastewater infrastructure would result in impacts to the project site. However, these impacts are considered as part of the project's construction and operation, and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study. In instances where significant impacts have been identified, mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

- c) As described in Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3, a Drainage Plan for the site shall be prepared that specifies how runoff on the site will be managed in order to protect water quality and surrounding property. The plans will be developed with detailed runoff calculations to appropriately size culverts, bridges, retention ponds/areas, and road side ditches to meet the drainage requirements of the project site. The purpose of the plan will be to prevent the creation of localized on- or off-site flooding and to prevent any negative water quality effects off-site. As envisioned, stormwater would be collected through grass buffers and detention ponds, where it would settle, then be metered out to the groundwater of the on-site ephemeral drainages. Construction and operation of stormwater treatment areas would result in impacts to the project site. However, these impacts are considered as part of the proposed project and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study. In instances where significant impacts have been identified for the project, mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. This impact is considered **less than significant**.
- e) The project site would be served by private water and septic systems; therefore, approval of the proposed project would result in **no impact** related to a wastewater treatment provider's capacity to serve the project.
- f) Project construction would generate solid waste from excavation activities, roadway materials, and general waste. All solid waste collected at the project site would be brought to transfer stations in Groveland or East Sonora, before being transferred by Cal Sierra Disposal to the Highway 59 Disposal Site, located at 7040 N. Highway 59 in Merced (Tuolumne County, 2018). The Highway 59 Disposal Site is well below its maximum permitted capacity of 30,012,352 cubic yards, with 28,025,334 cubic yards remaining capacity (Cal Recycle, 2018a). Construction waste generated by the project is not

anticipated to cause the disposal site to exceed its maximum permitted disposal volume as no structures would be demolished. Additionally, the Highway 59 Disposal Site is not expected to reach its total maximum permitted disposal capacity during the project's construction period. Therefore, the Highway 59 Disposal Site will have sufficient capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the project.

Based on a waste generation factor of 0.001 tons per room per day, as documented by the Cal Recycle website, the project's proposed 99 tents would generate approximately 0.099 tons per day, or 36 tons per year (CalRecycle, 2018b). The Highway 59 Disposal Site has a permitted disposal capacity of 1,500 tons per day and is estimated to reach capacity in 2030. During operation, solid waste generated from the project would represent less than 0.007 percent of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the Highway 59 Disposal Site. The proposed project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day, as compared to the permitted daily capacity at the Highway 59 Disposal Site; therefore, the landfill will have sufficient capacity to accept solid waste generated by the project and impacts would be **less than significant**.

- g) Construction and operation of the proposed project would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

## References

- CalRecycle, 2018a. SWIS Facility Detail – Highway 59 Disposal Site. Available: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/swfacilities/Directory/24-AA-0001/>. Accessed September 13, 2018.
- CalRecycle, 2018b. Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates. Available: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastecharacterization/general/rates>. Accessed September 13, 2018.
- Tuolumne County, 2018. General Plan Update Draft EIR. Available: <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/889/General-Plan-Update>. Accessed September 13, 2018.

## Mandatory Findings of Significance

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE —</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- a) Per the impact discussions above, the potential of the proposed project to substantially degrade the environment is **less than significant** with incorporated mitigation measures. As described in this Initial Study, the proposed project has the potential for impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, and public services. However, these impacts would be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of avoidance and mitigation measures discussed in each section.
- b) The past, present and reasonably foreseeable future conditions of the project site and vicinity were considered for the cumulative analysis. A specific project in the vicinity which was considered is the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite project, located directly north of the proposed project across State Highway 120. Tuolumne County received an application to allow the development of the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite project, which includes a master planned lodging development with 140 guest rooms, 25 four-bedroom cabins, a market, a lodge, an event space and support buildings.

Aesthetics. The proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts as it would be screened by existing trees from motorists along Highway 120.

Agricultural and Forest Resources. Both the proposed project and the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite project would include development on land zoned Commercial Recreation (C-K). While both projects are located in a forested area they represent a very small fraction of the forested land in the vicinity. The proposed project would remove the fewest trees

possible and is not anticipated to result in the conversion of any off-site forest land to non-forest use. As such cumulative impacts to forest resources would be less than significant.

**Air Quality and GHG Emissions.** For cumulative impacts to air quality and GHG emissions see the Air Quality and GHG Emissions sections above. The thresholds used consider the contribution of other projects within the air basin. Additionally, GHG Emissions are considered cumulative in nature because it is unlikely that a single project would contribute significantly to climate change.

**Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils/Seismicity, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Public Services.** The project's impacts for these environmental issues would be limited to the project site and thus would not contribute to cumulative impacts.

**Hydrology and Water Quality.** Both the proposed project and the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite project would be required to develop plans to address stormwater during construction and operation. With this requirement, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

**Land Use and Land Use Planning.** The proposed project is an allowable use under the existing zoning and would not contribute to cumulative land use issues.

**Mineral Resources.** The project would have no impact to mineral resources and thus does not contribute to cumulative impacts.

**Noise.** The project's noise impacts are anticipated to be minor and the project will comply with the noise standards in the Noise Element of the General Plan. As such, cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant.

**Population and Housing.** Although tourist use will increase, operation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. The proposed project would provide temporary employment for several people during construction, and up to 40 seasonal employees during operation of the campground. The proposed project would not result in the permanent creation of a significant number of new jobs that would induce substantial population growth. Therefore, cumulative population and housing impacts would be less than significant.

**Recreation.** The proposed project would increase the area's tourist population and number of visitors at Yosemite National Park, the Stanislaus National Forest, and associated facilities. However, the proposed project has been designed to provide visitors with recreational opportunities within the designated campground areas. The proposed project will provide facilities to enhance the area as well as increase the number of visitors, and would not significantly increase the usage or the physical deterioration of surrounding recreational areas or facilities. The proposed project is intended to accommodate visitors and tourists that are already in the project vicinity. Accordingly, cumulative impacts to recreation would be less than significant.

Transportation and Traffic. For cumulative impacts see the Transportation and Traffic section above. A traffic impact mitigation fee program has been developed to address cumulative traffic impacts within Tuolumne County.

Utilities and Service Systems. The project site would be served by private water and septic systems, and would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day. Stormwater would be treated on-site. Therefore, cumulative impacts to utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

As described above, the impacts of the proposed project are minimal, site specific, and/or mitigated to a less-than-significant level. None of the impacts would be cumulatively considerable. The cumulative impact of the proposed project is **less than significant**.

- c) The proposed project will not result in any substantial adverse effects to human beings, either directly or indirectly, since each potentially significant impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of the mitigation measures provided in this document. No other substantial adverse effects to human beings are anticipated as a result of this project, resulting in a **less-than-significant** impact.
-

# Appendix A

## **Project Design**



**Project Narrative:**

- Trash:** Under Canvas will utilize dumpsters on the property, which will be located near the entrance of the property. These will be regularly emptied and serviced by a local provider.
- Seasonal:** Under Canvas is a seasonal business operating between March-October. At the end of every season water lines will be blown out and the camp winterized. The lines on the property are all considered private and the company's responsibility from the meter and manhole. Many of the tents may be taken down at the end of the season and put into storage with only some of the larger tents remaining up through the winter. Under Canvas employees will manage and maintain all equipment.
- Road Maintenance:** Roads will be graded annually and further maintenance as needed will be undertaken by Under Canvas to maintain a 20' width. Roads will be compacted and surfaced with crushed gravel. Culverts and weir road crossings will be installed to direct water away from road surfaces and along existing historic drainage paths.
- Emergency Protocol:** All Under Canvas staff will be trained in emergency procedures for inclement weather (severe storms), fire and as first responders for medical emergencies to guests. Emergency responders will have access to each site.
- Water and Sewer:** General all water and sewer lines that are in trails and 12' paths will be buried. Other lines that service tents and facilities may be on or near the surface. The camp will be closed in the winter and all facilities will be winterized. All lines are considered private and are the responsibility of Under Canvas.
- Estimated Traffic Impact:** Peak hour traffic is typically between 7:30 and 10:30am and 5:00 and 10:00pm. During these periods there could be 35 vehicles/hr leaving in the morning and 25 vehicles/hr arriving in the evening. Total round trips per day is estimated at 160 including guests, employees, and deliveries.
- Lighting:** All exterior lighting will be down lighting and comply with dark sky standards.
- Fire Risk and Defensible Space:** Fires are allowed only in the fire pits as shown. Smoking is only allowed in a designated area and no smoking or camp fires are allowed at tent locations. Areas around tents and other facilities will be kept clear of dead wood and vegetation for fuel reduction. General USFS guide lines will be followed for camp ground maintenance regarding fuel reduction. The water supply system will have a hose and yard hydrant at the fire pits and in other areas around the camp for quick response situations.



**SITE STATISTICS:**

TENTS	30,500 SF
AMENITIES	9,000 SF
ACCESS ROADS (20' Surface)	44,000 SF
CART PATHS (12' Width)	26,680 SF
PARKING	20,500 SF
<b>TOTAL CAMP</b>	<b>130,680 SF</b>



**PERCENT OPEN SPACE:**

TOTAL AREA = 79.1 ACRES  
 CAMP AREA = 3.0 ACRES  
 OPEN SPACE = 76.1 ACRES

= (76.1/79.1) X 100 = **96.2%**

**LEGEND**

- PROPERTY LINE
- MAJOR CONTOURS (10' INTERVAL)
- MINOR CONTOURS (2' INTERVAL)
- EPHEMERAL DRAINAGE
- PROPOSED GRAVEL ROADS
- PROPOSED CART PATHS (12' WIDE TYP)
- PROPOSED CULVERTS
- GRAVEL PARKING SPACES (135)
- SAFARI TENTS (22)
- DELUXE TENTS (63)
- SUITE TENTS (14)
- FIRE PIT
- LOBBY TENT
- BATH CABINS



- SITE PLAN NOTES:**
- TENT LOCATIONS, WATER, AND SEWER MAY BE ADJUSTED.
  - PROPOSED DITCHES AND WATERWAYS WILL BE ON FINAL PLANS.
  - NO PAVED AREAS ARE PROPOSED.
  - ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES SHALL BE ADDED ALONG THE ONEWAY ROAD.

File: \\ms\yosemite\UC 6.5\JEREMY\7ACAD2013.DWG, Sheet: C-101-SP, Location: C:\Users\JANDERSON\Documents\ANDERSON ENGINEERING\JANDERSON\PROJECTS\Yosemite\CAD\FROM UNDER CANVAS - Photo: 2/16/2019, Plotted by: JANDERSON

© 2019 ANDERSON ENGINEERING INC., THIS DRAWING AND ASSOCIATED ELECTRONIC FILES ARE THE WORK PRODUCT OF ANDERSON ENGINEERING, INC AND REUSE OF FILES IS BY LIMITED PERMISSION FROM ANDERSON ENGINEERING, INC.

**GL Gritz Engineering**  
 (209) 770-2853 120 Summit  
 Avenue, Sonoma, California 95370

**YOSEMITE UNDER CANVAS  
 TUOLUMNE COUNTY, CA  
 S26, T1S, R18E  
 SITE PLAN**

Date: 01/10/2019 MS  
 Drawn By: WHA  
 Checked By: WHA  
 Revisions: 6.4

**SHEET**

**C-101**

5520 Sourdough Rd., Bozeman, MT 59715  
 Phone: (406) 925-0580



# Appendix B

## **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Modeling**

- B1. CalEEMod Model Output  
for Project Emissions
- B2. CalEEMod Model Output  
for Woodstove Emissions



## B1. CalEEMod Model Output for Project Emissions



Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**Under Canvas Campsite  
Tuolumne County, Annual**

**1.0 Project Characteristics**

**1.1 Land Usage**

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Motel	99.00	Room	3.20	139,352.00	0

**1.2 Other Project Characteristics**

<b>Urbanization</b>	Urban	<b>Wind Speed (m/s)</b>	2.2	<b>Precipitation Freq (Days)</b>	66
<b>Climate Zone</b>	1			<b>Operational Year</b>	2021
<b>Utility Company</b>	Pacific Gas & Electric Company				
<b>CO2 Intensity (lb/MW hr)</b>	290	<b>CH4 Intensity (lb/MW hr)</b>	0.029	<b>N2O Intensity (lb/MW hr)</b>	0.006

**1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data**

Project Characteristics - PG&E EF for 2020

Land Use - Camp is on 80 acres with 96% open space.

Construction Phase -

Vehicle Trips - Adjust trip rates to match Transportation analysis.

Woodstoves -

Area Coating -

Energy Use -

Water And Wastewater - Campsite. No outdoor water use.; all wastewater is septic

## Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	194,059.80	139,352.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	4.46	3.20
tblProjectCharacteristics	CO2IntensityFactor	641.35	290
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	5.63	2.73
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	5.63	2.73
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	5.63	2.73
tblWater	AerobicPercent	87.46	0.00
tblWater	AnaDigestCombDigestGasPercent	100.00	0.00
tblWater	AnaerobicandFacultativeLagoonsPercent	2.21	0.00
tblWater	SepticTankPercent	10.33	100.00

## 2.0 Emissions Summary

---



Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

Quarter	Start Date	End Date	Maximum Unmitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)	Maximum Mitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)
1	1-1-2019	3-31-2019	0.9799	0.9799
2	4-1-2019	6-30-2019	0.9155	0.9155
3	7-1-2019	9-30-2019	0.9255	0.9255
4	10-1-2019	12-31-2019	0.8056	0.8056
5	1-1-2020	3-31-2020	1.5564	1.5564
		Highest	1.5564	1.5564

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.7058	1.0000e-005	9.1000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.7700e-003	1.7700e-003	0.0000	0.0000	1.8900e-003
Energy	0.0156	0.1418	0.1191	8.5000e-004		0.0108	0.0108		0.0108	0.0108	0.0000	291.1251	291.1251	0.0166	5.6600e-003	293.2274
Mobile	0.1638	0.4679	1.6727	2.4900e-003	0.1913	3.4500e-003	0.1948	0.0515	3.2400e-003	0.0547	0.0000	225.7644	225.7644	0.0163	0.0000	226.1719
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	11.0021	0.0000	11.0021	0.6502	0.0000	27.2573
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9160	1.9160	0.5706	1.9700e-003	16.7678
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.8852</b>	<b>0.6097</b>	<b>1.7927</b>	<b>3.3400e-003</b>	<b>0.1913</b>	<b>0.0142</b>	<b>0.2056</b>	<b>0.0515</b>	<b>0.0140</b>	<b>0.0655</b>	<b>11.0021</b>	<b>518.8071</b>	<b>529.8092</b>	<b>1.2537</b>	<b>7.6300e-003</b>	<b>563.4263</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**2.2 Overall Operational**

**Mitigated Operational**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.7058	1.0000e-005	9.1000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.7700e-003	1.7700e-003	0.0000	0.0000	1.8900e-003
Energy	0.0156	0.1418	0.1191	8.5000e-004		0.0108	0.0108		0.0108	0.0108	0.0000	291.1251	291.1251	0.0166	5.6600e-003	293.2274
Mobile	0.1638	0.4679	1.6727	2.4900e-003	0.1913	3.4500e-003	0.1948	0.0515	3.2400e-003	0.0547	0.0000	225.7644	225.7644	0.0163	0.0000	226.1719
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	11.0021	0.0000	11.0021	0.6502	0.0000	27.2573
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9160	1.9160	0.5706	1.9700e-003	16.7678
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.8852</b>	<b>0.6097</b>	<b>1.7927</b>	<b>3.3400e-003</b>	<b>0.1913</b>	<b>0.0142</b>	<b>0.2056</b>	<b>0.0515</b>	<b>0.0140</b>	<b>0.0655</b>	<b>11.0021</b>	<b>518.8071</b>	<b>529.8092</b>	<b>1.2537</b>	<b>7.6300e-003</b>	<b>563.4263</b>

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**3.0 Construction Detail**

**Construction Phase**

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	1/1/2019	1/7/2019	5	5	
2	Grading	Grading	1/8/2019	1/17/2019	5	8	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	1/18/2019	12/5/2019	5	230	
4	Paving	Paving	12/6/2019	12/31/2019	5	18	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	1/1/2020	1/24/2020	5	18	

**Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0**

**Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 4**

**Acres of Paving: 0**

**Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 209,028; Non-Residential Outdoor: 69,676; Striped Parking Area: 0 (Architectural Coating – sqft)**

**OffRoad Equipment**

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Grading	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	6.00	9	0.56
Paving	Pavers	1	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	6.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	6.00	80	0.38
Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48

**Trips and VMT**

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	59.00	23.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	8	20.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	12.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction**

**3.2 Site Preparation - 2019**

**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0452	0.0000	0.0452	0.0248	0.0000	0.0248	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0108	0.1139	0.0552	9.0000e-005		5.9800e-003	5.9800e-003		5.5000e-003	5.5000e-003	0.0000	8.5422	8.5422	2.7000e-003	0.0000	8.6097
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.1139</b>	<b>0.0552</b>	<b>9.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0452</b>	<b>5.9800e-003</b>	<b>0.0512</b>	<b>0.0248</b>	<b>5.5000e-003</b>	<b>0.0303</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>8.5422</b>	<b>8.5422</b>	<b>2.7000e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>8.6097</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.2 Site Preparation - 2019**

**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	4.8000e-004	4.0000e-004	3.7800e-003	0.0000	3.6000e-004	0.0000	3.6000e-004	9.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0000e-004	0.0000	0.3484	0.3484	3.0000e-005	0.0000	0.3492
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.8000e-004</b>	<b>4.0000e-004</b>	<b>3.7800e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>3.6000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>3.6000e-004</b>	<b>9.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.3484</b>	<b>0.3484</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.3492</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0452	0.0000	0.0452	0.0248	0.0000	0.0248	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0108	0.1139	0.0552	9.0000e-005		5.9800e-003	5.9800e-003		5.5000e-003	5.5000e-003	0.0000	8.5422	8.5422	2.7000e-003	0.0000	8.6097
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.1139</b>	<b>0.0552</b>	<b>9.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0452</b>	<b>5.9800e-003</b>	<b>0.0512</b>	<b>0.0248</b>	<b>5.5000e-003</b>	<b>0.0303</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>8.5422</b>	<b>8.5422</b>	<b>2.7000e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>8.6097</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.2 Site Preparation - 2019**

**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	4.8000e-004	4.0000e-004	3.7800e-003	0.0000	3.6000e-004	0.0000	3.6000e-004	9.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0000e-004	0.0000	0.3484	0.3484	3.0000e-005	0.0000	0.3492
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.8000e-004</b>	<b>4.0000e-004</b>	<b>3.7800e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>3.6000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>3.6000e-004</b>	<b>9.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.3484</b>	<b>0.3484</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.3492</b>

**3.3 Grading - 2019**

**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0262	0.0000	0.0262	0.0135	0.0000	0.0135	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0103	0.1134	0.0652	1.2000e-004		5.5900e-003	5.5900e-003		5.1400e-003	5.1400e-003	0.0000	10.6569	10.6569	3.3700e-003	0.0000	10.7412
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0103</b>	<b>0.1134</b>	<b>0.0652</b>	<b>1.2000e-004</b>	<b>0.0262</b>	<b>5.5900e-003</b>	<b>0.0318</b>	<b>0.0135</b>	<b>5.1400e-003</b>	<b>0.0186</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>10.6569</b>	<b>10.6569</b>	<b>3.3700e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>10.7412</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.3 Grading - 2019**

**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	6.4000e-004	5.3000e-004	5.0400e-003	1.0000e-005	4.7000e-004	1.0000e-005	4.8000e-004	1.3000e-004	1.0000e-005	1.3000e-004	0.0000	0.4645	0.4645	5.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4657
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.4000e-004</b>	<b>5.3000e-004</b>	<b>5.0400e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>4.7000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>4.8000e-004</b>	<b>1.3000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.3000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.4645</b>	<b>0.4645</b>	<b>5.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.4657</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0262	0.0000	0.0262	0.0135	0.0000	0.0135	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0103	0.1134	0.0652	1.2000e-004		5.5900e-003	5.5900e-003		5.1400e-003	5.1400e-003	0.0000	10.6569	10.6569	3.3700e-003	0.0000	10.7412
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0103</b>	<b>0.1134</b>	<b>0.0652</b>	<b>1.2000e-004</b>	<b>0.0262</b>	<b>5.5900e-003</b>	<b>0.0318</b>	<b>0.0135</b>	<b>5.1400e-003</b>	<b>0.0186</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>10.6569</b>	<b>10.6569</b>	<b>3.3700e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>10.7412</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.3 Grading - 2019**

**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	6.4000e-004	5.3000e-004	5.0400e-003	1.0000e-005	4.7000e-004	1.0000e-005	4.8000e-004	1.3000e-004	1.0000e-005	1.3000e-004	0.0000	0.4645	0.4645	5.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4657
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.4000e-004</b>	<b>5.3000e-004</b>	<b>5.0400e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>4.7000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>4.8000e-004</b>	<b>1.3000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.3000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.4645</b>	<b>0.4645</b>	<b>5.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.4657</b>

**3.4 Building Construction - 2019**

**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.2715	2.4241	1.9738	3.0900e-003		0.1483	0.1483		0.1395	0.1395	0.0000	270.3698	270.3698	0.0659	0.0000	272.0164
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.2715</b>	<b>2.4241</b>	<b>1.9738</b>	<b>3.0900e-003</b>		<b>0.1483</b>	<b>0.1483</b>		<b>0.1395</b>	<b>0.1395</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>270.3698</b>	<b>270.3698</b>	<b>0.0659</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>272.0164</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.4 Building Construction - 2019**

**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0202	0.4103	0.1608	7.2000e-004	0.0172	3.8600e-003	0.0211	4.9700e-003	3.6900e-003	8.6600e-003	0.0000	68.4948	68.4948	2.7000e-003	0.0000	68.5623
Worker	0.0726	0.0604	0.5705	5.9000e-004	0.0536	6.8000e-004	0.0542	0.0143	6.3000e-004	0.0149	0.0000	52.5266	52.5266	5.2100e-003	0.0000	52.6568
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0928</b>	<b>0.4707</b>	<b>0.7313</b>	<b>1.3100e-003</b>	<b>0.0708</b>	<b>4.5400e-003</b>	<b>0.0753</b>	<b>0.0192</b>	<b>4.3200e-003</b>	<b>0.0235</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>121.0214</b>	<b>121.0214</b>	<b>7.9100e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>121.2192</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.2715	2.4241	1.9738	3.0900e-003		0.1483	0.1483		0.1395	0.1395	0.0000	270.3695	270.3695	0.0659	0.0000	272.0161
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.2715</b>	<b>2.4241</b>	<b>1.9738</b>	<b>3.0900e-003</b>		<b>0.1483</b>	<b>0.1483</b>		<b>0.1395</b>	<b>0.1395</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>270.3695</b>	<b>270.3695</b>	<b>0.0659</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>272.0161</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.4 Building Construction - 2019**

**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0202	0.4103	0.1608	7.2000e-004	0.0172	3.8600e-003	0.0211	4.9700e-003	3.6900e-003	8.6600e-003	0.0000	68.4948	68.4948	2.7000e-003	0.0000	68.5623
Worker	0.0726	0.0604	0.5705	5.9000e-004	0.0536	6.8000e-004	0.0542	0.0143	6.3000e-004	0.0149	0.0000	52.5266	52.5266	5.2100e-003	0.0000	52.6568
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0928</b>	<b>0.4707</b>	<b>0.7313</b>	<b>1.3100e-003</b>	<b>0.0708</b>	<b>4.5400e-003</b>	<b>0.0753</b>	<b>0.0192</b>	<b>4.3200e-003</b>	<b>0.0235</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>121.0214</b>	<b>121.0214</b>	<b>7.9100e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>121.2192</b>

**3.5 Paving - 2019**

**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0114	0.1148	0.1108	1.7000e-004		6.4800e-003	6.4800e-003		5.9700e-003	5.9700e-003	0.0000	15.0501	15.0501	4.6300e-003	0.0000	15.1658
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0114</b>	<b>0.1148</b>	<b>0.1108</b>	<b>1.7000e-004</b>		<b>6.4800e-003</b>	<b>6.4800e-003</b>		<b>5.9700e-003</b>	<b>5.9700e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>15.0501</b>	<b>15.0501</b>	<b>4.6300e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>15.1658</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.5 Paving - 2019**

**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.9300e-003	1.6000e-003	0.0151	2.0000e-005	1.4200e-003	2.0000e-005	1.4400e-003	3.8000e-004	2.0000e-005	3.9000e-004	0.0000	1.3935	1.3935	1.4000e-004	0.0000	1.3969
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.9300e-003</b>	<b>1.6000e-003</b>	<b>0.0151</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.4200e-003</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.4400e-003</b>	<b>3.8000e-004</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>3.9000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.3935</b>	<b>1.3935</b>	<b>1.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.3969</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0114	0.1148	0.1108	1.7000e-004		6.4800e-003	6.4800e-003		5.9700e-003	5.9700e-003	0.0000	15.0501	15.0501	4.6300e-003	0.0000	15.1658
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0114</b>	<b>0.1148</b>	<b>0.1108</b>	<b>1.7000e-004</b>		<b>6.4800e-003</b>	<b>6.4800e-003</b>		<b>5.9700e-003</b>	<b>5.9700e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>15.0501</b>	<b>15.0501</b>	<b>4.6300e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>15.1658</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.5 Paving - 2019**

**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.9300e-003	1.6000e-003	0.0151	2.0000e-005	1.4200e-003	2.0000e-005	1.4400e-003	3.8000e-004	2.0000e-005	3.9000e-004	0.0000	1.3935	1.3935	1.4000e-004	0.0000	1.3969
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.9300e-003</b>	<b>1.6000e-003</b>	<b>0.0151</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.4200e-003</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.4400e-003</b>	<b>3.8000e-004</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>3.9000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.3935</b>	<b>1.3935</b>	<b>1.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.3969</b>

**3.6 Architectural Coating - 2020**

**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	1.6147					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.1800e-003	0.0152	0.0165	3.0000e-005		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003	0.0000	2.2979	2.2979	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.3024
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.6169</b>	<b>0.0152</b>	<b>0.0165</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>		<b>1.0000e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-003</b>		<b>1.0000e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.2979</b>	<b>2.2979</b>	<b>1.8000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.3024</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.6 Architectural Coating - 2020**

**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.0800e-003	8.7000e-004	8.2200e-003	1.0000e-005	8.5000e-004	1.0000e-005	8.6000e-004	2.3000e-004	1.0000e-005	2.4000e-004	0.0000	0.8130	0.8130	7.0000e-005	0.0000	0.8149
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.0800e-003</b>	<b>8.7000e-004</b>	<b>8.2200e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>8.5000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>8.6000e-004</b>	<b>2.3000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>2.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.8130</b>	<b>0.8130</b>	<b>7.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.8149</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	1.6147					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.1800e-003	0.0152	0.0165	3.0000e-005		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003	0.0000	2.2979	2.2979	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.3024
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.6169</b>	<b>0.0152</b>	<b>0.0165</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>		<b>1.0000e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-003</b>		<b>1.0000e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.2979</b>	<b>2.2979</b>	<b>1.8000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.3024</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.6 Architectural Coating - 2020**

**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.0800e-003	8.7000e-004	8.2200e-003	1.0000e-005	8.5000e-004	1.0000e-005	8.6000e-004	2.3000e-004	1.0000e-005	2.4000e-004	0.0000	0.8130	0.8130	7.0000e-005	0.0000	0.8149
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.0800e-003</b>	<b>8.7000e-004</b>	<b>8.2200e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>8.5000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>8.6000e-004</b>	<b>2.3000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>2.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.8130</b>	<b>0.8130</b>	<b>7.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.8149</b>

**4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile**

---

**4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile**

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.1638	0.4679	1.6727	2.4900e-003	0.1913	3.4500e-003	0.1948	0.0515	3.2400e-003	0.0547	0.0000	225.7644	225.7644	0.0163	0.0000	226.1719
Unmitigated	0.1638	0.4679	1.6727	2.4900e-003	0.1913	3.4500e-003	0.1948	0.0515	3.2400e-003	0.0547	0.0000	225.7644	225.7644	0.0163	0.0000	226.1719

4.2 Trip Summary Information

Land Use	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Motel	270.27	270.27	270.27	512,910	512,910
Total	270.27	270.27	270.27	512,910	512,910

4.3 Trip Type Information

Land Use	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Motel	9.50	7.30	7.30	19.00	62.00	19.00	58	38	4

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Motel	0.471330	0.050819	0.207818	0.162046	0.053743	0.008065	0.018819	0.011540	0.003291	0.001284	0.007070	0.001791	0.002386

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Electricity Mitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	136.7464	136.7464	0.0137	2.8300e-003	137.9313
Electricity Unmitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	136.7464	136.7464	0.0137	2.8300e-003	137.9313
NaturalGas Mitigated	0.0156	0.1418	0.1191	8.5000e-004		0.0108	0.0108		0.0108	0.0108	0.0000	154.3787	154.3787	2.9600e-003	2.8300e-003	155.2961
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.0156	0.1418	0.1191	8.5000e-004		0.0108	0.0108		0.0108	0.0108	0.0000	154.3787	154.3787	2.9600e-003	2.8300e-003	155.2961

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Motel	2.89295e+006	0.0156	0.1418	0.1191	8.5000e-004		0.0108	0.0108		0.0108	0.0108	0.0000	154.3787	154.3787	2.9600e-003	2.8300e-003	155.2961
<b>Total</b>		<b>0.0156</b>	<b>0.1418</b>	<b>0.1191</b>	<b>8.5000e-004</b>		<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.0108</b>		<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>154.3787</b>	<b>154.3787</b>	<b>2.9600e-003</b>	<b>2.8300e-003</b>	<b>155.2961</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas**

**Mitigated**

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Motel	2.89295e+006	0.0156	0.1418	0.1191	8.5000e-004		0.0108	0.0108		0.0108	0.0108	0.0000	154.3787	154.3787	2.9600e-003	2.8300e-003	155.2961
<b>Total</b>		<b>0.0156</b>	<b>0.1418</b>	<b>0.1191</b>	<b>8.5000e-004</b>		<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.0108</b>		<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>154.3787</b>	<b>154.3787</b>	<b>2.9600e-003</b>	<b>2.8300e-003</b>	<b>155.2961</b>

**5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity**

**Unmitigated**

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Motel	1.03957e+006	136.7464	0.0137	2.8300e-003	137.9313
<b>Total</b>		<b>136.7464</b>	<b>0.0137</b>	<b>2.8300e-003</b>	<b>137.9313</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity**

**Mitigated**

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Motel	1.03957e+006	136.7464	0.0137	2.8300e-003	137.9313
<b>Total</b>		<b>136.7464</b>	<b>0.0137</b>	<b>2.8300e-003</b>	<b>137.9313</b>

**6.0 Area Detail**

**6.1 Mitigation Measures Area**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.7058	1.0000e-005	9.1000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.7700e-003	1.7700e-003	0.0000	0.0000	1.8900e-003
Unmitigated	0.7058	1.0000e-005	9.1000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.7700e-003	1.7700e-003	0.0000	0.0000	1.8900e-003

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**6.2 Area by SubCategory**

**Unmitigated**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.1615					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.5442					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	9.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	9.1000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.7700e-003	1.7700e-003	0.0000	0.0000	1.8900e-003
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.7058</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>9.1000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.7700e-003</b>	<b>1.7700e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.8900e-003</b>

**Mitigated**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.1615					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.5442					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	9.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	9.1000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.7700e-003	1.7700e-003	0.0000	0.0000	1.8900e-003
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.7058</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>9.1000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.7700e-003</b>	<b>1.7700e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.8900e-003</b>

**7.0 Water Detail**

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**7.1 Mitigation Measures Water**

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	MT/yr			
Mitigated	1.9160	0.5706	1.9700e-003	16.7678
Unmitigated	1.9160	0.5706	1.9700e-003	16.7678

**7.2 Water by Land Use**

**Unmitigated**

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Motel	2.51131 / 0.279034	1.9160	0.5706	1.9700e-003	16.7678
<b>Total</b>		<b>1.9160</b>	<b>0.5706</b>	<b>1.9700e-003</b>	<b>16.7678</b>

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**7.2 Water by Land Use**

**Mitigated**

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Motel	2.51131 / 0.279034	1.9160	0.5706	1.9700e-003	16.7678
<b>Total</b>		<b>1.9160</b>	<b>0.5706</b>	<b>1.9700e-003</b>	<b>16.7678</b>

**8.0 Waste Detail**

---

**8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste**

**Category/Year**

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	MT/yr			
Mitigated	11.0021	0.6502	0.0000	27.2573
Unmitigated	11.0021	0.6502	0.0000	27.2573

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**8.2 Waste by Land Use**

**Unmitigated**

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Motel	54.2	11.0021	0.6502	0.0000	27.2573
<b>Total</b>		<b>11.0021</b>	<b>0.6502</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>27.2573</b>

**Mitigated**

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Motel	54.2	11.0021	0.6502	0.0000	27.2573
<b>Total</b>		<b>11.0021</b>	<b>0.6502</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>27.2573</b>

**9.0 Operational Offroad**

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-----------

Under Canvas Campsite - Tuolumne County, Annual

**10.0 Stationary Equipment**

---

**Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators**

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

**Boilers**

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------

**User Defined Equipment**

Equipment Type	Number
----------------	--------

**11.0 Vegetation**

---



## B2. CalEEMod Model Output for Woodstove Emissions



Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**Under Canvas woodstoves emissions  
Tuolumne County, Annual**

**1.0 Project Characteristics**

**1.1 Land Usage**

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
User Defined Residential	99.00	Dwelling Unit	3.40	0.00	283

**1.2 Other Project Characteristics**

<b>Urbanization</b>	Urban	<b>Wind Speed (m/s)</b>	2.2	<b>Precipitation Freq (Days)</b>	66
<b>Climate Zone</b>	1			<b>Operational Year</b>	2021
<b>Utility Company</b>	Pacific Gas & Electric Company				
<b>CO2 Intensity (lb/MW hr)</b>	641.35	<b>CH4 Intensity (lb/MW hr)</b>	0.029	<b>N2O Intensity (lb/MW hr)</b>	0.006

**1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data**

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - Avreage adjusted to match project.

Construction Phase - This run for woodstove emissions only. No construction.

Off-road Equipment - Woodstoves only.

Trips and VMT - Woodstoves only.

Woodstoves - Per PD, wood burning or pellet stoves.

Water And Wastewater -

## Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	1.00
tblFireplaces	NumberGas	54.45	0.00
tblFireplaces	NumberWood	34.65	0.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	0.00	3.40
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	4.00	0.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberCatalytic	4.95	50.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberNoncatalytic	4.95	0.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberPellet	0.00	49.00

## 2.0 Emissions Summary

---



Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

Quarter	Start Date	End Date	Maximum Unmitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)	Maximum Mitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)
		Highest		

**2.2 Overall Operational**

**Unmitigated Operational**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	1.1432	0.5944	6.1340	0.0299		0.9293	0.9293		0.9293	0.9293	200.1148	1.2008	201.3155	0.9352	0.0000	224.6944
Energy	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Mobile	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.1432</b>	<b>0.5944</b>	<b>6.1340</b>	<b>0.0299</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>200.1148</b>	<b>1.2008</b>	<b>201.3155</b>	<b>0.9352</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>224.6944</b>

Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**2.2 Overall Operational**

**Mitigated Operational**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	1.1432	0.5944	6.1340	0.0299		0.9293	0.9293		0.9293	0.9293	200.1148	1.2008	201.3155	0.9352	0.0000	224.6944
Energy	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Mobile	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.1432</b>	<b>0.5944</b>	<b>6.1340</b>	<b>0.0299</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>200.1148</b>	<b>1.2008</b>	<b>201.3155</b>	<b>0.9352</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>224.6944</b>

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**3.0 Construction Detail**

**Construction Phase**

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	8/7/2018	8/7/2018	5	1	

**Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0**

Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 0**

**Acres of Paving: 0**

**Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 0; Non-Residential Outdoor: 0; Striped Parking Area: 0 (Architectural Coating – sqft)**

**OffRoad Equipment**

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	0	8.00	97	0.37

**Trips and VMT**

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

**3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction**



Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**3.2 Site Preparation - 2018**

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>							

**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>							

**4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile**

---

Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unmitigated	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

**4.2 Trip Summary Information**

Land Use	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
User Defined Residential	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00		

**4.3 Trip Type Information**

Land Use	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
User Defined Residential	10.80	7.30	7.50	37.30	20.70	42.00	0	0	0

**4.4 Fleet Mix**

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
User Defined Residential	0.471330	0.050819	0.207818	0.162046	0.053743	0.008065	0.018819	0.011540	0.003291	0.001284	0.007070	0.001791	0.002386

Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**5.0 Energy Detail**

Historical Energy Use: N

**5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Electricity Mitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Electricity Unmitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
NaturalGas Mitigated	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000



Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity**

**Unmitigated**

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
User Defined Residential	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>

**Mitigated**

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
User Defined Residential	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>

**6.0 Area Detail**

**6.1 Mitigation Measures Area**

Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	1.1432	0.5944	6.1340	0.0299		0.9293	0.9293		0.9293	0.9293	200.1148	1.2008	201.3155	0.9352	0.0000	224.6944
Unmitigated	1.1432	0.5944	6.1340	0.0299		0.9293	0.9293		0.9293	0.9293	200.1148	1.2008	201.3155	0.9352	0.0000	224.6944

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	1.1209	0.5859	5.3973	0.0299		0.9252	0.9252		0.9252	0.9252	200.1148	0.0000	200.1148	0.9340	0.0000	223.4645
Landscaping	0.0223	8.5000e-003	0.7367	4.0000e-005		4.0600e-003	4.0600e-003		4.0600e-003	4.0600e-003	0.0000	1.2008	1.2008	1.1600e-003	0.0000	1.2298
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.1432</b>	<b>0.5944</b>	<b>6.1340</b>	<b>0.0299</b>		<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.9293</b>		<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>200.1148</b>	<b>1.2008</b>	<b>201.3155</b>	<b>0.9352</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>224.6944</b>

## Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**6.2 Area by SubCategory****Mitigated**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	1.1209	0.5859	5.3973	0.0299		0.9252	0.9252		0.9252	0.9252	200.1148	0.0000	200.1148	0.9340	0.0000	223.4645
Landscaping	0.0223	8.5000e-003	0.7367	4.0000e-005		4.0600e-003	4.0600e-003		4.0600e-003	4.0600e-003	0.0000	1.2008	1.2008	1.1600e-003	0.0000	1.2298
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.1432</b>	<b>0.5944</b>	<b>6.1340</b>	<b>0.0299</b>		<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.9293</b>		<b>0.9293</b>	<b>0.9293</b>	<b>200.1148</b>	<b>1.2008</b>	<b>201.3155</b>	<b>0.9352</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>224.6944</b>

**7.0 Water Detail****7.1 Mitigation Measures Water**

Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	MT/yr			
Mitigated	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unmitigated	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

**7.2 Water by Land Use**

**Unmitigated**

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
User Defined Residential	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>

Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**7.2 Water by Land Use**

**Mitigated**

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
User Defined Residential	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>

**8.0 Waste Detail**

---

**8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste**

**Category/Year**

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	MT/yr			
Mitigated	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unmitigated	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**8.2 Waste by Land Use**

**Unmitigated**

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
User Defined Residential	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>

**Mitigated**

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
User Defined Residential	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>

**9.0 Operational Offroad**

---

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-----------

## Under Canvas woodstoves emissions - Tuolumne County, Annual

**10.0 Stationary Equipment**

---

**Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators**

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

**Boilers**

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------

**User Defined Equipment**

Equipment Type	Number
----------------	--------

**11.0 Vegetation**

---

Appendix C  
**USFWS, CDFW, and CNPS  
Species Lists**



Appendix C  
**USFWS, CDFW, and CNPS  
Species Lists**



## IPaC Information for Planning and Consultation U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service


# IPaC resource list

This report is an automatically generated list of species and other resources such as critical habitat (collectively referred to as *trust resources*) under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) jurisdiction that are known or expected to be on or near the project area referenced below. The list may also include trust resources that occur outside of the project area, but that could potentially be directly or indirectly affected by activities in the project area. However, determining the likelihood and extent of effects a project may have on trust resources typically requires gathering additional site-specific (e.g., vegetation/species surveys) and project-specific (e.g., magnitude and timing of proposed activities) information.

Below is a summary of the project information you provided and contact information for the USFWS office(s) with jurisdiction in the defined project area. Please read the introduction to each section that follows (Endangered Species, Migratory Birds, USFWS Facilities, and NWI Wetlands) for additional information applicable to the trust resources addressed in that section.

## Location

Tuolumne County, California



## Local office

Sacramento Fish And Wildlife Office

☎ (916) 414-6600

📠 (916) 414-6713

Federal Building

2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605

Sacramento, CA 95825-1846

# Endangered species

**This resource list is for informational purposes only and does not constitute an analysis of project level impacts.**

The primary information used to generate this list is the known or expected range of each species. Additional areas of influence (AOI) for species are also considered. An AOI includes areas outside of the species range if the species could be indirectly affected by activities in that area (e.g., placing a dam upstream of a fish population, even if that fish does not occur at the dam site, may indirectly impact the species by reducing or eliminating water flow downstream). Because species can move, and site conditions can change, the species on this list are not guaranteed to be found on or near the project area. To fully determine any potential effects to species, additional site-specific and project-specific information is often required.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act **requires** Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of such proposed action" for any project that is conducted, permitted, funded, or licensed by any Federal agency. A letter from the local office and a species list which fulfills this requirement can **only** be obtained by requesting an official species list from either the Regulatory Review section in IPaC (see directions below) or from the local field office directly.

For project evaluations that require USFWS concurrence/review, please return to the IPaC website and request an official species list by doing the following:

1. Draw the project location and click CONTINUE.
2. Click DEFINE PROJECT.
3. Log in (if directed to do so).
4. Provide a name and description for your project.
5. Click REQUEST SPECIES LIST.

## Listed species

<sup>1</sup> and their critical habitats are managed by the [Ecological Services Program](#) of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the fisheries division of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA Fisheries<sup>2</sup>).

Species and critical habitats under the sole responsibility of NOAA Fisheries are **not** shown on this list. Please contact [NOAA Fisheries](#) for [species under their jurisdiction](#).

- 
1. Species listed under the [Endangered Species Act](#) are threatened or endangered; IPaC also shows species that are candidates, or proposed, for listing. See the [listing status page](#) for more information.
  2. [NOAA Fisheries](#), also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

The following species are potentially affected by activities in this location:

## Amphibians

NAME	STATUS
California Red-legged Frog <i>Rana draytonii</i> There is <b>final</b> critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2891">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2891</a>	Threatened

## Fishes

NAME	STATUS
Delta Smelt <i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i> There is <b>final</b> critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/321">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/321</a>	Threatened

## Critical habitats

Potential effects to critical habitat(s) in this location must be analyzed along with the endangered species themselves.

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS AT THIS LOCATION.

## Migratory birds

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act

<sup>1</sup> and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act<sup>2</sup>.

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described [below](#).

1. The [Migratory Birds Treaty Act](#) of 1918.
2. The [Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act](#) of 1940.

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Birds of Conservation Concern <http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/managed-species/birds-of-conservation-concern.php>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/project-assessment-tools-and-guidance/conservation-measures.php>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/pdf/management/nationwidestandardconservationmeasures.pdf>

The birds listed below are birds of particular concern either because they occur on the [USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern](#) (BCC) list or warrant special attention in your project location. To learn more about the levels of concern for birds on your list and how this list is generated, see the FAQ [below](#). This is not a list of every bird you may find in this location, nor a guarantee that every bird on this list will be found in your project area. To see exact locations of where birders and the general public have sighted birds in and around your project area, visit the [E-bird data mapping tool](#) (Tip: enter your location, desired date range and a species on your list). For projects that occur off the Atlantic Coast, additional maps and models detailing the relative occurrence and abundance of bird species on your list are available. Links to additional information about Atlantic Coast birds, and other important information about your migratory bird list, including how to properly interpret and use your migratory bird report, can be found [below](#).

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME

BREEDING SEASON (IF A BREEDING SEASON IS INDICATED FOR A BIRD ON YOUR LIST, THE BIRD MAY BREED IN YOUR PROJECT AREA SOMETIME WITHIN THE TIMEFRAME SPECIFIED, WHICH IS A VERY LIBERAL ESTIMATE OF THE DATES INSIDE WHICH THE BIRD BREEDS ACROSS ITS ENTIRE RANGE. "BREEDS ELSEWHERE" INDICATES THAT THE BIRD DOES NOT LIKELY BREED IN YOUR PROJECT AREA.)

California Spotted Owl *Strix occidentalis occidentalis*

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7266>

Breeds Mar 10 to Jun 15

Olive-sided Flycatcher *Contopus cooperi*

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3914>

Breeds May 20 to Aug 31

Williamson's Sapsucker *Sphyrapicus thyroideus*

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8832>

Breeds May 1 to Jul 31

## Probability of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read and understand the FAQ “Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report” before using or attempting to interpret this report.

### Probability of Presence (■)

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25.
2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05, and that the probability of presence at week 12 (0.25) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is  $0.25/0.25 = 1$ ; at week 20 it is  $0.05/0.25 = 0.2$ .
3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

To see a bar's probability of presence score, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

### Breeding Season (■)

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

### Survey Effort (|)

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.

To see a bar's survey effort range, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.


### No Data (—)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

### Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.

■ probability of presence ■ breeding season | survey effort — no data



Tell me more about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds.

[Nationwide Conservation Measures](#) describes measures that can help avoid and minimize impacts to all birds at any location year round. Implementation of these measures is particularly important when birds are most likely to occur in the project area. When birds may be breeding in the area, identifying the locations of any active nests and avoiding their destruction is a very helpful impact minimization measure. To see when birds are most likely to occur and be breeding in your project area, view the Probability of Presence Summary. [Additional measures](#) and/or [permits](#) may be advisable depending on the type of activity you are conducting and the type of infrastructure or bird species present on your project site.

What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS [Birds of Conservation Concern \(BCC\)](#) and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#) and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle ([Eagle Act](#) requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the [E-bird Explore Data Tool](#).

What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs for the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The probability of presence graphs associated with your migratory bird list are based on data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). This data is derived from a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#).

Probability of presence data is continuously being updated as new and better information becomes available. To learn more about how the probability of presence graphs are produced and how to interpret them, go to the Probability of Presence Summary and then click on the "Tell me about these graphs" link.

### How do I know if a bird is breeding, wintering, migrating or present year-round in my project area?

To see what part of a particular bird's range your project area falls within (i.e. breeding, wintering, migrating or year-round), you may refer to the following resources: [The Cornell Lab of Ornithology All About Birds Bird Guide](#), or (if you are unsuccessful in locating the bird of interest there), the [Cornell Lab of Ornithology Neotropical Birds guide](#). If a bird on your migratory bird species list has a breeding season associated with it, if that bird does occur in your project area, there may be nests present at some point within the timeframe specified. If "Breeds elsewhere" is indicated, then the bird likely does not breed in your project area.

### What are the levels of concern for migratory birds?

Migratory birds delivered through IPaC fall into the following distinct categories of concern:

1. "BCC Rangewide" birds are [Birds of Conservation Concern](#) (BCC) that are of concern throughout their range anywhere within the USA (including Hawaii, the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands);
2. "BCC - BCR" birds are BCCs that are of concern only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA; and
3. "Non-BCC - Vulnerable" birds are not BCC species in your project area, but appear on your list either because of the [Eagle Act](#) requirements (for eagles) or (for non-eagles) potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities (e.g. offshore energy development or longline fishing).

Although it is important to try to avoid and minimize impacts to all birds, efforts should be made, in particular, to avoid and minimize impacts to the birds on this list, especially eagles and BCC species of rangewide concern. For more information on conservation measures you can implement to help avoid and minimize migratory bird impacts and requirements for eagles, please see the FAQs for these topics.

### Details about birds that are potentially affected by offshore projects

For additional details about the relative occurrence and abundance of both individual bird species and groups of bird species within your project area off the Atlantic Coast, please visit the [Northeast Ocean Data Portal](#). The Portal also offers data and information about other taxa besides birds that may be helpful to you in your project review.

Alternately, you may download the bird model results files underlying the portal maps through the [NOAA NCCOS Integrative Statistical Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Marine Bird Distributions and Abundance on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf](#) project webpage.

Bird tracking data can also provide additional details about occurrence and habitat use throughout the year, including migration. Models relying on survey data may not include this information. For additional information on marine bird tracking data, see the [Diving Bird Study](#) and the [nanotag studies](#) or contact [Caleb Spiegel](#) or [Pam Loring](#).

### What if I have eagles on my list?

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to [obtain a permit](#) to avoid violating the Eagle Act should such impacts occur.

### Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report

The migratory bird list generated is not a list of all birds in your project area, only a subset of birds of priority concern. To learn more about how your list is generated, and see options for identifying what other birds may be in your project area, please see the FAQ "What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location". Please be aware this report provides the "probability of presence" of birds within the 10 km grid cell(s) that overlap your project; not your exact project footprint. On the graphs provided, please also look carefully at the survey effort (indicated by the black vertical bar) and for the existence of the "no data" indicator (a red horizontal bar). A high survey effort is the key component. If the survey effort is high, then the probability of presence score can be viewed as more dependable. In contrast, a low survey effort bar or no data bar means a lack of data and, therefore, a lack of certainty about presence of the species. This list is not perfect; it is simply a starting point for identifying what birds of concern have the potential to be in your project area, when they might be there, and if they might be breeding (which means nests might be present). The list helps you know what to look for to confirm presence, and helps guide you in knowing when to implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts from your project activities, should presence be confirmed. To learn more about conservation measures, visit the FAQ "Tell me about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds" at the bottom of your migratory bird trust resources page.

## Facilities

### Wildlife refuges and fish hatcheries

REFUGE AND FISH HATCHERY INFORMATION IS NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME

## Wetlands in the National Wetlands Inventory

Impacts to [NWI wetlands](#) and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District](#).

THERE ARE NO KNOWN WETLANDS AT THIS LOCATION.

### Data limitations

The Service's objective of mapping wetlands and deepwater habitats is to produce reconnaissance level information on the location, type and size of these resources. The maps are prepared from the analysis of high altitude imagery. Wetlands are identified based on vegetation, visible hydrology and geography. A margin of error is inherent in the use of imagery; thus, detailed on-the-ground inspection of any particular site may result in revision of the wetland boundaries or classification established through image analysis.

The accuracy of image interpretation depends on the quality of the imagery, the experience of the image analysts, the amount and quality of the collateral data and the amount of ground truth verification work conducted. Metadata should be consulted to determine the date of the source imagery used and any mapping problems.

Wetlands or other mapped features may have changed since the date of the imagery or field work. There may be occasional differences in polygon boundaries or classifications between the information depicted on the map and the actual conditions on site.

**Data exclusions**

Certain wetland habitats are excluded from the National mapping program because of the limitations of aerial imagery as the primary data source used to detect wetlands. These habitats include seagrasses or submerged aquatic vegetation that are found in the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries and nearshore coastal waters. Some deepwater reef communities (coral or tubercid worm reefs) have also been excluded from the inventory. These habitats, because of their depth, go undetected by aerial imagery.

**Data precautions**

Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands may define and describe wetlands in a different manner than that used in this inventory. There is no attempt, in either the design or products of this inventory, to define the limits of proprietary jurisdiction of any Federal, state, or local government or to establish the geographical scope of the regulatory programs of government agencies. Persons intending to engage in activities involving modifications within or adjacent to wetland areas should seek the advice of appropriate federal, state, or local agencies concerning specified agency regulatory programs and proprietary jurisdictions that may affect such activities.

NOT FOR CONSULTATION



# Selected Elements by Scientific Name

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

California Natural Diversity Database



Query Criteria: Quad (Ascension Mtn. (3711978) OR Cherry Lake South (3711988) OR Lake Eleanor (3711987) OR Ackerson Mtn. (3711977) OR El Portal (3711967) OR Kinsley (3711968) OR Buckhorn Peak (3712061) OR Jawbone Ridge (3712071) OR Duckwall Mtn. (3712081))

Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
<i>Agrostis humilis</i> mountain bent grass	PMPOA040P0	None	None	G4Q	S2	2B.3
<i>Allium tribracteatum</i> three-bracted onion	PMLIL022D0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Allium yosemitense</i> Yosemite onion	PMLIL022L0	None	Rare	G3	S3	1B.3
<i>Anaxyrus canorus</i> Yosemite toad	AAABB01040	Threatened	None	G2G3	S2S3	SSC
<i>Antrozous pallidus</i> pallid bat	AMACC10010	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
<i>Apodontia rufa californica</i> Sierra Nevada mountain beaver	AMAF01013	None	None	G5T3T4	S2S3	SSC
<i>Balsamorhiza macrolepis</i> big-scale balsamroot	PDAST11061	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Banksula tuolumne</i> Tuolumne cave harvestman	ILARA14090	None	None	G1	S1	
<i>Big Tree Forest</i> Big Tree Forest	CTT84250CA	None	None	G3	S3.2	
<i>Bombus caliginosus</i> obscure bumble bee	IIHYM24380	None	None	G4?	S1S2	
<i>Bombus crotchii</i> Crotch bumble bee	IIHYM24480	None	None	G3G4	S1S2	
<i>Bombus occidentalis</i> western bumble bee	IIHYM24250	None	None	G2G3	S1	
<i>Brasenia schreberi</i> watershield	PDCAB01010	None	None	G5	S3	2B.3
<i>Calicina conifera</i> Crane Flat harvestman	ILARAU8030	None	None	G1	S1	
<i>Carex limosa</i> mud sedge	PMCYP037K0	None	None	G5	S3	2B.2
<i>Carex tompkinsii</i> Tompkins' sedge	PMCYP03DR0	None	Rare	G3G4	S3S4	4.3
<i>Carex viridula ssp. viridula</i> green yellow sedge	PMCYP03EM5	None	None	G5T5	S2	2B.3
<i>Cinna bolanderi</i> Bolander's woodreed	PMPOA1H040	None	None	G2G3	S2S3	1B.2



Selected Elements by Scientific Name  
California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
California Natural Diversity Database



Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
<b><i>Clarkia australis</i></b> Small's southern clarkia	PDONA05040	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<b><i>Clarkia biloba ssp. australis</i></b> Mariposa clarkia	PDONA05051	None	None	G4G5T3	S3	1B.2
<b><i>Clarkia lingulata</i></b> Merced clarkia	PDONA050P0	None	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
<b><i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i></b> Townsend's big-eared bat	AMACC08010	None	None	G3G4	S2	SSC
<b><i>Diplacus pulchellus</i></b> yellow-lip pansy monkeyflower	PDSCR1B280	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<b><i>Empidonax traillii</i></b> willow flycatcher	ABPAE33040	None	Endangered	G5	S1S2	
<b><i>Emys marmorata</i></b> western pond turtle	ARAAD02030	None	None	G3G4	S3	SSC
<b><i>Eriophyllum congdonii</i></b> Congdon's woolly sunflower	PDAST3N030	None	Rare	G2	S2	1B.2
<b><i>Eriophyllum nubigenum</i></b> Yosemite woolly sunflower	PDAST3N0A0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.3
<b><i>Erythranthe filicalis</i></b> slender-stemmed monkeyflower	PDSCR1B150	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<b><i>Erythronium taylorii</i></b> Pilot Ridge fawn lily	PMLIL0U0S0	None	None	G1	S1	1B.2
<b><i>Erythronium tuolumnense</i></b> Tuolumne fawn lily	PMLIL0U0H0	None	None	G2G3	S2S3	1B.2
<b><i>Euderma maculatum</i></b> spotted bat	AMACC07010	None	None	G4	S3	SSC
<b><i>Eumops perotis californicus</i></b> western mastiff bat	AMACD02011	None	None	G5T4	S3S4	SSC
<b><i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i></b> American peregrine falcon	ABNKD06071	Delisted	Delisted	G4T4	S3S4	FP
<b><i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i></b> bald eagle	ABNKC10010	Delisted	Endangered	G5	S3	FP
<b><i>Helminthoglypta allynsmithi</i></b> Merced Canyon shoulderband	IMGASC2020	None	None	G1	S1	
<b><i>Horkelia parryi</i></b> Parry's horkelia	PDROS0W0C0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<b><i>Hulsea brevifolia</i></b> short-leaved hulsea	PDAST4Z020	None	None	G3	S3	1B.2
<b><i>Hydromantes brunus</i></b> limestone salamander	AAAAD09010	None	Threatened	G2G3	S2S3	FP
<b><i>Lasionycteris noctivagans</i></b> silver-haired bat	AMACC02010	None	None	G5	S3S4	



**Selected Elements by Scientific Name**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
<i>Lasiurus blossevillii</i> western red bat	AMACC05060	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i> hoary bat	AMACC05030	None	None	G5	S4	
<i>Lewisia congdonii</i> Congdon's lewisia	PDPOR04040	None	Rare	G2	S2	1B.3
<i>Lomatium congdonii</i> Congdon's lomatium	PDAPI1B0B0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Margaritifera falcata</i> western pearlshell	IMBIV27020	None	None	G4G5	S1S2	
<i>Mielichhoferia elongata</i> elongate copper moss	NBMUS4Q022	None	None	G5	S4	4.3
<i>Mielichhoferia shevockii</i> Shevock's copper moss	NBMUSA1010	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Monadenia yosemitensis</i> Yosemite Mariposa sideband	IMGASZ3010	None	None	G1	S1S2	
<i>Myotis evotis</i> long-eared myotis	AMACC01070	None	None	G5	S3	
<i>Myotis thysanodes</i> fringed myotis	AMACC01090	None	None	G4	S3	
<i>Myotis volans</i> long-legged myotis	AMACC01110	None	None	G5	S3	
<i>Myotis yumanensis</i> Yuma myotis	AMACC01020	None	None	G5	S4	
<i>Orthotrichum holzingeri</i> Holzinger's orthotrichum moss	NBMUS560E0	None	None	G3	S2	1B.3
<i>Pekania pennanti</i> fisher - West Coast DPS	AMAJF01021	None	Threatened	G5T2T3Q	S2S3	SSC
<i>Picoides arcticus</i> black-backed woodpecker	ABNYF07090	None	None	G5	S2	
<i>Plagiobothrys torreyi</i> var. <i>torreyi</i> Yosemite popcornflower	PDBOR0V152	None	None	G4T3Q	S3	1B.2
<i>Potamogeton epihydrus</i> Nuttall's ribbon-leaved pondweed	PMPOT03080	None	None	G5	S2S3	2B.2
<i>Potamogeton robbinsii</i> Robbins' pondweed	PMPOT030Z0	None	None	G5	S3	2B.3
<i>Rana boylei</i> foothill yellow-legged frog	AAABH01050	None	Candidate Threatened	G3	S3	SSC
<i>Rana draytonii</i> California red-legged frog	AAABH01022	Threatened	None	G2G3	S2S3	SSC
<i>Rana sierrae</i> Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog	AAABH01340	Endangered	Threatened	G1	S1	WL



**Selected Elements by Scientific Name**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



<b>Species</b>	<b>Element Code</b>	<b>Federal Status</b>	<b>State Status</b>	<b>Global Rank</b>	<b>State Rank</b>	<b>Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP</b>
<b><i>Rhynchospora capitellata</i></b> brownish beaked-rush	PMCYP0N080	None	None	G5	S1	2B.2
<b><i>Schoenoplectus subterminalis</i></b> water bulrush	PMCYP0Q1G0	None	None	G4G5	S3	2B.3
<b><i>Stellaria obtusa</i></b> obtuse starwort	PDCAR0X0U0	None	None	G5	S4	4.3
<b><i>Strix nebulosa</i></b> great gray owl	ABNSB12040	None	Endangered	G5	S1	
<b><i>Stygbromus wengerorum</i></b> Wengerors' Cave amphipod	ICMAL05620	None	None	G1	S1	
<b><i>Tetrix sierrana</i></b> Sierra pygmy grasshopper	IIORT27010	None	None	G1G2	S1S2	
<b><i>Vulpes vulpes necator</i></b> Sierra Nevada red fox	AMAJA03012	Candidate	Threatened	G5T1T2	S1	

**Record Count: 67**



## Plant List

### Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants

51 matches found. *Click on scientific name for details*

#### Search Criteria

Found in Quads 3712081, 3711988, 3711987, 3712071, 3711978, 3711977, 3712061 3711968 and 3711967;

[Modify Search Criteria](#)
[Export to Excel](#)
[Modify Columns](#)
[Modify Sort](#)
[Display Photos](#)

Scientific Name	Common Name	Family	Lifeform	Blooming Period	CA Rare Plant Rank	State Rank	Global Rank
<a href="#">Agrostis humilis</a>	mountain bent grass	Poaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Sep	2B.3	S2	G4Q
<a href="#">Allium sanbornii var. sanbornii</a>	Sanborn's onion	Alliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	May-Sep	4.2	S3S4	G4T3T4
<a href="#">Allium tribracteatum</a>	three-bracted onion	Alliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	Apr-Aug	1B.2	S2	G2
<a href="#">Allium yosemitense</a>	Yosemite onion	Alliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	Apr-Jul	1B.3	S3	G3
<a href="#">Balsamorhiza macrolepis</a>	big-scale balsamroot	Asteraceae	perennial herb	Mar-Jun	1B.2	S2	G2
<a href="#">Bolandra californica</a>	Sierra bolandra	Saxifragaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Jul	4.3	S4	G4
<a href="#">Brasenia schreberi</a>	watershield	Cabombaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb (aquatic)	Jun-Sep	2B.3	S3	G5
<a href="#">Bulbostylis capillaris</a>	thread-leaved beakseed	Cyperaceae	annual herb	Jun-Aug	4.2	S3	G5
<a href="#">Carex buxbaumii</a>	Buxbaum's sedge	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Mar-Aug	4.2	S3	G5
<a href="#">Carex limosa</a>	mud sedge	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jun-Aug	2B.2	S3	G5
<a href="#">Carex tompkinsii</a>	Tompkins' sedge	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	May-Jul	4.3	S3S4	G3G4
<a href="#">Carex viridula ssp. viridula</a>	green yellow sedge	Cyperaceae	perennial herb	(Jun)Jul-Sep(Nov)	2B.3	S2	G5T5
<a href="#">Ceanothus fresnensis</a>	Fresno ceanothus	Rhamnaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	May-Jul	4.3	S4	G4
<a href="#">Cinna bolanderi</a>	Bolander's woodreed	Poaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Sep	1B.2	S2	G2
<a href="#">Clarkia australis</a>	Small's southern clarkia	Onagraceae	annual herb	May-Aug	1B.2	S2	G2
	Mariposa clarkia	Onagraceae	annual herb	Apr-Jul	1B.2	S2S3	G4G5T2T3

<u><a href="#">Clarkia biloba ssp. australis</a></u>								
<u><a href="#">Clarkia lingulata</a></u>	Merced clarkia	Onagraceae	annual herb	May-Jun	1B.1	S1	G1	
<u><a href="#">Clarkia virgata</a></u>	Sierra clarkia	Onagraceae	annual herb	May-Aug	4.3	S3	G3	
<u><a href="#">Claytonia parviflora ssp. grandiflora</a></u>	streambank spring beauty	Montiaceae	annual herb	Feb-May	4.2	S3	G5T3	
<u><a href="#">Cordylanthus rigidus ssp. brevibracteatus</a></u>	short-bracted bird's-beak	Orobanchaceae	annual herb (hemiparasitic)	Jul-Aug (Oct)	4.3	S3	G5T3	
<u><a href="#">Cypripedium montanum</a></u>	mountain lady's-slipper	Orchidaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Mar-Aug	4.2	S4	G4	
<u><a href="#">Diplacus pulchellus</a></u>	yellow-lip pansy monkeyflower	Phrymaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jul	1B.2	S2	G2	
<u><a href="#">Eriophorum gracile</a></u>	slender cottongrass	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb (emergent)	May-Sep	4.3	S4	G5	
<u><a href="#">Eriophyllum congdonii</a></u>	Congdon's woolly sunflower	Asteraceae	annual herb	Apr-Jun	1B.2	S2	G2	
<u><a href="#">Eriophyllum nubigenum</a></u>	Yosemite woolly sunflower	Asteraceae	annual herb	May-Aug	1B.3	S2	G2	
<u><a href="#">Erythranthe filicaulis</a></u>	slender-stemmed monkeyflower	Phrymaceae	annual herb	Apr-Aug	1B.2	S2	G2	
<u><a href="#">Erythranthe inconspicua</a></u>	small-flowered monkeyflower	Phrymaceae	annual herb	May-Jun	4.3	S4	G4	
<u><a href="#">Erythranthe laciniata</a></u>	cut-leaved monkeyflower	Phrymaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jul	4.3	S4	G4	
<u><a href="#">Erythronium taylorii</a></u>	Pilot Ridge fawn lily	Liliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	Apr-May	1B.2	S1	G1	
<u><a href="#">Erythronium tuolumnense</a></u>	Tuolumne fawn lily	Liliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	Mar-Jun	1B.2	S2S3	G2G3	
<u><a href="#">Horkelia parryi</a></u>	Parry's horkelia	Rosaceae	perennial herb	Apr-Sep	1B.2	S2	G2	
<u><a href="#">Hulsea brevifolia</a></u>	short-leaved hulsea	Asteraceae	perennial herb	May-Aug	1B.2	S3	G3	
<u><a href="#">Jensia yosemitana</a></u>	Yosemite tarplant	Asteraceae	annual herb	(Apr)May-Jul	3.2	S3	G3	
<u><a href="#">Lewisia congdonii</a></u>	Congdon's lewisia	Montiaceae	perennial herb	Apr-Jun	1B.3	S2	G2	
<u><a href="#">Lomatium congdonii</a></u>	Congdon's lomatium	Apiaceae	perennial herb	Mar-Jun	1B.2	S2	G2	
<u><a href="#">Lupinus spectabilis</a></u>	shaggyhair lupine	Fabaceae	annual herb	Apr-May	1B.2	S2	G2	
<u><a href="#">Lycopus uniflorus</a></u>	northern bugleweed	Lamiaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Sep	4.3	S4	G5	
<u><a href="#">Mielichhoferia elongata</a></u>	elongate copper moss	Mielichhoferiaceae	moss		4.3	S4	G5	
<u><a href="#">Mielichhoferia shevockii</a></u>	Shevock's copper moss	Mielichhoferiaceae	moss		1B.2	S2	G2	

<a href="#">Orthotrichum holzingeri</a>	Holzinger's orthotrichum moss	Orthotrichaceae	moss		1B.3	S2	G3
<a href="#">Piperia colemanii</a>	Coleman's rein orchid	Orchidaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Aug	4.3	S4	G4
<a href="#">Plagiobothrys torreyi var. perplexans</a>	chaparral popcornflower	Boraginaceae	annual herb	Apr-Sep	4.3	S3?	G4T3?
<a href="#">Plagiobothrys torreyi var. torreyi</a>	Yosemite popcornflower	Boraginaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jun	1B.2	S3	G4T3Q
<a href="#">Potamogeton epihydrus</a>	Nuttall's ribbon-leaved pondweed	Potamogetonaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb (aquatic)	(Jun)Jul-Sep	2B.2	S2S3	G5
<a href="#">Potamogeton robbinsii</a>	Robbins' pondweed	Potamogetonaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb (aquatic)	Jul-Aug	2B.3	S3	G5
<a href="#">Pseudostellaria sierrae</a>	Sierra starwort	Caryophyllaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	May-Aug	4.2	S3	G3G4
<a href="#">Rhynchospora californica</a>	California beaked-rush	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	May-Jul	1B.1	S1	G1
<a href="#">Rhynchospora capitellata</a>	brownish beaked-rush	Cyperaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Aug	2B.2	S1	G5
<a href="#">Schoenoplectus subterminalis</a>	water bulrush	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb (aquatic)	Jun-Aug (Sep)	2B.3	S3	G4G5
<a href="#">Stellaria obtusa</a>	obtuse starwort	Caryophyllaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	May-Sep (Oct)	4.3	S4	G5
<a href="#">Wyethia elata</a>	Hall's wyethia	Asteraceae	perennial herb	May-Aug	4.3	S4	G4

### Suggested Citation

California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program. 2018. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-03 0.39). Website <http://www.rareplants.cnps.org> [accessed 10 September 2018].

#### Search the Inventory

[Simple Search](#)

[Advanced Search](#)

[Glossary](#)

#### Information

[About the Inventory](#)

[About the Rare Plant Program](#)

[CNPS Home Page](#)

[About CNPS](#)

[Join CNPS](#)

#### Contributors

[The Calflora Database](#)

[The California Lichen Society](#)

[California Natural Diversity Database](#)

[The Jepson Flora Project](#)

[The Consortium of California Herbaria](#)

[CalPhotos](#)

#### Questions and Comments

[rareplants@cnps.org](mailto:rareplants@cnps.org)