

3—DRAFT SEIR ERRATA

3.1 OVERVIEW

In reviewing and responding to comments on the Draft SEIR, Alameda County (County) determined that revisions to portions of the Draft SEIR text were warranted to correct, clarify, or amplify certain information. CEQA Guidelines § 15088 provides that where the response to comments makes important changes in the information contained in the text of the Draft SEIR, the Lead Agency should either revise the text in the body of the EIR or include marginal notes showing that the information is revised in the response to comments.

Section 3.2 of this Final SEIR provides revisions to the Draft SEIR as deemed necessary based on consideration of issues raised in comments on the Draft SEIR. Revisions to the Draft SEIR text are shown as *errata*, consisting of an excerpt of the Draft EIR text with changes represented with added text shown in underline (example) and deleted text show in strikethrough (~~example~~).

None of the changes provided in Section 3.2 of this Final SEIR contain significant new information. The inclusion of this information in the Final SEIR does not deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect. The Final SEIR does not identify any new significant impacts or substantial increases in the severity of any environmental effects identified in the Draft SEIR. Therefore, recirculation of the Draft SEIR is not required (see CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5).

3.2 ERRATA

This section contains errata to the Draft SEIR; each is preceded by a brief explanation of the purpose of the change to the Draft SEIR text.

3.2.1 Errata to Draft SEIR Executive Summary, p.ES-5

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR, Chapter ES, “Executive Summary,” to address an inadvertent misnumbering of the project objectives. The objectives numbers, accurately portrayed in other areas of the Draft SEIR, have been updated in the Executive Summary as follows.

ERRATA

The reclamation plan amendment provides site-specific actions designed to meet the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. The proposed project includes the following objectives:

- 1) Address the requirements of Condition 7 of County Resolution No. 12-20.
- 2) Realign and restore an approximately 5,800-foot reach of the Arroyo del Valle (ADV) resulting in an enhanced riparian corridor that flows south of, rather than through (as currently anticipated in SMP-23), Lake B.
- 3) Maximize the extraction of the remaining available on-site sand and gravel resources through the anticipated reclamation end date of 2056, including a change in the final bottom elevation of excavation in Lake B to 150 feet msl.
- 4) Continue to supply the regional demands for Portland Cement Concrete (PCC) grade aggregate.

- ~~4)5)~~ Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and the related air emissions by retaining a local source of aggregate.
- ~~5)6)~~ Carry out the objectives of the LAVQAR and Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Zone 7 (hereafter referred to as “Zone 7”) Agreement for implementation of the Chain of Lakes on the portions of land controlled by CEMEX.
- ~~6)7)~~ Implement a public use pedestrian and bike trail on the southern perimeter of the CEMEX property.
- ~~7)8)~~ Implement the proposed reclamation plan amendment to establish end uses of water management, open space, and nonprime agriculture in accordance with the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) (Public Resources Code 2710, et seq.).

END OF ERRATA

3.2.2 Errata to Draft SEIR Summary Table ES-1

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR, Chapter 4, “Environmental Analysis,” (see errata Sections 3.2.3 through 3.2.20 below for a discussion of these revisions). These changes modified the language of Mitigation Measures 4.1-1, 4.2-1, 4.2-2, 4.3-1e, 4.6-3, and 4.8-1a and updated relevant cross references. The following errata incorporate these revisions to Table ES-2, “Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.” In addition, all mitigation measure language has been updated to replace “Applicant” with “Permittee,” which better reflects the nature of CEMEX as they would no longer be the Applicant if the project is approved and instead would be the Permittee.

ERRATA

**TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation ¹
AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES			
Impact 4.1-1: Substantial Degradation of the Approved Visual Character or Quality of the Site and Its Surroundings	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.1-2: Creation of a New Source of Substantial Light and Glare That Would Adversely Affect Day or Nighttime Views in the Area	PS	Mitigation Measure 4.1-1: All construction <u>reclamation-related construction</u> activities shall be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. – 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8 9 a.m. – 5 6 p.m. <u>8 9 a.m. – 5 6 p.m. on Saturday. Reclamation construction activity shall be prohibited on</u> and <u>Sundays.</u> ¹	LS
AIR QUALITY			
Impact 4.2-1: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of the Applicable Air Quality Plan	S	Mitigation Measure 4.2-1: Off-road Equipment Plan. The Permittee shall implement the following to reduce project NOx emissions: a) Develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in Lake A reclamation and the Lake B realignment of the Arroyo del Valle would achieve a fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average for the duration of these reclamation activities. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as such become available. <u>The plan shall be submitted to the County within 90 days of project approval.</u> The Alameda County Community Development Agency would be responsible for ensuring compliance.	SU

¹ Applies to reclamation activities; does not apply to vested mining and processing activities.

LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation ¹
<p>Impact 4.2-2b: 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: ROG, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}</p>	LS	<p>None required—, but the following Mitigation Measure has been added at the request of the City of Livermore.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.2-2: Update Dust Control Plan. <u>Within 90 days of proposed project approval, the Permittee shall update its existing 2015 Dust Control Plan to address changes that would occur as a result of the proposed project. The new plan shall comply with BAAQMD best practices and be approved by the County.</u></p>	LS
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact 4.3-1a: The Project Could Result in Direct Effects or Loss of Habitat for Special-Status Wildlife Species: Lake A Reclamation and Diversion Structure Construction</p>	PS	<p>[Mitigation Measures 4.3-1a, 4.3-1b, 4.3-1c, 4.3-1d, 4.3-1f, 4.3-1g, and 4.3-1h remain unchanged.]</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-1e: Loggerhead Shrike To avoid and minimize potential impacts to loggerhead shrike, the following shall apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If reclamation-related ground disturbing activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) is to commence within 200 feet of suitable nesting habitat during the nesting season (February 15-August 31), then a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for loggerhead shrike nests in all suitable shrubs and trees that are within 200 feet from the construction activities. The survey shall occur within 30 days prior to the commencement of ground disturbing activities. Adjacent parcels under different land ownership will be surveyed only if access is granted or if the parcels are visible from authorized areas. 2. The biologist shall supply a brief written report (including date, time of survey, survey method, name of surveyor and survey results) to the Planning Department prior to the commencement of ground disturbing activity. If no active nests are found during the survey, then no further mitigation would be required. 3. If nesting individuals are found, then an exclusion zone shall be established within 200 feet of the active nest(s) until a qualified biologist determines that the young of the year are no longer reliant upon the nest. 4. Comply with the mitigation requirements and conditions of any Section 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (Agreement) with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for project reclamation 	LS

LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation ¹
		activities, as applicable to the loggerhead shrike. If there is a conflict between the terms of mitigation items 1, 2, or 3 above and the Agreement, then the Permittee shall abide by the terms of the Agreement.	
<p>Impact 4.3-2a: The Project Could Result in Loss of Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community: Lake A Reclamation and Diversion Structure Construction</p>	PS	<p>[Mitigation Measures 4.3-1a and 4.3-2a remain unchanged.]</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b: Riparian Habitat Within one year of the commencement of reclamation-related ground disturbing activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) associated with the construction of the Lake A diversion structure, realigned Arroyo del Valle, or other areas identified as riparian habitat in the project biological resources assessment report, the applicant <u>Permittee</u> shall mitigate for any permanent riparian impacts at a minimum 1:1 ratio, <u>unless the regulatory permit process results in a different ratio</u>. The implementation of mitigation for the loss of riparian habitat may be addressed separately for each phase of reclamation (e.g., Lake A diversion structure or realigned Arroyo del Valle). Exact acreage per phase shall be determined in consultation with CDFW <u>and other applicable regulatory requirements</u>. Mitigation shall be accomplished by complying with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enter into and comply with the mitigation requirements and conditions of a Section 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (Agreement) with CDFW. 2. If the Agreement results in less than a 1:1 mitigation ratio for loss of riparian habitat, then the applicant <u>Permittee</u> shall demonstrate that the riparian habitat which went unmitigated/uncompensated as a result of permitting has been mitigated through other means. Acceptable methods include purchase of credits from a mitigation bank or creation/preservation of on-site or off-site riparian habitats through the establishment of a permanent conservation easement, subject to the approval of the Planning Department. 	LS
<p>Impact 4.3-3a: The Project Could Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on State or Federally Protected Wetlands: Lake A Reclamation and Diversion Structure Construction</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-3: 1:1 Wetland Compensation Ratio Prior to the commencement of reclamation-related ground disturbing activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) associated with the construction of the Lake A diversion structure, realigned Arroyo del Valle, or in other areas identified as containing wetlands in the project aquatic resource</p>	LS

LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation ¹
		<p>delineation report, the applicant Permittee shall mitigate for direct and indirect wetland impacts at a 1:1 ratio, unless the regulatory permit process results in a different ratio. The implementation of mitigation for the loss of wetlands may be addressed separately for each phase of reclamation (e.g., Lake A diversion structure or realigned Arroyo del Valle). Exact acreage per phase shall be determined prior to initiating that phase based on the verification of the preliminary jurisdictional determination by the USACE and other applicable regulatory requirements. Mitigation shall be accomplished by complying with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Obtain and comply with the mitigation requirements and conditions of a Section 404 Permit(s) and Section 401 Water Quality Certification(s) for reclamation activities, as applicable. b) If regulatory permitting processes result in less than a 1:1 compensation ratio for loss of wetlands, then the applicant Permittee shall demonstrate that the wetlands which went unmitigated/uncompensated as a result of permitting have been mitigated through other means. Acceptable methods include purchase of credits from a mitigation bank or creation/preservation of on-site or off-site wetlands through the establishment of a permanent conservation easement, subject to the approval of the Planning Department. 	
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
<p>Impact 4.6-1d: Violation of Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements or Substantial Degradation of Surface Water or Groundwater Quality Regarding Reclamation of Lake B</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-2: Implementation of Adaptive Management Program for Iron. The Permittee shall implement the Adaptive Management Program for Iron (see Appendix F-6 to the SEIR), which will be incorporated into conditions of approval.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-3: Install Lake B Groundwater Monitoring Wells. The Permittee shall install two or <u>up to</u> three groundwater monitoring wells on Lake B perimeter, after Permittee shall consultation on locations with Zone 7 regarding the location and specifications of these wells. to inform MM 4.6-3 actions. <u>The Permittee shall provide documentation to the County that they have conducted a good faith effort of coordinating with Zone 7 regarding the amount and location of the groundwater monitoring wells.</u></p>	LS

LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation ¹
Impact 4.6-5: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan	PS	Implement Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 (see Impact 4.6-1a), 4.4-1 (see Impact 4.4-4), 4.6-2 , 4.6-3 (see Impact 4.6-1d), and 4.6-4 (see Impact 4.6-3d).	LS
NOISE			
Impact 4.8-2: Construction Noise Impacts Relative to Existing Ambient Conditions	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 (see Impact 4.1-2). Mitigation Measure 4.8-1a: All residences within 500 feet of the conduit and pipeline installation components of the proposed project <u>and the City of Livermore Community Development Department</u> should be provided notice of the pipeline installation schedule and informed that short-term periods of elevated daytime ambient noise levels could occur during that period. <u>The notice shall be sent no less than one week prior to construction activities.</u> Mitigation Measure 4.8-1b: Mufflers. All mobile equipment shall be fitted with mufflers consistent with manufacturers recommendations & shall be well maintained.	LS
OTHER CEQA TOPICS			
Impact 7-2b: Impacts that are Individually Limited but Cumulatively Considerable: Criteria Pollutants ROG, CO, SO _x , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5}	LS	None required—, <u>but the following Mitigation Measure has been added at the request of the City of Livermore.</u> Mitigation Measure 4.2-2: Update Dust Control Plan (see Impact 4.2-2b).	LS
Impact 7-3: Environmental Effects which will Cause Substantial Adverse Effects on Human Beings	PS	Implement Mitigation Measures 4.1-1, 4.2-1 (see Impact 4.2-1), 4.2-2 (see Impact 4.2-2b), 4.4-1, 4.4-2, 4.4-3, 4.4-4 (see Impact 4.4-1), 4.5-1a, 4.5-1b, 4.5-1c, 4.5-1d, 4.5-1e, 4.5-1f, 4.5-1g, 4.5-1h (see Impact 4.5-1), 4.6-1 (see Impact 4.6-1a), 4.6-2 (see Impact 4.6-1d), 4.6-3 (see Impact 4.6-3d), 4.8-1a, and 4.8-1b (see Impact 4.8-2).	LS

END OF ERRATA

LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

3.2.3 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.1, “Aesthetics and Visual Resources,” p. 4.1-24**Explanation**

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.1, “Aesthetics and Visual Resources,” to address a comment on the Draft SEIR regarding noise and lighting made by the City of Livermore (see Chapter 4, “Response to Comments,” Comments 2-3 and 2-4). These changes modified the language of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, “Daily Limitation of Construction Hours,” which also applies to Section 4.8, “Noise,” (see Section 3.2.19 of this Final SEIR, below). The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

Mitigation Measure 4.1-1: Daily Limitation of Construction Hours.

All ~~construction~~ reclamation-related construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. – 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 9 a.m. – 6 p.m. on Saturday. Reclamation construction activity shall be prohibited on ~~and~~ Sundays.

END OF ERRATA**3.2.4 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.2, “Air Quality,” p. 4.2-20****Explanation**

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.2, “Air Quality,” to add enforceability language to Mitigation Measure 4.2-1. The change requires the Permittee to submit the Off-road Equipment Plan to the County within 90 days of project approval. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-1: Off-road Equipment Plan

The ~~Permittee applicant~~ shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in Lake A reclamation and the Lake B realignment of the Arroyo del Valle would achieve a fleet-average 20 percent NO_x reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average for the duration of these reclamation activities. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as such become available. The plan shall be submitted to the County within 90 days of project approval.

The Alameda County Community Development Agency would be responsible for ensuring compliance.

Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable.

END OF ERRATA**3.2.5 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.2, “Air Quality,” p. 4.2-22****Explanation**

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.2, “Air Quality,” to address a comment on the Draft SEIR made by the City of Livermore (see Chapter 4, “Response to Comments,” Comment 2-2). These changes modified the language of Impact 4.2-4b analysis and added new Mitigation Measure 4.2-2, “Update Dust Control Plan.” The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

Impact 4.2-2b: 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: ROG, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}

As stated in Impact 4.2-2a above, proposed project operations associated with reclamation would emit criteria air pollutants, including ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} from construction equipment and from mobile equipment and motor vehicles associated with excavation, grading/fill, and construction of water management facilities at Lakes A and B.

Table 4.2-3 presents the daily criteria air pollutants and ozone precursor emissions analysis. Table 4.2-4 presents the annual criteria air pollutants and ozone precursor emissions analysis. The modeling results from ~~the~~ the Air and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Study's (Appendix C-1) indicate that project criteria pollutant emissions are below applicable BAAQMD thresholds of significance for CEQA except for daily emissions of NO_x. Therefore, the proposed project's estimated ROG, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions would constitute a less than significant impact.

Despite the less than significant impact, the County would require Mitigation Measure 4.2-2 to further reduce potential impacts from PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions.

Level of Significance: Less than Significant.

Mitigation Measure: None required, but the following Mitigation Measure has been added at the request of the City of Livermore.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-2: Update Dust Control Plan

Within 90 days of proposed project approval, the Permittee shall update its existing 2015 Dust Control Plan to address changes that would occur as a result of the proposed project. The new plan shall comply with BAAQMD best practices and be approved by the County.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.6 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.3, "Biological Resources," p. 4.3-15

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.3, "Biological Resources," in response to comments received from the Alameda Creek Alliance (see Chapter 4, Comments 7-6, 7-7, and 7-8). These changes modified the language of the Environmental Setting regarding special status fish species. The following errata incorporate these revisions into Section 4.3.1.8 of the Draft SEIR.

ERRATA

Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) was designated as part of the 1996 revisions to the federal Magnuson-Stevens Act which refined the focus of fish management by emphasizing the need to protect fish habitat. EFH is defined as "...those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity." Until recently, the project area was presumed to not contain suitable aquatic habitat for coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), steelhead or other important or sensitive fish species due to the historic and ongoing disturbance to aquatic features within the project reach and downstream movement barriers that prevent fish from accessing the area. As barriers to fish passage are removed by Zone 7 and others,

the potential for steelhead to be present during project activities in the ADV may exist (Hanson et. al. 2004, as cited in Foothill Associates 2019). For this reason, ~~if determined to be necessary,~~ the Permittee ~~will~~ would be required to consult with the NMFS (pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act) and ~~potentially~~ obtain an incidental take statement for work associated with the Lake A diversion structure and realignment of the ADV.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.7 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” p. 4.3-35

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” in response to a comment received from the Alameda Creek Alliance (see Chapter 4, Comment 7-13). These changes amplified the analysis in Impact 4.3-1a to provide additional information regarding impacts to sycamore woodland, as also described in Response 7-13 (Arbor Day Foundation 2021). The following errata incorporate these revisions into Section 4.3.4.2, p. 4.3-35 of the Draft SEIR.

ERRATA

Installation of Berms Between the ADV and Lake A

Berms would be installed between Lake A and the ADV to reduce the potential for the ADV to overtop and for flood waters to flow into Lake A during reclamation operations and in future reclaimed conditions (see page 13 of Appendix B-1). An approximately 50-linear foot portion of berm to be constructed along the ADV at Lake A near Vallecitos Road would impact approximately 0.045-acre of sycamore woodland. See also a discussion of the Lake A Landscaping Plan, “Implementation of a Landscaping Plan,” regarding proposed replacement of the impacted sycamore woodland habitat, provided below.

...

Implementation of a Landscape Plan

The proposed project also includes an updated landscape plan for Lake A that features California native drought tolerant tree, shrub, and grass species that are well-adapted to Alameda County. The species chosen for inclusion in the seed mixes are intended to be self-sustaining without dependence on irrigation, or ongoing applications of soil amendments or fertilizers, provided that planting takes place in the fall and subsequent rainfall is not abnormally low. As such, irrigation should not be needed. See Appendix B-2, “Lake A Landscape Plan,” and B-3, “Lake A Landscape Plan Functions and Values Memo” for full list of species and their proposed locations as part of restoration. Table 4 in Appendix B-2 also provides a detailed list of the seed mix for revegetation.

Some elderberry bushes (not occupied by valley elderberry longhorn beetle) are located in the Lake A area near the access road (see Figure 4.3-1), but these bushes would remain and are not located in an area that would be impacted by project activities. The Lake A Landscaping Plan also includes planting and temporary irrigation of approximately 2,500 trees and shrubs and hydroseeding 53 acres of land in the Lake A area. Of the approximately 2,500 trees and shrubs, 49 new sycamore trees are proposed to replace the 0.045-acre sycamore woodland habitat that would be impacted by an approximately 50-linear foot portion of a proposed berm. The proposed ratio of replacement sycamore acreage (at maturity) to acreage impacted can be calculated using

the canopy spread of a mature sycamore, which ranges from 40 to 70 feet in diameter (Arbor Day Foundation 2021). To be conservative, the calculation will use a radius of 20 feet (half the diameter of lowest in the range), which would result in an area of 1,256 square feet per tree. When multiplied by 49, the number of proposed replacement trees, the result is 61,544 square feet, or 1.41 acres. The ratio of the proposed replacement tree acreage of 1.41 acres (at minimum) to the impacted 0.045-acre of existing sycamore woodland could therefore be simplified to approximately 634:1.

The ~~plan~~ Lake A Landscaping Plan also features a low maintenance, low water use design that is exempt from State of California Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance requirements and was designed specifically to ensure compatibility with the reclaimed end use of water management to be operated by Zone 7 (see page 14 of Appendix B-1) (Helix 2020a). Furthermore, the Lake A landscaping plan uses current revegetation methods and standards to update the approved reclamation plan with a low maintenance, low water use design (CEMEX 2019).

END OF ERRATA

3.2.8 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” p. 4.3-39

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” in response to a comment received from the Alameda Creek Alliance regarding impacts to sycamore woodland (see Chapter 4, Comment 7-13). These changes modify the analysis in Impact 4.3-1a to incorporate additional information regarding impacts to sycamore woodland, as provided in Section 3.2.7, above. The following errata incorporate these revisions into Section 4.3.4.2, p. 4.3-35 of the Draft SEIR.

ERRATA

Vegetation within this community also provides potential nesting habitat for various bird species (Foothill Associates 2019). Therefore, Lake A reclamation activities would result in a loss of habitat for special status species which potentially reside in these communities.

Although these elements would result in some habitat and surface disturbance, the disturbance or removal would overall enhance wildlife habitat by providing substantial new landscaping with native species to compensate for any existing habitat removal, the majority of which is comprised of non-native species. Furthermore, the diversion structure, including the intake (fitted with a screen to prevent fish capture or trapping), a low-head diversion dam to control water levels in the channel, a bypass structure for fish passage, a flow control structure, a conduit into Lake A, and the infiltration bed would be subject to Mitigation Measure 4.3-1a, “Obtain Regulatory Entitlements and Authorizations,” which requires the ~~Applicant~~ Permittee to obtain regulatory entitlements and authorizations from the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW.

In addition, although the approximately 50-linear foot portion of berm to be constructed along the ADV at Lake A near Vallecitos Road would impact approximately 0.045-acre of sycamore woodland habitat, the proposed Lake A Landscaping Plan includes replacing this impacted area with 49 sycamore trees. The 49 new trees would result in 1.41 acres of new habitat, thereby replacing the removed area at an approximately 634:1 ratio. No further mitigation beyond Mitigation Measure 4.3-1a is required for this impact.

Finally, impacts on special status wildlife and plant species resulting from reclamation activities would be further reduced to a less than significant level with Mitigation Measures 4.3-1b through 4.3-1h, each of which provide more than one avoidance or minimization measure specific to the group of species or habitat in question. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.9 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” p. 4.3-41

Explanation

A minor revision has been made to Mitigation Measure 4.3-1e, “Loggerhead Shrike,” in Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” to correct the required window of time for surveys to occur prior to reclamation-related ground disturbing activities.

ERRATA

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1e: Loggerhead Shrike

To avoid and minimize potential impacts to loggerhead shrike, the following shall apply:

1. *If reclamation-related ground disturbing activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) is to commence within 200 feet of suitable nesting habitat during the nesting season (February 15-August 31), then a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for loggerhead shrike nests in all suitable shrubs and trees that are within 200 feet from the construction activities. The survey shall occur within 30 days prior to the commencement of ground disturbing activities. Adjacent parcels under different land ownership will be surveyed only if access is granted or if the parcels are visible from authorized areas.*
2. *The biologist shall supply a brief written report (including date, time of survey, survey method, name of surveyor and survey results) to the Planning Department prior to the commencement of ground disturbing activity. If no active nests are found during the survey, then no further mitigation would be required.*
3. *If nesting individuals are found, then an exclusion zone shall be established within 200 feet of the active nest(s) until a qualified biologist determines that the young of the year are no longer reliant upon the nest.*
4. *Comply with the mitigation requirements and conditions of any Section 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (Agreement) with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for project reclamation activities, as applicable to the loggerhead shrike. If there is a conflict between the terms of mitigation items 1, 2, or 3 above and the Agreement, then the ~~Applicant~~ Permittee shall abide by the terms of the Agreement.*

END OF ERRATA

3.2.10 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” pp. 4.3-55 to 4.3-56

Explanation

A minor revision has been made to Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b, “Riparian Habitat,” in Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” to clarify that the required 1:1 ratio may be overridden if the regulatory permit process results in a different required ratio.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b: Riparian Habitat

Within one year of the commencement of reclamation-related ground disturbing activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) associated with the construction of the Lake A diversion structure, realigned Arroyo del Valle, or other areas identified as riparian habitat in the project biological resources assessment report, the ~~applicant~~ Permittee shall mitigate for any permanent riparian impacts at a minimum 1:1 ratio, unless the regulatory permit process results in a different ratio. The implementation of mitigation for the loss of riparian habitat may be addressed separately for each phase of reclamation (e.g., Lake A diversion structure or realigned Arroyo del Valle). Exact acreage per phase shall be determined in consultation with CDFW and other applicable regulatory requirements. Mitigation shall be accomplished by complying with the following:

1. *Enter into and comply with the mitigation requirements and conditions of a Section 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (Agreement) with CDFW.*
2. *If the Agreement results in less than a 1:1 mitigation ratio for loss of riparian habitat, then the ~~applicant~~ Permittee shall demonstrate that the riparian habitat which went unmitigated/uncompensated as a result of permitting has been mitigated through other means. Acceptable methods include purchase of credits from a mitigation bank or creation/preservation of on-site or off-site riparian habitats through the establishment of a permanent conservation easement, subject to the approval of the Planning Department.*

END OF ERRATA

3.2.11 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” pp. 4.3-58 to 4.3-59

Explanation

A minor revision has been made to Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b, “Riparian Habitat,” in Draft SEIR Section 4.3, “Biological Resources,” to clarify that the required 1:1 ratio may be overridden if the regulatory permit process results in a different required ratio.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3: 1:1 Wetland Compensation Ratio

Prior to the commencement of reclamation-related ground disturbing activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) associated with the construction of the Lake A diversion structure, realigned Arroyo del Valle, or in other areas identified as containing wetlands in the project aquatic resource delineation report, the ~~applicant~~ Permittee shall mitigate for direct and indirect wetland impacts at a 1:1 ratio, unless the regulatory permit process results in a different ratio. The implementation of mitigation for the loss of wetlands may be addressed separately for each phase of reclamation (e.g., Lake A diversion structure or realigned Arroyo del Valle). Exact acreage per phase shall be determined prior to initiating that phase based on the verification of the preliminary jurisdictional determination by the USACE and other applicable regulatory requirements. Mitigation shall be accomplished by complying with the following:

- a) *Obtain and comply with the mitigation requirements and conditions of a Section 404 Permit(s) and Section 401 Water Quality Certification(s) for reclamation activities, as applicable.*
- b) *If regulatory permitting processes result in less than a 1:1 compensation ratio for loss of wetlands, then the ~~applicant~~ Permittee shall demonstrate that the wetlands which went unmitigated/uncompensated as a result of permitting have been mitigated through other means. Acceptable methods include purchase of credits from a mitigation bank or creation/preservation*

of on-site or off-site wetlands through the establishment of a permanent conservation easement, subject to the approval of the Planning Department.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.12 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.4, “Geology and Soils,” p. 4.4-19 and 4.4-20

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.4, “Geology and Soils,” to address Zone 7 comments on the Draft SEIR requesting installation of an inclinometer (see Final SEIR Chapter 4, Comment 1-8). This change modified impact analysis for Impact 4.4-1 and Impact 4.4-2. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

Impact 4.4-1: Exposure of People or Structures to Potential Substantial Adverse Effects, Including the Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death as a Result of Rupture of a Known Fault

The project site is not located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (Geocon 2019a). No faults are on-site, and the nearest fault is 3 miles southeast of the site. The project area is in a seismically active area, with the potential for moderately strong ground shaking from sources such as the Greenville Fault. The project includes changes to the design of approved structures (e.g., spillways, underground conveyance pipes, berms). However, no new structures are proposed and no structures would be located on a fault; thus, no new risk would be introduced.

In addition, per the slope stability analysis (see Appendix E-1), the proposed slopes on-site would achieve the required factors of safety under static and seismic conditions (Geocon 2019a). Furthermore, the County would implement a Condition of Approval requiring installation of an inclinometer to a depth that extends to at least the proposed mining depth to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of users of State Route (SR) 84 and neighbors that live in Livermore. Therefore, the project’s potential to introduce substantial adverse effects as a result of rupture of a known fault is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Level of Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

Impact 4.4-2: Exposure of People or Structures to Potential Substantial Adverse Effects, Including the Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death as a Result of Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

As discussed in Impact 4.4-1, above, no new structures are proposed and the proposed slopes on-site would achieve the required factors of safety under static and seismic conditions (Geocon 2019a). Furthermore, the County would implement a Condition of Approval requiring installation of an inclinometer to a depth that extends to at least the proposed mining depth to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of users of SR 84 and neighbors that live in Livermore. Thus, no new risk would be introduced. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Level of Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.13 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.4, “Geology and Soils,” p. 4.4-20

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.4, “Geology and Soils,” to address Zone 7 comments on the Draft SEIR requesting additional surveying and installation of an inclinometer (see Final SEIR Chapter 4, Comments 1-7 and 1-8). These changes modified impact analysis for Impact 4.4-3. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

Impact 4.4-3: Exposure of People or Structures to Seismic-Related Ground Failure, Including Liquefaction, or Landslides

Portions of the site are mapped as having either the potential for liquefaction or landslides. As described in Impact 4.4-1, the project includes no new structures, and the proposed slopes on-site would achieve the required factors of safety under static and seismic conditions (Geocon 2019a and Geocon 2019b). Therefore, this impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

In response to Zone 7’s March 3, 2021 comment letter, the County would also implement two new Conditions of Approval (COAs), the first of which would require installation of an inclinometer to a depth that extends to at least the proposed mining depth to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of users of SR 84 and neighbors that live in Livermore. The second COA would require CEMEX to survey the bottom of the dry mining pits on a semi-annual basis to ensure approved mining depths are not exceeded, which could result in slope stabilities outside of what has been analyzed to date. It should be noted that these COAs address vested mining activity that is not part of the proposed project. In addition, a COA shall be required that prior to final reclamation sign-off by the County, CEMEX shall have a geotechnical report prepared to establish that the final reclamation slope on the east wall of Lake B meets the Factors of Safety that are required by SMARA.

Level of Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.14 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.4, “Geology and Soils,” p. 4.4-23

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.4, “Geology and Soils,” to address Zone 7 comments on the Draft SEIR requesting additional surveying and installation of an inclinometer (see Final SEIR Chapter 4, Comments 1-7 and 1-8). These changes modified impact analysis for Impact 4.4-5. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA**Impact 4.4-5: 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**

Impact 4.4-3, above, discusses the potential for the project to result in impacts associated with liquefaction and landslides and concludes that these potential impacts are less than significant. Further, the risk of settlement caused by earthquakes by densification of dry alluvium material at the site is considered to be low because the existing alluvial materials are generally dense, consolidated, and somewhat cemented. As discussed at Impact 4.4-1, the proposed slopes on-site would achieve the required factors of safety under static and seismic conditions (Geocon 2019a and Geocon 2019b). Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

In response to Zone 7's March 3, 2021 comment letter, the County would also implement two new Conditions of Approval (COAs), the first of which would require installation of an inclinometer to a depth that extends to at least the proposed mining depth to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of users of SR 84 and neighbors that live in Livermore. The second COA would require the Permittee to survey the bottom of the dry mining pits on a semi-annual basis to ensure approved mining depths are not exceeded, which could result in slope stabilities outside of what has been analyzed to date. However, these COAs address vested mining activity that is not part of the proposed project. In addition, a COA shall be required that prior to final reclamation sign-off by the County, CEMEX shall have a geotechnical report prepared to establish that the final reclamation slope on the east wall of Lake B meets the Factors of Safety required by SMARA.

Level of Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

END OF ERRATA**3.2.15 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.6, "Hydrology and Water Quality," p. 6.4-92 and 6.4-93****Explanation**

Revisions have been made to page 6.4-92 and 6.4-93 of Draft SEIR Section 4.6, "Hydrology and Water Quality," in response to a request made by Zone 7 to adopt their same sampling schedule and parameters. This change modified the impact analysis to include a discussion about a new COA that would require the Permittee to adopt Zone 7's sampling schedule and parameters as requested. In addition, Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 language has been revised to make the measure more enforceable. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

Once mining is completed, there would be no significant impact related to mixing of groundwater from the lower and upper aquifers with the implementation of design features discussed above and the adoption of Mitigation Measure 4.6-2, which would eliminate or reduce any impacts to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or substantial degradation to surface water or groundwater quality due to iron. In addition, ~~two or~~ up to three groundwater well monitoring locations would be added on the perimeter of Lake B to monitor groundwater quality, as required by Mitigation Measure 4.6-3. Finally, in response to comments made by Zone 7 in its March 3, 2021

letter, the Permittee has agreed to abide by a condition of approval that would require CEMEX to adopt the same sampling schedule and parameters used by Zone 7 for the proposed sentinel monitoring wells until such time as reclamation is complete and Lakes A and B are transferred to Zone 7. For these reasons, the potential impact associated with elevated iron concentrations in reclaimed lakes at the project site and water quality in the Upper and Lower Aquifers is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Level of Significance: Potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measures: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 (see Impact 4.6-1a, above).

Mitigation Measure 4.6-2: Implementation of Adaptive Management Program for Iron

The Permittee shall implement the Adaptive Management Program for Iron (see Appendix F-6 to the SEIR), which will be incorporated into conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-3: Install Lake B Groundwater Monitoring Wells

The Permittee shall install ~~two or~~ up to three groundwater monitoring wells on Lake B perimeter. ~~after~~ Permittee shall consultation on locations with Zone 7 regarding the location and specifications of these wells. ~~to inform MM 4.6-3 actions.~~ The Permittee shall provide documentation to the County that they have conducted a good faith effort of coordinating with Zone 7 regarding the amount and location of the groundwater monitoring wells.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.16 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.6, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” p. 6.4-104

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.6, “Hydrology and Water Quality.” These changes modified the cross references to mitigation measures to accurately reflect the intended measures discussed. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

To prevent any disruption to the silt caused by conveyance of water from Lake A to Lake B, with associated erosion and sedimentation, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-~~34~~ is required. Mitigation Measure 4.6-~~34~~ requires implementation of one of two options to convey water around the Lake B silt storage area, including a high-density polyethylene (HDPE) pipe connected to the Lake B pipeline turnout or a lined channel across the top of the compacted backfill surface of the silt storage facility at the east end of Lake B. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-~~34~~, erosion and siltation impacts due to conveyance of water from Lake A to Lake C and Lake A to Lake B would be less than significant.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.17 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.6, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” p. 6.4-105***Explanation***

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.6, “Hydrology and Water Quality.” These changes modified the cross references to mitigation measures to accurately reflect the intended measures discussed. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

In addition, the overflow outlet flow path and apron would be lined with riprap to mitigate the potential for erosion to occur. This stable pathway would ensure that construction of the Lake B spillway would have a less than significant impact on erosion, siltation, surface runoff that would result in flooding, polluted runoff, or impeded or redirected flood flows. However, as noted above, the conveyance of water from Lake A to Lake B could result in a significant impact in this regard. As a result, Mitigation Measure 4.6-~~34~~, below, is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

END OF ERRATA**3.2.18 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.6, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” p. 6.4-109*****Explanation***

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.6, “Hydrology and Water Quality.” These changes modified the cross references to mitigation measures to accurately reflect the intended measures discussed. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA**Impact 4.6-5: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan**

Unlike the previous thresholds of significance that require impact statements for each major component of the proposed project, this impact statement applies to the entire site and each component. Zone 7’s Alternative Plan requires implementation of the Chain of Lakes to comply with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan. The proposed reclamation plan is a component of the implementation of the Chain of Lakes. The ~~Applicant~~ Permittee would continue to adhere to all applicable plans, permits, and regulations governing water quality. During construction related to reclamation, the ~~Applicant~~ Permittee would comply with its NPDES permit (NPDES No. CAG982001), effective January 1, 2021, and Mitigation Measure 4.6-1, discussed above, which includes obtaining a Stormwater General Permit with an associated SWPPP that would require BMPs for construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measure: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 (see Impact 4.6-1a, above), 4.4-1 (see Section 4.4), 4.6-2, ~~and~~ 4.6-3 (see Impact 4.6-1d), and 4.6-4 (see Impact 4.6-3d).

END OF ERRATA

3.2.19 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.8, “Noise,” p. 4.8-20

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.8, “Noise,” to address a comment on the Draft SEIR made by the City of Livermore (see Chapter 4, “Response to Comments,” Comment 2-3), as well as correct mitigation naming consistency. The change modified the language of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, “Daily Limitation of Construction Hours,” which originally appears in Draft SEIR Section 4.1 and is repeated in Section 4.8. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

In addition, construction noise is exempt from the requirements of the Alameda County and City of Livermore noise standards provided construction activities are limited to the hours of 7 a.m. – 8 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8 a.m. – 8 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday. However, if construction activities were to occur during nighttime hours after 8 p.m., such activities would not be exempt from the local noise standards and the applicable nighttime noise level standards would be exceeded at the residences to the south of Vineyard Avenue. As a result, this nighttime noise impact is considered potentially significant. This impact would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.1-1, “Hourly Daily Limitation of Construction Activities Hours,” which is described in Section 4.1, “Aesthetics and Visual Resources,” of this SEIR.

Level of Significance: Potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.1-1: Daily Limitation of Construction Hours

(see Section 4.1, “Aesthetics and Visual Resources,” of this SEIR)

All ~~construction~~ reclamation-related construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. – 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8 a.m. – 6 p.m. on Saturday. Reclamation construction activity shall be prohibited on ~~and~~ Sundays.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than significant.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.20 Errata to Draft SEIR Section 4.8, “Noise,” p. 4.8-22

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Section 4.8, “Noise,” to address a comment on the Draft SEIR made by the City of Livermore (see Chapter 4, “Response to Comments,” Comment 2-4), as well as correct mitigation naming consistency. This change modified the language of Mitigation Measure 4.8-2, “Notice of Activities.” The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

Mitigation Measure: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-1, “Hourly Daily Limitation of Construction Activities Hours” (see Section 4.1, “Aesthetics and Visual Resources,” of this SEIR)

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1a: Notice of Activities

All residences within 500 feet of the conduit and pipeline installation components of the proposed project and the City of Livermore Community Development Department should be provided notice of the pipeline installation schedule and informed that short-term periods of elevated daytime ambient

noise levels could occur during that period. The notice shall be sent no less than one week prior to construction activities.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.21 Errata to Draft SEIR Chapter 7, “Other CEQA Topics,” p. 7-3

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Chapter 7, “Other CEQA Topics,” to address a new mitigation measure, as discussed in Section 4.3.3. These changes modified impact analysis and mitigation for Impact 7-2b. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

Impact 7-2b: Impacts that are Individually Limited but Cumulatively Considerable: Criteria Pollutants ROG, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}

Section 4.2, “Air Quality,” and Chapter 5, “Cumulative Impacts,” of this SEIR evaluate the proposed project’s potential impacts to air quality, including an evaluation of cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutants. As described in Section 4.2 and Chapter 5, proposed project operations associated with reclamation would emit criteria air pollutants, including reactive-organic gases (ROG), NO_x, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SO_x), respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀), and particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) from construction equipment and from mobile equipment and motor vehicles associated with excavation, grading/fill, and construction of water management facilities at Lakes A and B.

Section 4.2 presents the daily and annual criteria air pollutants and ozone precursor emissions analyses. The modeling results from *the Air and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Study’s* (Appendix C-1) indicate that project criteria pollutant emissions are below applicable BAAQMD thresholds of significance for CEQA except for daily emissions of NO_x. Therefore, the proposed project’s estimated ROG, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions would constitute a less than significant impact.

Despite the less than significant impact, the County would require Mitigation Measure 4.2-2 to further reduce potential impacts from PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions.

Level of Significance: Less than Significant.

Mitigation Measure: None required, but the following Mitigation Measure has been added at the request of the City of Livermore, as originally presented in Section 4.2, “Air Quality.”

Mitigation Measure 4.2-2: Update Dust Control Plan

Within 90 days of proposed project approval, the Permittee shall update its existing 2015 Dust Control Plan to address changes that would occur as a result of the proposed project. The new plan shall comply with BAAQMD best practices and be approved by the County.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.22 Errata to Draft SEIR Chapter 7, “Other CEQA Topics,” p. 7-5

Explanation

Revisions have been made to Draft SEIR Chapter 7, “Other CEQA Topics,” to address a new mitigation measure, as discussed in Section 4.3.3, and mitigation measure naming consistency for Mitigation Measure 4.4-1. These changes modified relevant mitigation measures for Impact 7-3. The following errata incorporate these revisions.

ERRATA

The SEIR and Initial Study jointly state that the proposed project’s impacts on greenhouse gas emissions, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation/traffic, and utilities would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant.

Mitigation Measures: Relevant mitigation measures required to reduce most of this impact to a less than significant level include:

- Mitigation Measure 4.1-1: ~~Hourly~~ Daily Limitation of Construction ~~Activities~~ Hours. See Section 4.1, “Aesthetics and Visual Resources.”
- Mitigation Measure 4.2-1: Off-road Equipment Plan. See Section 4.2, “Air Quality.”
- Mitigation Measure 4.2-2: Update Dust Control Plan
- Mitigation Measure 4.4-1: Erosion Control Plan. See Section 4.4, “Geology and Soils.”
- Mitigation Measure 4.4-2: Berm and Embankment Grading.
- Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: Embankment Fill Slope Geometry
- Mitigation Measure 4.4-4: Cut Slope of Lake B Adjacent to Realigned ADV
- Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a: Idling Times. See Section 4.5, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions.”
- Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b: Idling Times for Diesel-powered Equipment.
- Mitigation Measure 4.5-1c: Equipment Maintenance.
- Mitigation Measure 4.5-1d: Alternative Fuel Plan.
- Mitigation Measure 4.5-1e: Local Building Materials.
- Mitigation Measure 4.5-1f: Recycle or Reuse Construction and Demolition Materials.
- Mitigation Measure 4.5-1g: On-site material hauling.
- Mitigation Measure 4.5-1h: Generator Alternative Fuel.
- Mitigation Measure 4.6-1: Development of SWPPP. See Section 4.6, “Hydrology and Water Quality.”
- Mitigation Measure 4.6-2: Implementation of Adaptive Management Program for Iron
- Mitigation Measure 4.6-3: Conveyance to Avoid Lake B Silt Storage Area
- Mitigation Measure 4.8-1a: Notice of Activities. See Section 4.8, “Noise.”
- Mitigation Measure 4.8-1b: Mufflers.

END OF ERRATA

3.2.23 Errata to Draft SEIR Appendix A-3, “Comments on NOP”***Explanation***

The Draft SEIR Appendix A-3, “Comments on the NOP,” inadvertently excluded a comment letter from NMFS. This comment letter is included in Final SEIR Appendix B, “Errata to Comments on the NOP,” to include the letter in the record. No errata are needed below to incorporate this revision. See Appendix B of the Final SEIR.