

Chapter 2

Environmental Checklist

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Project Title: | County of El Dorado Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update |
| 2. Lead Agency Name and Address: | County of El Dorado
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667 |
| 3. Contact Person and Phone Number: | Shawna Purvines
(530) 621-5362 |
| 4. Project Location: | The County of El Dorado, California |
| 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: | County of El Dorado
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667 |
| 6. General Plan Designation: | Various |
| 7. Zoning: | Various |
| 8. Description of Project: | |

The County of El Dorado (County) is proposing a limited number of targeted amendments to its 2004 General Plan and the adoption of a comprehensive update to the Zoning Ordinance. Targeted General Plan Amendments (TGPA) mostly consist of proposed policy revisions for the Land Use Element; Transportation and Circulation Element; Public Services and Utilities Element; Public Health, Safety and Noise Element; Conservation and Open Space Element; and Agriculture and Forestry Element.

The proposed comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update has two components: One, revising the zoning maps to bring existing zoning designations into conformance with the General Plan, and, two, providing a comprehensive update of the text of the Zoning Ordinance Update to bring conformance with the General Plan and to modernize implementation tools.

This project consists of proposed changes to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Update. It does not include any specific development projects.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project affects those portions of unincorporated El Dorado County that are under the jurisdiction of the County. Land uses include the low-density residential communities along the U.S. Highway 50 corridor (i.e., El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park), with their associated commercial areas; rural agricultural areas that include grazing lands, vineyards, and orchards; rural residential or estate residential; forested agricultural areas; and low-density residential development within the Lake Tahoe basin. The project does not include the incorporated cities of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe, nor does it include land under federal jurisdiction, such as within Eldorado National Forest.

10. Other Public Agencies whose Approval Is Required:

The TGPA and comprehensive zoning update for El Dorado County are subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors. No other public agency approvals are required.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project (i.e., the project would involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact”) as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

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

Determination: (to be completed by the lead agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- 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 to 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 an impact on the environment that is “potentially significant” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For County of El Dorado

Aesthetics

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

Setting

The County of El Dorado, located in east-central California, encompasses 1,805 square miles of rolling hills and mountainous terrain. The county’s western boundary contains part of Folsom Lake, and the eastern boundary is also the California-Nevada state line. The county is topographically divided into two zones. The northeast corner of the county is in the Lake Tahoe basin, while the remainder of the county is in the “western slope” of the Sierra Nevada, the area west of Echo Summit. A large portion of the county is within the jurisdiction of Eldorado National Forest, which supports recreational and forestry activities.

The areas under County jurisdiction include low-density suburbs, small rural communities, rolling grazing lands, and hills and valleys supporting rural residential and agricultural activities. The overall aesthetic setting, particularly outside of the urbanized areas such as El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park, is one of rural open space (often composed of working landscapes), forested ridgelines, and mountain vistas (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

The overall population of the county is not expected to change as a result of the Targeted General Plan Amendments (TGPA) or Zoning Ordinance Update, nor will development expand beyond those areas already identified for future development on the current General Plan. However, proposed TGPA policies allowing higher density development in areas designated for high-density residential or mixed uses in community areas and rural communities would potentially result in new multi-

story structures. Proposed Chapter 17.34 Outdoor Lighting of the Zoning Ordinance Update would help reduce the light and glare effects associated with new development.

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Multi-story residential or mixed-use buildings in areas that are presently developed with single- and double-story buildings could potentially affect views of surrounding hills and open spaces. This will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?

A portion of State Highways 50 and 89 are designated state scenic highways within the County of El Dorado. Proposed changes in the TGPA or Zoning Ordinance Update would not increase the potential for substantial damage beyond the potential under the existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Update. However, new development will occur under the requirements and standards of the TGPA and comprehensive zoning update, altering the existing environment, and may result in effects on existing scenic resources along these highways. The potential for change is greatest along the Highway 50 corridor. This will be addressed in the EIR.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Allowing commercial and industrial uses in the Rural Regions, along with the presences of multi-story structures, could potentially alter the character of rural communities. This will be addressed in the EIR.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

New development under the TGPA and comprehensive zoning update could increase the potential for increased light or glare beyond existing levels. This may be a significant effect and will be addressed in the EIR.

Agricultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts on 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. Would the project:</p>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The County of El Dorado has an active agricultural economy in its rural areas. This includes an active wine industry and the agriculture associated with the Apple Hill area (largely fruits and nuts). In 2010, gross crop value in the County was approximately \$35 million, including timber harvesting on public and private lands. Total estimated economic value to the County was \$360 million, of which approximately \$158 million derived from the wine industry and \$108 million from business associated with Apple Hill. The top five agricultural commodities in the County in 2010, by proportion of the overall gross crop value, were: fruits and nuts (30%), livestock (22%), wine grapes (17%), hay and pasture (12%) and Christmas trees (7%) (The County of El Dorado Agricultural Commissioner 2010).

According to the Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, The County of El Dorado contains large amounts of grazing land (193,833 acres), a smaller amount of Farmland of Local Importance (59,565 acres), and relatively small amounts of land identified as Prime Farmland (661 acres), Farmland of Statewide Importance (827 acres), and Unique Farmland (3,206 acres) (California Department of Conservation).

Impact Discussion

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 nonagricultural use?

A small amount of agricultural land is converted in the County of El Dorado each year as a result of suburbanization or land being removed from production. The provisions of the Zoning Ordinance Update related to farm businesses are intended to provide an economic incentive to farmers to retain their land in agriculture by providing alternative sources of income. The project may result in substantial conversions, because of the option to allow for increased business opportunities on areas currently designated for agriculture and not current designated for development. There will be a potential significant impact.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?

The Zoning Ordinance Update will ensure that lands under Williamson Act contracts retain the appropriate zoning. Accordingly there would be no conflict and no impact.

c. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?

The existing General Plan contains policies to protect agricultural operations from incompatible land uses. The proposed project will only strengthen these policies. However, the project may result in substantial conversions, because of the option to allow for increased business opportunities on areas currently designated for agriculture and not current designated for development. There will be a potential significant impact.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>III. AIR QUALITY. When 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. Would the project:</p>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a non-attainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The area of potential impact is in the Mountain Counties Air Basin, and air pollutant emissions from most stationary sources and some mobile sources are regulated by the County of El Dorado Air Quality Management District (AQMD). Most mobile sources in the County (e.g. motor vehicles) are under the jurisdiction of the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The AQMD regulates air quality through the federal and state Clean Air Act, district rules, and its own permitting authority. At the same time, counties within the Sacramento Area (Sacramento, Yolo, and portions of Placer, El Dorado, Solano, and Sutter) are under the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality

Management District (SMAQMD) and have adopted the 2009 Sacramento Metropolitan Area 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Ozone Plan). This plan outlines strategies to achieve the health-based ozone standard. The Sacramento Region is also in the process of developing a plan to address Particulate Matter (PM).

The greenhouse gases primarily generated by vehicle exhaust and fossil fuel combustion are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrogen oxide (N₂O).

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) estimates that CO₂ accounts for more than 75% of all anthropogenic (i.e., man-made) Green House Gas (GHG) emissions. Three quarters of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions are the result of fossil fuel burning, and approximately one quarter of emissions are the result of land-use change (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2007). CH₄ is the second largest contributor of anthropogenic GHG emissions and is the result of growing rice, raising cattle, combustion, and mining coal (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 2005). N₂O, while not as abundant as CO₂ or CH₄, is a powerful GHG. Sources of N₂O include agricultural processes, nylon production, fuel-fired power plants, nitric acid production, and vehicle emissions.

In order to simplify reporting and analysis, the IPCC defines the global warming potential of various GHG emissions on a normalized scale that recasts all GHG emissions in terms of CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e), which compares the gas in question to that of the same mass of CO₂ (CO₂ has a Global Warming Potential (GWP) of 1 by definition).

The SMAQMD's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County* establishes analysis expectations with regard to GHG emissions in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents (Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District 2009). The district recommends that an analysis of potential impacts of project-generated GHG emissions should include a description of GHGs, summary of existing regulations, and a discussion of GHG emissions sources in the project area. The guidelines further state that the analysis quantifies the mass emissions associated with project construction and operations. Although the Guidelines recommend GHG emissions should be quantified, they do not establish a set emissions thresholds. Rather, they state that the Lead Agency should determine a threshold appropriate to the project using either thresholds adopted by other agencies or their own. Finally, the SMAQMD requires that CEQA documents make a conclusion as to the significance of project-related GHG emissions and identify feasible mitigation measures. The El Dorado AQMD does not currently contain any guidance for the analysis of climate change impacts.

Impact Discussion

Although the proposed TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not substantially increase the area proposed for future development under the General Plan, development under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would increase the intensity of development relative to existing conditions in some areas.

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. However, the TGPA will encourage higher density development within high-density residential and mixed-use developments in community regions, rural communities, and infill locations. This may result in increased traffic and a related increase in emissions.

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Future development will not vary substantially from the existing General Plan, which has been accounted for in the SMAQMD's air pollutant emissions inventories. As a result, no conflict is expected to occur and there would be no impact.

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Future development projects will be subject to the County of El Dorado AQMD rules and best management practices. No new land uses not currently allowed would be allowed as a result of the project. No violations of air quality standards are expected to occur as a result of the project, and there would be no impact.

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Development under the existing General Plan will increase criteria pollutant emissions. The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update do not propose any reductions in development potential over the existing General Plan. Therefore, they are expected to increase pollutant emissions over existing conditions. This will be addressed in the EIR.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Development under the existing General Plan may expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, including "hot spot" emissions. The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update do not propose any reductions in development potential over the existing General Plan. Therefore, future development projects under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update may likewise result in the exposure of sensitive receptors. This will be addressed in the EIR.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The project does not include any specific development proposals. Objectionable odors depend on the type of project being proposed (e.g., wastewater treatment plant, feedlot, tannery). At this time, there is no proposal that would result in the creation of new objectionable odors. No new land uses not currently allowed would be amended as a result of the project. There would be no impact.

f. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

The County is in the process of analyzing the project's potential to emit GHGs. Because global climate change is a cumulative impact (i.e., the result of many contributions, most or all of which may be less than significant when viewed individually) emissions that are small in comparison to total global emissions may nonetheless be significant. In an abundance of caution, this Environmental Checklist assumes that the analysis will result in a conclusion that the emissions will be significant. This topic will be analyzed in more detail in the EIR.

g. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The two most applicable GHG plans to the proposed project are AB 32 and SB 375. AB 32 is designed to reduce California's GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the 2020. SB 375 requires the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy that addresses how the regions will obtain emissions reductions targets established by the Air Resource Board (ARB). SACOG adopted its Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) to comply with SB 375 in April 2012.

The proposed project will be consistent with the 2012 MTP, which in turn complies with SB 375. This Environmental Checklist assumes that the analysis will result in a conclusion that the emissions will be significant. The EIR will analyze if the project will conform to the general reduction policy established by AB 32 in more detail. In an abundance of caution, this Environmental Checklist has indicated that the impact may be significant; which shall be determined after further analysis.

Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

As discussed in the EIR certified for the current General Plan (from which much of the following summary is excerpted), the County of El Dorado possesses a diversity of habitats and native flora

and fauna. The physical features that support these diverse habitats include a wide range of elevations and varied terrain, diverse soils, large tracts of contiguous natural habitat, and a range of climatic conditions. Habitats are generally distributed in an integrated mosaic pattern across the County. Coniferous forest is dominant at higher elevations in the eastern portion of the County, including the Lake Tahoe Basin; oak and hardwood habitats are found mostly in the central region; and annual grassland, chaparral, agriculture, and urban development is found primarily in the western third of the County.

The array of habitats in the County of El Dorado supports abundant and diverse fauna. For example, Sierran mixed conifer habitat alone, the most common habitat in the County, supports 355 species of animals. Oak woodlands provide habitat for more than 100 species of birds, 60 species of mammals, 80 species of amphibians and reptiles, and 5,000 species of insects. Blue oak-foothill pine, another major habitat type in the County of El Dorado, provides suitable breeding habitat for 29 species of amphibians and reptiles, 79 species of birds, and 22 species of mammals. In addition, unique habitat exists for a number of special-status plant species.

Water bodies within and bordering the County of El Dorado support numerous species of native and introduced game and nongame fish. Historically, steelhead and other anadromous fishes have been prevented from upstream migration on the South Fork of the American River above Salmon Falls and, later, Folsom Dam. Important habitat for anadromous fishes on the Cosumnes River is located downstream of the section of the river that flows through the County (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

a. through f.

Future development consistent with the project will not vary substantially from the existing General Plan, particularly in relation to the area projected for future development. However, there may be impacts from the expansion of rural commerce opportunities and that development may result in losses of habitat relative to existing conditions and the associated impacts on special-status species. The project may result in significant impacts in this regard. This will be addressed in the EIR.

Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Prehistoric and Ethnographic Setting

The project area is located in the Sierra Nevada foothills, adjacent to the Sacramento Valley. Little archaeological evidence has been found that indicates human use of the area during the late Pleistocene and early Holocene eras (14,000–6,000 B.P.). This lack of evidence is likely due to data gaps in the archaeological record rather than indicating that the area was not used. Most Pleistocene- and early Holocene-era sites in the Sacramento Valley area are deeply buried in accumulated gravels and silts or have eroded away. More archaeological information is available about people in the area beginning in the mid-Holocene (5000 B.P.). Between 5000 B.P. and the mid-1800s, native Californians utilized the area, developing a broad hunter-gatherer subsistence strategy and a diverse technology base.

The indigenous people that occupied the project area at the time of European contact are called the Nisenan, or Southern Maidu. The Nisenan language, together with the languages of the Maidu and Konkow, their northern neighbors, form the Maiduan language family (Kroeber 1925). Ethnographic information on the Nisenan is summarized in Wilson and Towne (1978).

Early Nisenan contact with Europeans appears to have been limited to the southern reaches of the Nisenan’s territory when Spanish expeditions began to cross Nisenan territory during the early 1800s. Unlike the valley Nisenan, the groups in the foothills remained relatively unaffected by the European presence until the discovery of gold at Coloma in 1848. In the 2 or 3 years following the gold discovery, Nisenan territory was overrun by settlers from all over the world. Gold seekers and the settlements that sprang up to support them were nearly fatal to the native inhabitants. The

sudden onslaught of humanity brought disease and violent conflict to the indigenous groups who lived in the area. Survivors lived on the edges of foothill towns, where they worked as wage laborers and domestic help. Nisenan still live in the County of El Dorado today and have made great strides in regenerating their culture.

Historic Context

The County of El Dorado is one of the original 27 counties created by the California State Legislature in 1850. Originally, the County's boundaries included parts of present-day Amador, Alpine, and Placer Counties. By 1919, the state had adopted the current boundary lines that are marked to the east by the state of Nevada and to the west by Sacramento County. The American and Cosumnes Rivers form the County's northern and southern boundaries. The original County seat was the town of Coloma, but in 1857 the County seat was moved to Placerville (Coy 1973:97-99; Hoover et al. 1990:71).

On January 24, 1848, James W. Marshall, an employee of John A. Sutter, discovered gold near the area of present-day Coloma. The first mining town in California sprouted soon after his discovery, and the gold region of the County of El Dorado experienced rapid growth. It was likely Marshall's discovery, as well as gold discovered by others, from which the County derives its name, El Dorado, meaning "the gilded man" in Spanish (Hoover et al. 1990:71-72).

For many years during and after the Gold Rush, gold mining was the predominant industry in the County of El Dorado. The County lies on a rich ore vein that extends through several counties on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada. By the turn of the twentieth century, lumbering, raising livestock, and farming had joined mining as the principal industries of the County.

Impact Discussion

Although the proposed TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not substantially increase the area proposed for future development under the General Plan, development under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update may change existing conditions by increasing the intensity of development relative to existing conditions.

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update do not include any specific development project. As a result, their effect on any specific resource cannot be determined. At the same time, the potential for future demolition of historic structures cannot be discounted. Therefore, development under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update may result in a substantial adverse change. This will be addressed in the EIR.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update do not include any specific development project. As a result, their effect on any specific resource cannot be determined. At the same time, the potential for a substantial adverse change in an archaeological resource cannot be completely discounted. Therefore, development under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update may result in a substantial adverse change. This will be addressed in the EIR.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update do not include any specific development project. Consequently, their effect on any specific resource cannot be determined. The potential for paleontological resources is low, given the underlying geology of the County. Therefore, development under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in a substantial adverse change. This will be addressed in the EIR.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update do not include any specific development project. Consequently, their effect on any specific resource cannot be determined. However, state regulations requiring the reporting and proper respectful handling of human remains uncovered during construction activities avoid this impact (see California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98). Therefore, development under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update is not expected to result in a significant effect. This will be addressed in the EIR.

Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. 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"/>
2. Strong seismic groundshaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 an onsite or offsite 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 wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The County of El Dorado is in the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California between the Great Valley province to the west and the Basin and Range province to the east. The Sierra Nevada province consists of Pliocene and older deposits that have been uplifted as a result of plate tectonics, granitic intrusion, and volcanic activity. Subsequent glaciation and additional volcanic activity led to the general east-west orientation of stream channels.

Seismic activity can cause hazards associated with seismically induced fault displacement and rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides, avalanches, and structural hazards, depending on soil and geologic conditions. Historical seismic activity and fault and seismic hazards mapping in the County indicate that the County has relatively low potential for seismic activity. No active faults have been mapped in the County, and none of the known inactive faults has been designated as an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The distribution of known faults in The County of El Dorado is concentrated in the western portion of the County, with several isolated faults in the central County area and the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The Seismic Hazard Mapping Act requires the State Geological Survey to prepare maps illustrating areas of geologic hazard, including potential landslide areas. The mapping program has centered on the state's major urban areas and no maps are available for the County of El Dorado (EDAW 2003).

The County requires a soils/geotechnical report to be prepared for commercial projects and certain nondiscretionary residential projects (i.e., projects where fill material is placed onsite, a cut or fill exceeding 10 feet in depth, or projects that increase soil-bearing values). All discretionary development must also conduct a soils/geotechnical study; these projects must further comply with all provisions current County standards and manuals. Report for tentative maps that "shall define the suitability for a tract with regard to waste discharge, building foundations, grading and drainage, traffic circulation, and passive solar opportunities." The soils and geology component of the report is required to include the following information.

- Groundwater effects on slope stability.
- Seismic risks.
- Earth movement unrelated to seismicity (e.g., landslides).
- Expansive soils.

Impact Discussion

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death from geologic activity?

The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects due to rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides. Future specific development projects under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update will be subject to standard requirements under the California Building Code designed to reduce risk from geologic activity to acceptable levels. There would be no impact.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Future projects under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update are not expected to result in substantial soil erosion or topsoil loss, because they will be subject to regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) designed specifically to prevent erosion or topsoil loss from occurring. A list of the general orders of the Lahontan and Central Valley RWQCBs, including those applicable to construction activities, **is attached**. As a result of these requirements, any impact would be less than significant.

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 an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Future projects under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update are not expected to result in substantial unstable soil or geologic units prone to landslide, slumping, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse because projects will be subject to the requirements of the current California Building Code. This code includes requirements for preparation of geotechnical reports on which to base construction design for projects that are greater than one story and 4,000 square feet in area. Any impact would be less than significant.

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?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Future projects under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update will be subject to the requirements of the California Building Code and therefore are not expected to result in substantial impact.

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Future projects will be required to comply with County regulations on the use of septic tanks and wastewater disposal and therefore are not expected to result in substantial impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling 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 that 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.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and 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.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The County of El Dorado does not have any sites listed on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC) "Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List—Site Cleanup (Cortese List)" database (DTSC 2012). The State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker database lists more than 310 clean-up sites in the County of El Dorado related to underground storage tanks, most of which have been remediated and the case has been closed (State Water Resources Control Board 2012).

Most hazardous materials regulation and enforcement in the County of El Dorado are overseen by the County of El Dorado Environmental Management Department, which serves as the state-designated "certified unified program agency" (CUPA) responsible for administering state regulations regarding the permitting, notification, and clean-up of hazardous materials. Large cases of hazardous materials contamination or violations are referred to the Lahontan RWQCB and DTSC for remediation enforcement. Other agencies, such as the County of El Dorado AQMD and the federal and state Occupational Safety and Health Administrations, may also be involved when issues related to hazardous materials arise.

State regulations require the preparation of preliminary environmental assessments of sites with known or suspected hazardous material contamination in order to assess the need for clean-up. Remediation would be required prior to development.

The County of El Dorado adopted its Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan on March 29, 2005. The plan establishes the County's approach to hazard reduction and emergency response. It has been approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). In 2009, the County General Plan was amended to integrate the Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan into the Public Safety, Health and Noise Element.

Substantial portions of the County of El Dorado are identified as moderate, high, and very high fire risk on the Fire Hazard Severity Zones map adopted by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Agency in 2007. The California Building Code (including the California Fire Code) and regulations adopted by the California Building Standards Commission (Title 24, Section 701A.3.2 New Buildings Located in Any Fire Hazard Severity Zone, California Code of Regulations) require that new construction in fire hazard zones be constructed of fire-resistant materials and that "defensible space" be maintained around all structures, including existing buildings. These requirements are enforced by the County of El Dorado Building Safety Services Division through the issuance and inspection of building permits. The County of El Dorado subdivision ordinance contains provisions for denying any proposed subdivision that would expose occupants or neighbors of the subdivision to excessive fire risk (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. Future projects under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would involve small quantities of commonly used materials, such as fuels and oils, to operate construction equipment. However, because standard construction best management practices would be implemented to

avoid the release of pollutants during construction of the proposed project, this impact is considered less than significant. Any potentially contaminated areas, if encountered during construction, will be evaluated by a qualified hazardous material specialist in the context of applicable County and state regulations. In addition, the TGPA would allow commercial and industrial uses in rural regions. This would result in the storage of hazardous materials in areas where they are not currently allowed. Storage and use of hazardous materials is regulated by state law, which requires the preparation and filing of hazardous materials plans with the County Environmental Management Department. The existing regulatory scheme would ensure that hazardous materials are properly handled and stored. The impact would be less than significant.

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?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . There are no reasonably foreseeable circumstances under which the project would create a hazard to the public or the environment through upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. There would be no impact.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . There are no reasonably foreseeable circumstances under which the project would result in the emission of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school, existing or proposed.

d. Be located on a site that 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?

There are listed sites within the County of El Dorado, particularly leaking underground storage tanks. No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Future development under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would be subject to County and state regulations governing development on listed sites. There would be no impact.

e. Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Future projects under the proposed project would be subject to the restrictions set out in the County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan and in proposed Section 17.17.020 (Airport Safety Combining Zone) of the Zoning Ordinance Update . Therefore, there would be no impact.

f. Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . The proposed TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not change land use designations in the areas of private airstrips and therefore would not result in an impact.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update are consistent with the Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. There would be no impact.

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?

Large portions of the County of El Dorado are identified as susceptible to fire hazard. No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Future development projects under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would be required to comply with County and state regulations that would reduce fire risk to acceptable levels. The impact would be less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The major water supply source in the County of El Dorado is surface water diverted from rivers, streams and reservoirs, and conveyed to water users via canals and, after treatment, pipelines. Access to groundwater is relatively limited (compared with access to surface water) as a result of geologic conditions and the related fragmented/fractured rock groundwater system found in the County, although groundwater remains the primary source of water in rural areas. Water supply availability is a function of natural conditions, such as climate (precipitation and evaporation), soil permeability, topography, and hydrogeology (including the capacity, location, and quality of aquifers), as well as management activities such as the construction and operation of distribution, storage, and treatment facilities.

Surface water on the west slope of the County of El Dorado is contained in three principal watersheds: the Middle Fork American River, the South Fork American River, and the Cosumnes River. The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), Georgetown Divide Public Utilities District (GDPUD), and Grizzly Flats Community Services District (GFCSD) manage domestic water supplies for the west slope, with EID serving by far the largest number of customers. These agencies also provide surface water to a majority of the irrigated agricultural land in the County. Water for the remaining agricultural areas comes from small water systems that obtain their supply from community systems, individual groundwater wells, and riparian diversions.

Surface water quality is regulated by the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board (WQCB) and, for the Tahoe Basin, Lahontan Regional WQCBs. Potential sources for diminished surface water quality include urban runoff, wastewater treatment plant operations, construction activities, and agricultural runoff. The RWQCBs regulate urban runoff, waste discharges from wastewater treatment plants, and construction activities (these are also regulated by the County under its grading and erosion control standards and management practices recommended by the Agricultural Commissioner and approved by the Board of Supervisors) through general permits and general orders (for timber harvesting, irrigated agricultural lands, and food processors, for example), as well as individual waste discharge requirements (for treatment plants, for example) (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Future development projects will be required to comply with the regulatory requirements

of the RWQCBs and County ordinance standards. The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not have an impact.

- b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. General plan policies require that site-specific developments with substantial water needs occur only in community areas and rural communities where adequate utilities are available. Water purveyors in the County of El Dorado rely primarily on surface water supplies, so future projects would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. The project would have no impact.

- 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?***

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. Future projects under the proposed project would be subject to the general order regulations to minimize construction-related erosion set out by the RWQCBs, as well as County grading and erosion control standards. No specific development projects are being proposed as part of this action that would substantially alter existing drainage patterns. Altering the course of a stream or river would require discretionary permits, such as a Streambed Alteration Agreement (Department of Fish and Game) or a Section 404 permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers), that would require a project-specific California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis. The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update project would have no impact.

- 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 onsite or offsite?***

The County of El Dorado participates in the National Flood Insurance Program and limits development within floodplains by ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance Update includes Chapter 17.32 Flood Damage Protection, which will impose restrictions on development necessary to ensure the County's continued participation in the federal program. This includes ensuring that development projects do not result in downstream flooding. Altering the course of a stream or river would require discretionary permits, such as a Streambed Alteration Agreement (Department of Fish and Game) or a Section 404 permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers), that would require a project-specific CEQA or NEPA analysis. If the project would potentially result in onsite or offsite flooding, that impact would be identified and mitigated as part of the CEQA or NEPA process. Impacts from development under the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update associated with the alteration of drainages are considered to be less than significant.

- 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?***

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. The County subdivision ordinance will require that future development projects include

sufficient stormwater drainage provisions to handle the runoff from those projects. The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would have no impact.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. Future development will be subject to state and local regulations that protect water quality. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

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?

The County of El Dorado participates in the National Flood Insurance Program and limits development within floodplains by ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance Update includes Chapter 17.32 Flood Damage Protection, which will impose restrictions on development necessary to ensure the County's continued participation in the federal program. This project will not result in the designation of lands within the floodplain for development that are now not designated for development. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?

The County of El Dorado participates in the National Flood Insurance Program and limits development within floodplains by ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance Update includes Chapter 17.32 Flood Damage Protection, which will impose restrictions on development necessary to ensure the County's continued participation in the federal program. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

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?

The County of El Dorado participates in the National Flood Insurance Program and limits development within floodplains. This project will not result in the designation of lands within the floodplain for development that are now not designated for development. The Zoning Ordinance Update includes Chapter 17.32 Flood Damage Protection and Section 17.27.040 Dam Failure Inundation Combining Zone, which will impose the necessary restrictions on development to ensure the County's continued participation in the federal program and establish enforceable restrictions on new development in any dam failure inundation area. Section 17.27.040 implements existing General Plan Policy 6.4.2 Dam Failure Inundation.

Currently there are 59 dams in the County of El Dorado that are listed in the National Inventory of Dams. Of these, nine dams in the County are classified as High Hazard Potential and 35 dams are classified Medium Hazard Potential. This does not suggest dams will fail; only that if they do they could result in inundation hazards. In addition, one dam in Amador County classified as a High Hazard Potential class dam may inundate inhabitants in the County of El Dorado in the unlikely event of a dam failure. The County has mapped those areas subject to inundation in the case of a dam failure. The proposed amendments will not substantially change the existing regulatory environment and increase existing risks. These impacts are considered to be less than significant.

j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

This project will not result in the designation of areas subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow for development that are now not designated for development. This impact would be less than significant.

Land Use and Planning

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
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, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or Zoning Ordinance Update) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Setting

The physical environment of the County of El Dorado is an important influence on its land use and development patterns. The most important physical features affecting development are the Sierra Nevada range, U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50), large areas of the County dominated by forestland, and Lake Tahoe. The Sierra Nevada divides the County of El Dorado into two distinct topographic areas—the western slope and Lake Tahoe Basin. The western slope extends from the Sacramento County line on the west to the summit of the Sierra Nevada on the east and contains most of the developed land and most of the forest land in the County. Development on the western slope is concentrated near the western County line and along U.S. 50. The density of residential and commercial development gradually decreases and the amount of open space (agricultural fields and forestland) increases heading east from the foothills to the Sierra Nevada summit. Placerville, located approximately 15 miles east of the County line, is the only incorporated city on the western slope.

The Lake Tahoe Basin extends from the eastern side of the Sierra Nevada to the California-Nevada border. This mountainous area is characterized physically by rugged and steep terrain. The focal point of the eastern slope is the Lake Tahoe Basin, the southwest quadrant of which is in the County of El Dorado. The County’s only other incorporated city, South Lake Tahoe, is located at the southern tip of Lake Tahoe.

U.S. 50 bisects the County of El Dorado, traveling east-west from Sacramento County through Placerville to and past the California-Nevada border just south of Lake Tahoe. Historically, development in the County has closely followed this route, with the densest development in the west. The cities, towns, and developments along this corridor include El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Shingle Springs, Placerville, Pollock Pines, and South Lake Tahoe. In addition to being a development

pathway, U.S. 50 is a major transportation corridor for residents living in the County of El Dorado and working in Sacramento County and for recreation-related traffic generated in areas outside of the County.

One reason for the clustering of development in the western portion of the County is the expanse of forestland that covers much of the eastern two-thirds of the County. Most of this land is within the Eldorado National Forest, administered by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS); other areas are privately owned commercial timberland. Towns and individual residences are scattered throughout these areas. For the most part, any pockets of substantive development in the area east of Placerville are clustered along the U.S. 50 corridor.

Outside the U.S. 50 corridor, western-slope development follows the other two main highways in the County: State routes (SR) 49 and 193. SR 49 crosses the County from north to south and connects many of the original boom towns founded during the California Gold Rush. This route is a prime tourist destination, and the City of Placerville and the towns of Cool, Pilot Hill, Coloma, Lotus, Diamond Springs, and El Dorado promote the mining heritage of the region with museums, historic districts, and commercial areas. SR 193 crosses the northern part of the County of El Dorado from SR 49 to Greenwood and Georgetown, then turns south through Kelsey and into Placerville. The Pleasant Valley & Rural Center areas along E16 may be potentially affected by expanded agricultural districts, opportunity areas, and the optional policy language that could allow some commercial or industrial uses in the rural regions.

A large portion of territory in the County is not subject to the County government's land use planning decisions. Approximately 46% of the land within the County is administered or owned by governmental entities that are not subject to the jurisdiction of the County. The largest non-jurisdictional landowners are the federal government (USFS and Bureau of Land Management) and the State of California (Department of Parks and Recreation and University of California). The Shingle Springs Rancheria of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians is treated as a sovereign nation under federal law. The cities of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe are also considered non-jurisdictional lands because the cities serve as the planning authority within their own city boundaries.

The County's adopted General Plan, zoning, subdivision, and grading ordinances, as well as other related County standards, guide land use decision-making within the County of El Dorado. Pursuant to California law (Government Code Section 65302, et seq.), the General Plan establishes the County's policies regarding land use, traffic/circulation, housing, open space and conservation, noise, and safety. The zoning and subdivision ordinances are required to be consistent with the policies of the General Plan.

Impact Discussion

a. Physically divide an established community?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. The TGPA contains no proposed policies that would divide established communities. Likewise, the Zoning Ordinance Update, which is being undertaken in order to conform the Zoning Ordinance Update to the General Plan, does not contain regulations that would divide an established community. Further, the TGPA does not include substantial land use designation changes. The project would have no impact.

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or Zoning Ordinance Update) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The TGPA proposes changes to General Plan policies and therefore, once adopted, will not conflict with any policy for the protection of the environment. However, the proposed policy changes embodied in the TGPA may result in environmental impacts that would have been avoided through implementation of the existing General Plan policies. For example, the increase in allowable residential density within the high-density residential designation and in mixed-use development may result in greater traffic and aesthetic impacts. Similarly, encouraging infill development may result in greater traffic impacts near infill sites than would have occurred under the existing General Plan. This will be addressed in the EIR.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update propose no changes to any habitat conservation plan. No natural community conservation plan exists in the County of El Dorado. The project would have no impact.

Mineral Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
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"/>

Setting

The County of El Dorado contains a wide variety of mineral resources. Both the U.S. Geological Service and the California Geological Survey have evaluated the potential locations and production capacity of various types of extractive resources throughout the County. Metallic mineral deposits, gold in particular, are considered the most significant extractive mineral resource. The California Gold Rush originated from gold discovered in the County of El Dorado. Other metallic minerals found in the County include silver, copper, nickel, chromite, zinc, tungsten, mercury, titanium, platinum, and iron. Nonmetallic mineral resources include building stone, limestone, slate, clay, marble, soapstone, sand, and gravel.

Pursuant to the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA), the California State Mining and Geology Board oversees the Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) classification system. The MRZ system characterizes both the location and known/presumed economic value of underlying mineral resources. Local agencies are required to use the classification information when developing land use plans and making land use decisions. Mineral land classification reports and maps have been developed for the project area, specifically the Auburn (1983), Camino and Mokelumne Hill (1987), Folsom (1984), Georgetown (1983), and Placerville (1983) 15-minute quadrangles.

The majority of the County’s important mineral resource deposits are concentrated in the western third of the County. Areas classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b (referred to hereafter as MRZ-2) are considered important mineral resource areas. The General Plan includes an MR overlay designation to identify these areas and limit activities that would conflict with mineral extraction. Where the MRZ-2 zones overlap Community Regions and Rural Centers, the General Plan does not apply an MR overlay because of the inherent conflicts between mineral resource extraction activities and the established residential and other higher intensity land uses within those planning concept areas. Areas where MRZ-2 lands were not included in the overlay designation include portions of the

Placerville and Diamond Springs community regions, portions of the Garden Valley and Kelsey rural centers, and part of the Crystal Boulevard platted lands area (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

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?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . The proposed TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not substantively amend any policy or ordinance provision in a manner that would increase restrictions on the recovery of mineral resources. Further, the TGPA does not include substantial land use designation changes. There would be no impact.

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?

The proposed TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not amend any policy or ordinance provision in a manner that would increase restrictions on the recovery of mineral resources. Further, the TGPA does not include substantial land use designation changes. There would be no impact.

Noise

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	NOISE. Would the project:				
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic 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"/>
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

There are numerous stationary noise sources (e.g., quarry operations, lumber mills, industrial facilities, park and sports facilities, airports) dispersed throughout the County. Some are located in urban settings and others, such as quarry operations, are sited in more rural locations. Noise-sensitive receptors located in the vicinity of these stationary sources consist primarily of residential dwellings. Traffic is the key mobile noise source, with the highest levels along US 50, SR 49 and arterial roads (EDAW 2003).

The El Dorado General Plan Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element establishes standards intended to protect noise-sensitive receptors. It establishes numerical limits for maximum allowable noise

exposure from transportation noise sources (refer to General Plan Table 6-1) and non-transportation noise sources (refer to General Plan Tables 6-2 through 6-5).

Impact Discussion

The TGPA does not propose any substantive change to existing General Plan noise policies. However, the TGPA includes an amendment to provide for exceptions to the noise standards for temporary night-time road work. Also, proposed Chapter 17.37 Noise Standards of the Zoning Ordinance Update includes provisions for limiting transportation and non-transportation noise at new sensitive receptors within standardized maximum levels. The ordinance allows for a discretionary exception where a public project emits night-time noise in excess of the standards. This substantially expands the existing noise regulations in Title 9 Public Peace, Morals, and Welfare of the County Ordinance Code that are generally limited to loud or raucous noise, motorboat noise on Lake Tahoe, and excessive noise in public parks.

a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

The Zoning Ordinance Update proposes to revise the County's noise standards, implementing the General Plan noise policies. The practical effect will be to expand the regulatory provisions beyond the existing code to cover more types of noise (i.e., noise from construction, non-transportation, and transportation sources) in more situations (i.e., when affecting noise sensitive land uses). The project would help ensure that persons are not exposed to noise levels in excess of the General Plan policies. At the same time, the TGPA may include expanded opportunities for commercial and industrial uses in rural areas which may result in localized increases in noise over current levels. This will be addressed in more detail in the EIR.

b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. The proposed TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not substantively amend any policy or ordinance provision in a manner that would increase exposure to groundborne vibration or noise levels. No new land uses not currently allowed would be allowed as a result of the project. The impact would be less than significant.

c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. However, the TGPA will encourage higher density development within high-density residential and mixed-use developments in community regions and rural communities, as well as infill locations. This may result in increased traffic and a related increase in the potential for excessive traffic noise at some locations. This will be addressed in the EIR.

d. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. The proposed Chapter 17.37 Noise Standards include limitations on construction noise.

Therefore, enactment of the project would reduce the potential for excessive construction noise. This impact would be less than significant.

e. Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Proposed Section 17.27.020 Airport Safety Combining Zone of the Zoning Ordinance Update provides standards for noise attenuation for new development within airport comprehensive land use plans. The impact would be less than significant.

f. Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Proposed Chapter 17.37 Noise Standards of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Update contains provisions for limiting transportation noise at new sensitive receptors. As a result, this effect will be less than significant.

Population and Housing

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

As discussed in the Land Use and Planning section, the County of El Dorado contains substantial suburban development in discrete communities, particularly along U.S. 50 (e.g., El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Shingle Springs), as well as rural small towns (e.g., Georgetown, Diamond Springs) and scattered residences along the western slope. The County of El Dorado’s population was estimated at 150,489 persons on January 1, 2011(California Department of Finance 2011a). Although the County of El Dorado has been known as a rapidly growing area, more recently the County’s rate of growth has slowed considerably. In July 2011, the California Department of Finance ranked the County of El Dorado as 35th among California’s 58 counties in rate of growth (California Department of Finance 2011b).

California Planning Law requires the County to adopt a housing element as part of its General Plan. The housing element identifies housing needs over the spectrum of incomes and provides strategies for meeting those needs. The County’s housing need numbers are assigned to the County by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) as part of the regional housing needs allocation process. Under state law, the County must adopt a land use plan and regulatory system that provide sufficient opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development to meet the allocated housing need. The County of El Dorado adopted its most recent Housing Element in 2009 and obtained concurrence in the element’s adequacy from the California Department of Housing and Community Development that same year. SACOG is expected to release the next update of the regional housing needs in October 2012 for integration into the County’s Housing Element by October 2013 (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update do not alter the population assumptions used for the General Plan.

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. The County of El Dorado General Plan authorizes new development pursuant to its policies and in the locations identified in the General Plan. The TGPA revises certain General Plan policies, but would not substantively change the planned locations of future growth. Its proposed policy revisions encouraging infill development and providing for higher residential densities within high-density residential and mixed-use developments are intended to further encourage new development to locate within communities where services and utilities are available rather than in rural areas. This will potentially increase the intensity of development of individual parcels in rural centers, for example, although it will not change the distribution or total amount of development within the County. In some areas of the County, the project may have a significant impact.

b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

For the reasons described above, the proposed TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update project would not displace existing housing. Therefore, there would be no impact.

c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

For the reasons described above, the proposed project would not displace residents. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental 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:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

Public services are provided within the County of El Dorado by a number of entities. The County Sheriff is responsible for law enforcement within the unincorporated areas. Fire protection is provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection in state responsibility areas, USFS on the Eldorado National Forest, and by 13 fire protection districts (e.g., Cameron Park Fire Department, the County of El Dorado Fire Protection District). Domestic water is provided by EID, GDPUD, and GFCSD for most communities on the western slope, with rural residences outside of the service areas using private wells. There are 15 school districts with a total of more than 60 schools in the County of El Dorado. The districts have varying levels of capacity for additional students. The County of El Dorado and a number of special districts provide parks and recreation facilities and services to County residents. Additional recreational opportunities are available at the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and the Eldorado National Forest (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

- a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental 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: Fire protection; Police protection; Schools; Parks; or Other public facilities.***

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . The current County of El Dorado General Plan authorizes new development pursuant to its policies and in the locations identified in the General Plan. The TGPA revises certain General Plan policies, but would not substantively change the planned locations of future growth or the overall level of future growth and demand for services. The Zoning Ordinance Update conforms the Zoning Ordinance Update to the provisions of the General Plan. The Timber Production Zone could allow a single residence under specified conditions related to active timber harvesting operations, subject to a discretionary conditional use permit. However, because of the limitations on eligibility for such permits established in the TPZ, this is not expected to result in a substantial number of new homes being built in these areas. Similarly, compatible recreational and other non-timber uses may be permitted in TPZs, but only where fire protection and public safety concerns have been adequately met, including the ability to provide adequate public access, emergency ingress and egress, and sufficient water supply and sewage disposal facilities. Therefore, any increase in demand for services would be minimal.

The General Plan policies for the provision of services to meet the needs of future growth are not affected by the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . The EIR for the 2004 General Plan identified significant and unavoidable impacts on services, including prospective impacts from new facilities to serve additional development under the General Plan. The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not contribute to that impact.

Recreation

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION.	Would the project:				
a.	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.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The County of El Dorado and a number of park districts provide parks and recreation facilities and services to County residents. Additional recreational opportunities are available at the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and the Eldorado National Forest. The County of El Dorado has an abundance of public lands available for recreation. However, it is generally underserved by developed community and local parks.

The parks and recreation element of the General Plan includes policies and standards for the provision of new parks and recreation facilities. Section 16.12.090 of the County subdivision ordinance authorizes the County to require the provision of parks and recreation facilities (or in-lieu fees) for new subdivisions at the rate of 3 acres per 1,000 residents (consistent with Government Code Section 66477) (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

a. 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?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update. The proposed TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not change the policies of the current General Plan’s Parks and Recreation Element regarding new park facilities, nor would they alter the subdivision ordinance requirements for the payment of fees to finance additional parks and recreation facilities. The impact would be less than significant.

b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No specific development projects, including parks and recreation area development, are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . There are no reasonably foreseeable construction or expansion of facilities associated with the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Therefore, no impacts would result from the proposed project.

Transportation and Traffic

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause, either individually or cumulatively, exceedance of a level-of-service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The County of El Dorado’s transportation system is focused around the roadway network. Most travel in the County is done in automobiles because the low-density development patterns have limited the viability of facilities or services related to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian use. Although automobile travel is the primary function for the roadway network, the network also serves a variety of other users, including drivers of trucks and buses, bicyclists, pedestrians, and, in some locations, equestrians.

The roadway network is suburban in character in the larger communities such as El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park, and more urban in the incorporated cities of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe. The network is rural in character in most other portions of the County. U.S. 50 is the primary transportation corridor extending through the County from west to east and serves all of the County's major population centers, including El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Shingle Springs, Placerville, Camino, Pollock Pines, and South Lake Tahoe. It is a multi-lane freeway from the Sacramento County line to Placerville, and then alternates between freeway and limited access expressway from Placerville to Riverton. SR 49 is a north-south route through the County but is not developed to freeway or expressway capacity. Other state highways, County arterials, and a network of local public and private roads constitute the remainder of the roadway system. Access to property is either directly from fronting arterial roads or from public or private local roads, many of which are narrow and unpaved in the rural areas.

Commuting, shopping, recreation, and goods movement are responsible for most of the travel demand on the transportation system. The Lake Tahoe Basin and Eldorado National Forest are popular recreational attractions, with destinations such as Desolation Wilderness, ski areas, and Nevada casinos. Other attractions include the American River, Marshall Gold Discovery State Historic Park, Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, Sly Park Reservoir, historic downtown Placerville, and Apple Hill. These currently attract substantial levels of visitor traffic.

Traffic levels and congestion on the highways and County road system have long been subjects of concern within the County. The Transportation and Circulation Element of the current General Plan includes standards for road improvements, level of service (LOS) standards for select County roads, and policies relating to the funding of road improvements, among other things.

In addition to those policies, Measure Y (the "Control Traffic Congestion" Initiative) was approved by County voters in 1998. It mandates General Plan policies that require denial of residential projects of five or more parcels or units when the project will cause or worsen LOS F conditions. Measure Y policies also require development fees to fully mitigate traffic impacts of all new development, preclude the County from using tax revenues to pay for such mitigation, and prohibit the County from adding any road segments to the list of segments allowed to operate at LOS F without voter approval. The County has adopted traffic impact fee programs to help fund road improvements necessitated by new development (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

The TGPA is proposing a number of revisions to the Transportation and Circulation Element of the General Plan, including moving some standards from the General Plan to the County design manual. Because the General Plan is a policy document and does not directly implement its own policies, moving standards from the General Plan to the design manual would retain those standards and provide a more direct method of implementation.

a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

The proposed revisions to the Transportation and Circulation Element may result in a change in projected traffic levels in the County. The proposed revisions to the Land Use Element increasing allowable residential density in high-density residential and mixed-use designations may similarly

result in changes in projected traffic levels. This may be a significant effect and will be addressed in the EIR.

b. Cause, either individually or cumulatively, exceedance of a level-of-service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

The TGPA's proposed revisions to the Transportation and Circulation and Land Use Elements may result in higher levels of congestion in some areas. This may be a significant effect and will be addressed in the EIR.

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?

The proposed project does not affect air traffic patterns, which are not regulated by the General Plan or Zoning Ordinance Update. Therefore, there will be no impact.

d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The proposed TGPA would amend design standards, but would not change them in a substantive manner that would result in hazardous design features being installed with new roads. All standards will comply with accepted traffic planning standards. There will be no impact.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

No specific development project is being proposed. The TGPA would revise existing transportation and circulation element policies, but those changes would not substantively affect emergency access. There will be no impact.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?

Parking capacity is the realm of the Zoning Ordinance Update. The proposed Zoning Ordinance Update includes parking capacity standards. Therefore, it would have no impact on parking capacity.

g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

The TGPA will not amend the General Plan policies related to alternative transportation. Therefore, it will have no impact.

Utilities and Service Systems

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.	Would the project:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Setting

The County of El Dorado's main water supply is surface water from streams and reservoirs; groundwater usage is fairly restricted because of geologic conditions found in the majority of the County. Because surface water supply can vary greatly due to natural conditions (i.e., rainfall, snowmelt, evaporation), management of the County's water supply through the operation of storage, distribution, and treatment facilities is particularly important. (For a more detailed discussion of surface water, see the Hydrology and Water Quality section above.)

There are three major drainage basins (watersheds) in the western slope of the County of El Dorado, each of which drains into one of these major rivers: the South Fork American River, the Middle Fork American River, and the Cosumnes River. Flooding is the main problem related to stormwater runoff, especially in urban areas. Other issues associated with stormwater runoff are sedimentation, erosion, and degradation of water quality.

Wastewater in the County of El Dorado is treated by two types of systems: 1) EID's wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) which are connected to the EID's wastewater collection system of pipelines and lift stations, and 2) onsite wastewater treatment systems (OWTS). The OWTS are either connected to individual residences or other buildings in areas not served by the EID collection system, or are small, community collection and disposal systems that also rely on septic tanks, underground disposal and other types of soil absorption systems.

Solid waste in the County is generated by commercial, industrial, institutional, and residential land uses. The unincorporated areas of the County of El Dorado generate solid waste mainly from residential uses. The County of El Dorado is divided into two waste management regions: the Tahoe Basin and the western slope. The solid waste produced in the County is shipped to the Lockwood Landfill in Nevada for disposal. The Union Mine Landfill is the last remaining landfill in the County of El Dorado but only receives processed sewage sludge from septic tanks. There is an onsite wastewater treatment plant where additional treatment of this water occurs (EDAW 2003).

Impact Discussion

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Future development projects will be required to comply with the regulatory requirements of the RWQCBs and County ordinance standards. The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not have an impact.

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?

The General Plan policies for the provision of services to meet the needs of future growth are not affected by the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . The TGPA revises certain General Plan policies, but would not substantively change the planned locations of future growth or the overall level of future growth and demand for services. Therefore, no new water or wastewater facilities will be required. The TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not have an impact.

c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The General Plan policies for the provision of services to meet the needs of future growth are not affected by the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . In addition, the TGPA revises certain General Plan policies, but would not substantively change the planned locations of future growth or the overall level of future growth. Therefore, no new stormwater facilities will be required. There would be no impact.

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?

The General Plan policies for the provision of services to meet the needs of future growth are not affected by the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . The TGPA revises certain General Plan policies, but would not substantively change the planned locations of future growth or the overall level of future growth and demand. Existing entitlements and water supply resources will be sufficient, and the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update would not have an impact.

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?

The General Plan policies for the provision of services to meet the needs of future growth are not affected by the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . Current wastewater treatment providers would continue to have adequate capacity to serve the County. There would be no impact.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Due to the fact that the proposed project would not substantively change the planned locations of future growth or the overall level of future growth in the County, the Lockwood Landfill in Nevada would have sufficient capacity to continue serving the County. There would be no impact.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The General Plan policies for the provision of utility services to meet the needs of future growth of the County are not affected by the TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update . The proposed project would comply with all federal, state and local laws and regulations related to solid waste. There would be no impact.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.					
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, substantially 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This Environmental Checklist has concluded that the proposed project could have potentially significant impacts in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, land use, noise, and transportation/traffic. Consequently, an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update to address these issues.

References Cited

- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Undated., Sacramento, CA. "El Dorado County, 2008-2010 Land Use Conversion (Table A-6).
- California Department of Finance. 2011a. *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change — January 1, 2010 and 2011*. Sacramento, CA. May 2011.
- California Department of Finance. 2011b. *County Estimates Rank July 2011*. Sacramento, CA. July 2011.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2012. EnviroStor database website. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/mapfull.asp?global_id=&x=-119&y=37&z=18&ms=640,480&mt=m&findaddress=True&city=el%20dorado%20county&zip=&county=&federal_superfund=true&state_response=true&voluntary_cleanup=true&school_cleanup=true&ca_site=true&tiered_permit=true&evaluation=true&military_evaluation=true&school_investigation=true&operating=true&post_closure=true&non_operating=true. Accessed April 17, 2012.
- Coy, O.C., Ph.D. 1973. *California County Boundaries*. Valley Publishers, Fresno, California. Pgs. 97-99
- EDAW. 2003. El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report, May 2003.
- The County of El Dorado Agricultural Commissioner. *El Dorado and Alpine Counties 2010 Crop and Livestock Report*. Placerville, CA. Undated
- Hoover, Milred Brook, Hero Eugene Rensch, and Ethal Grace Rensch. 1990. *Historic Spots in California*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Introduction. In: *Climate Change 2007: Mitigation (Working Group III Fourth Assessment Report)*. Available: <<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg3/ar4-wg3-spm.pdf>>. Accessed: August 11, 2009.
- Kroeber. 1925. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Washington D.C.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 2005. *Greenhouse Gases: Frequently Asked Questions*. Available: <<http://lwf.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/gases.html>>. Accessed: September 22, 2009.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District 2009. *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*. Sacramento, CA. December.
- State Water Resources Control Board. 2012. GeoTracker website. <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=el+dorado+county>. Accessed April 17, 2012.
- Wilson, Norman L., and Arlean Towne. 1978. Nisenan. In *Handbook of North American Indians* (vol. 8), edited by Robert F. Heizer. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.