



**EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING SERVICES  
2850 FAIRLANE COURT  
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** Zone Change Z05-0013

**Lead Agency Name and Address:** El Dorado County, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

**Contact Person:** Winnifred Wilson, Senior Planner

**Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** James Kidder, 4068 Mother Lode Dr. Suite C, Single Springs, CA 95682

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** James R. Kidder, 4068 Mother Lode Dr. Suite C, Single Springs, CA 95682

**Project Agent's Name and Address:** Jams R. Kidder, 4068 Mother Lode Dr. Suite C, Single Springs, CA 95682

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:** Preston Sutton Architect, 3195 Cedar Valley Lane, Placerville, CA

**Project Location:** North east corner of Mother Lode Drive and Production Drive, 3/8 mile east of the intersection with Greenstone Road in the Diamond Springs/El Dorado area (Exhibit A, Vicinity Map).

**Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 319-370-24

**Zoning:** Planned Commercial (CP)

**Section:** 33     **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

**General Plan Designation:** Commercial (C)

**Description of Project:** A zone change request to rezone the existing 37,999 square foot subject property from Planned Commercial (CP) to General Commercial (CG) in order to allow uses that are permitted by right under the new zone (Exhibit D, Site Plan). The proposed use would keep the same square footage of office and warehouse space within the existing building, and the same parking standard ratio as that of past uses under the current zone. The future owner proposes to use a large portion of the building to conduct a whole sale automobile spare parts business while leasing out the rest for other uses that are permitted by right under this rezone.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	CP	C	office/warehouse
North:	CG	C	Industrial
East:	CP	C	Church
South:	RE-5	MFR	Mother Lode Drive/vacant
West:	CG	I	Production Drive/vacant

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The subject property, located on the northeast corner of Mother Lode Drive and Production Drive, is fronted by an existing vacant building along the eastern boundary line. The topography of the site is relatively flat. The project site is fully developed with an inverted L-shaped 7,500 square foot structure, fronted by parking lot on the western half, and bordered by either bare ground, or sparse and spotty perimeter landscaping. Public utility services, including sewer and water, are already in place. Access to the site is from Mother Lode Drive, a thirty-two foot wide paved County-maintained Rural Minor Arterial, with a 100 foot right-of-way via Production Drive, which is a private twenty-four foot wide paved road. The project is located in the Diamond Springs/El Dorado area.

**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):** None

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance			

**DETERMINATION**

**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 in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described in attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, pursuant to applicable standards; and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: June 2, 2006

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_ For: El Dorado County

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character quality of the site and its surroundings?			X
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista.

- (a) **Scenic Vista.** The subject property is not adjacent to U.S. Highway 50. No public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway has been identified by the County in the surrounding area of the project site (Exhibit 5.3-1, Table 5.3-1, General Plan DEIR.).

The rezone, by itself, will introduce uses that are more in character with the surrounding mix of commercial, and light industrial uses than the current zone. Currently, the site is developed with an existing building, minimal landscaping and a parking lot. The aesthetic quality of the site would be improved with a revised landscape plan associated with this zone change. The new landscape plan, approved by staff in April, 13, 2006, would provide a denser vegetative buffer, with more oak trees, drought-resistant shrubs, and groundcover. The 5' landscape buffer proposed along the parking lot would provide an adequate screen from the adjoining streets. Although the rezone would allow more intensive uses by right, the site would not be adequate in size to accommodate such uses, other than what is being proposed. There would be no impact as a result of this rezone.

- (b) **Scenic Resources.** The project site is fully developed with an office/warehouse building, a parking lot, and some scanty perimeter landscaping. The building is currently vacant because of the rezone. There are no rock outcrops or historical buildings that would contribute to exceptional aesthetic value either on the site or in the project vicinity.

- (c) **Visual Character.** The 37,999 square .foot project site is bordered by a small church site to the east, a light industrial business to the north, Production Drive to the west and Mother Lode Drive to the south. Except for the adjacent church property, short - to - long range views of the project site are dominated by a mix of commercial and residential, and light industrial development in a largely commercial neighborhood. The rezone would reinforce the neighborhood character by allowing uses which would visually blend in with the surrounding existing commercial and light industrial neighborhood north of Mother Lode Drive. The subject property is within the Community Region of Diamond Springs.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- (d) **Light and Glare.** The former office/warehouse building was constructed with a building permit in 1987 and equipped with exterior security lighting in conformance to Section 17.14.170 of the Zoning Ordinance. No new lighting sources are being proposed under this rezone. Additionally, there is no residential development in the project vicinity that could be affected by any light spillover. The nearest residential homes are across Mother Lode Drive to the southeast of the subject site. Therefore there would be no impacts of light and glare.

**Findings**

No impacts from light and glare are expected and no mitigation is required. The proposed rezone would promote uses that are compatible with the surrounding uses. For this “aesthetics” category, the threshold of significance has not been exceeded.

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?			X
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

- (a) **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural District (A) General Plan land use overlay designation and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan Land Use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not considered to be “Prime Farmland” nor is there properties designated as being within the Agricultural District (A) General Plan land use overlay area adjacent to the project site. The rezone request will not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses.
- (b) **Williamson Act Contract.** The parcel is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of land designated for agricultural use or land that is under a Williamson Act Contract. It will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract because the site is not designated for Williamson Act Contract nor is it designated for agricultural use. The project site is in an urbanized area, dominated by commercial and light industrial uses.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

(c) **Non-Agricultural Use.** The subject parcel was already developed as an office/warehouse use since 1987 and zoned for Planned Commercial (CP). The site is in an urban built up area and is not identified as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland or Locally Important Farmland under the Farmland mapping Program.

**Finding**

No impacts to agricultural land are expected since the site is already developed in an urbanized setting and no mitigation is required. The subject property, after a rezone, is compatible with the surrounding commercial neighborhood. There is no impact on agriculture.

<b>III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

(a) **Air Quality Plan.** El Dorado County has adopted the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>). This plan also contains a schedule for implementation and funding of Transportation Control Measures (TCM) to limit mobile source emissions. Implementation measures from this plan are required to be implemented at the project level.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

The project site, which was already developed, was not in conflict with or obstructs the implementation of this plan and would not do so because no future construction or improvements would be anticipated.

(b – c) **Air Quality and Ambient Air Quality Standards.** El Dorado County is classed as being in “severe non-attainment” status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (O3). Additionally, the County is classified as being in “non-attainment” status for particulate matter (PM10) under the State’s standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County’s Air Pollution Control Program to meet the State’s ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District administers point source air pollution control. The County requires project emissions of ROG, Nox, and PM10 be quantified using URBEMIS 7G or other approved model acceptable to the District. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

- Short-term impacts related to construction activities; and
- Long-term impacts related to the project operation.

The rezone, by itself, will not generate additional vehicle trips onto Mother Lode Drive. There would be no future construction after the rezone. No grading will occur. Because of this, the Air Pollution Control District has determined the project parcel will have no significant short-term impact on air quality.

The subject property is accessed off of Mother Lode Drive, a thirty-two foot wide paved County-maintained Rural Minor Arterial, with a 100 foot right-of-way via Production Drive, which is a private twenty-four foot wide paved road. During the 2004 traffic count, Mother Lode Drive, 400 yards west of Pleasant Valley Road, is currently operating at a Level of Service (LOS) C with an ADT of 10,526, and 381 a.m. and 355 p.m. peak trips based on the Department of Transportation 2005 Traffic Count Summary. The list of permitted uses allowed by right under the proposed CG zone does not ordinarily cause more than a minimal amount of dust or smoke and does not generate much more than that is allowed under the existing CP zone.

Because the project parcel, after the rezone, would keep the same square footage for commercial and warehouse uses within the existing building as the site plans approved by building permit no. 92078272, and building permit no. 93085543, it would generate the same number of Average Daily Traffic (ADT) after the rezone, as past uses under the current zone (Department of Transportation analysis, April 2006). According to DOT, the 2,598 square feet of office space at 24.6 ADT per square foot, would generate 63.91 ADT, while the 4,902 square feet of warehouse at 4.88 ADT per square foot would generate 23.92 ADT. The total ADT of 87.83 before and after the rezone is considered minimal. Consequently, there would be minimal impacts on adjacent traffic on Mother Lode Drive as a result of this rezone. The Department of Transportation has, therefore, determined that no traffic study is warranted for this rezone request. Because of this slight increase in ADT, impacts by air quality emissions would be minimal.

Current County records indicate this property is located within the Asbestos Review Area. This could result in a temporary negative impact on air quality with regard to the release of particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) in the form of asbestos dust. District Rule 223.2 addresses the regulations and mitigation measures for asbestos dust emissions during the construction phase. However, since there will not be any future construction or grading for street improvements for this rezone, there will be no impacts on air quality.

(d) **Sensitive Receptors.** Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly, and such sites as schools, hospitals, daycare centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single family residences. The nearest adjacent single-family residences are to the southeast of the project site across from Mother Lode Drive. The nearest school, Buckeye Union School District, is located more than 9,300 feet west from the project parcel, sufficiently far to be adversely impacted by this project. As mentioned previously, there will be no future grading and construction. Therefore no impact on sensitive receptors would be anticipated.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

**(e) Objectionable Odors.** The list of permitted uses under this rezone, including the proposed office and warehouse use, would not ordinarily be caused more than a minimal amount of odor. Consequently, there would be no impact from the Project concerning odors.

**Finding**

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, no impacts to air quality impacts are expected and no mitigation is required. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
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?			<b>X</b>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			<b>X</b>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Biological Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species; or
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

(a – b) **Sensitive Habitat.** Review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Draft Recovery Plan for the Red-legged Frog indicate the project parcel is not within the core area for the species. The project site is in the urban built up area. No streams exist in the project vicinity that is considered to be the species natural habitat. Further review of the 2004 General Plan EIR Exhibit 5.12-7 confirms that the project parcel is not located in any other protected and sensitive natural habitat. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse effect on any sensitive or special status species or habitat.

(c) **Wetlands.** Review of the U.S. Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Maps determines that there are no wetlands, seasonal streams, or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project parcel. There are no impacts to wetlands as a result of this rezone.

(d) **Wildlife Interference.** The project site is fully built and located in an urbanized area. There is no known or mapped wildlife migration corridors identified on or adjacent to the project site. This is based upon review of the Department of Fish and Games Migratory Deer Herd Maps and General Plan DEIR Exhibit V-8-4. The project site will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.

(e & f) **Biological Resources.** The proposed use, allowed by this rezone, does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The site is located within Mitigation Area 2 of the El Dorado County Ecological Preserve program (Ordinance 4500; Fee Resolution 205-98), and pursuant to the implementation memorandum of September 25, 1998, all future commercial development as a result of the parcel map will require fee payment of \$0.28 per square foot prior to building permit issuance. However, since there will not be any future development of this Project, no fee payment would be required.

<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			<b>X</b>
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			<b>X</b>
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			<b>X</b>
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			<b>X</b>

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

**Discussion:**

In general, significant impacts are those that diminish the integrity, research potential, or other characteristics that make a historical or cultural resource significant or important. A substantial adverse effect on Cultural Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property or historic or cultural significant to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study;
- Affect a landmark of cultural/historical importance;
- Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.

(a - c) **Historic Resources.** The subject property was fully developed since 1987 with several building permits and there were no historic sites identified on the project site or in the project vicinity. There will be no future development plan as a result of the rezone.

(d) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site did not reveal any known paleontological sites or known fossil locales during construction. There is no future construction or street improvements anticipated if the rezone is approved. Therefore, no impacts on historic resources would occur.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				<b>X</b>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			<b>X</b>	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			<b>X</b>	
iv) Landslides?				<b>X</b>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				<b>X</b>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
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?				
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Geologic Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

(a) **Seismicity, Subsidence and Liquefaction.** Only those earthquake faults considered having a relatively high potential for future earthquake activity, and which have well defined surface fault traces were considered for mapping under the Fault Evaluation Program of the California Division of Mines and Geology. This program was designed to carry out the objectives of the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act of 1972. There are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones currently mapped in El Dorado County, and there are no known faults that transect the project area or are located on the project site. However, as there are faults located regionally, the project site could be expected to undergo moderate to severe ground shaking during large magnitude earthquakes. The County requires all new structures to be built in accordance with Seismic Zone 3 criteria, as set forth in the Uniform Building Code (UBC), reducing a seismic hazard to less than significant. However, the existing structure was built in 1987, and fully permitted in conformance with the UBC. In addition, there will be no grading or construction after the rezone. Therefore, there would be no impacts as a result of seismic hazards.

(iv) The Generalized Map Showing Relative Amounts of Landslides in California places El Dorado County entirely within the low severity zone for landslide activity (CDMG 1973 - General Plan EIR). Generally, landslide activity is restricted to areas of very steep slopes (in excess of 40 percent) and where planes of weakness in the soil or bedrock are evident and have been disturbed by development activities such as grading and construction. The topography of this project site is relatively flat with no significant topographic variations. The potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.

(b) **Soil Erosion and Loss of Topsoil.** No future grading will occur as a result of the rezone, therefore there will be no impact due to loss of topsoil and soil erosion.

(c & d) **Expansive Soils.**

Based on the Soil Survey of El Dorado County, the project site is located within the Auburn AxD Soil Series with a low shrink-swell potential. Shrink-swell potential is a measure of soil expansiveness, and is dependant upon the amount of clay content within the soil series. The subject property was already fully developed and the low shrink-swell potential was ideally suited for the placing of the building structure which exists today.

(e) **Public Sewer.** The proposed use, allowed by this rezone, would continue to utilize public sewer provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

**Findings.**

No significant geophysical impacts are anticipated from the Project. For this “Geology and Soils: category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X
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?			X
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X
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?			X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect due to Hazards or Hazardous Materials would occur if implementation of the project would:

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

(a-b) **Hazardous Substances and Emissions.** The proposed project, a commercial rezone, will not require the use, disposal, or transport of any hazardous materials. Since there would be no future construction for the proposed office and warehouse which would be fully enclosed within the existing building, there would not be hazardous materials (such as air toxic substances) used at construction. However, if there are storage of hazardous materials related to the proposed use, or other hazardous materials-generating uses, the subject property, would be required to adhere to the El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, during the site plan review and building permit issuance phase.

(c) The nearest school, Buckeye Union School District, is located more than 9,300 feet west from the project parcel, sufficiently far to be adversely impacted by this project.

(d) **Hazardous Materials Sites.** Based on an internet search in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List in the Department of Toxic Substances homepage, [www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public](http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public), the project parcel is not listed as a known hazardous materials site.

(e – f) **Public/Private Airport Hazards.** The project parcel is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or private airport.

(g) **Emergency Response Plan.** The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the project area.

(h) **Fire Hazards.** The project site is located in an area of high hazard for wildland fires as identified on the Diamond Springs/El Dorado County Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection), and as such, will expose people or structures to a less than significant risk of loss, injury or death due to wildland fires. At the time of building permit issuance for the development of the existing building in 1987, the property was already conditioned so as not to expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area.

(i) For the fire safety, the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District requested that the commercial dumpster for this project parcel be relocated 5 feet away from the existing building pursuant to Section 1103 of the California Fire Code. The project site plan has been revised to reflect this change.

**Finding**

No impacts from hazardous conditions are expected and no mitigation is required. For this “Hazards” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?		X	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X
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 which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		X	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		X	
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?			X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
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?			X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Hydrology and Water Quality would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

(a) **Water Quality Standards.** General Plan Policy 7.3.2.2 establishes that projects requiring a grading permit shall have an erosion control program approved where necessary. Since there would be no construction after this rezone, a grading permit would not be required. There would be no discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements.

Storm water runoff from the project site would be managed through existing facilities in accordance with the County's NPDES Phase 2 storm water permit. The amount of runoff and types of constituents that would be discharged to the storm drain system by the proposed use would not be of sufficient volume or concentration to violate water quality standards. In addition, after the rezone is approved, the new owner of the building would be required to comply with all the relevant water quality standards during the site plan review and building permit phase, should there be a change in the interior dimension and type of uses within the existing building. The impact would be less than significant.

(b) **Groundwater.** The geology of the Western Slope portion of El Dorado County is principally hard crystalline, igneous or metamorphic rock overlain with a thin mantle of sediment or soil. Groundwater in this region is found in fractures, joints, cracks, and fault zones within the bedrock mass. These discrete fracture areas are typically vertical in orientation rather than horizontal as in sedimentary or alluvial aquifers. Recharge is predominantly through rainfall infiltrating into the fractures. Movement of this groundwater is very limited due to the lack of porosity in the bedrock. The subject property has been provided for potable water by the El Dorado Irrigation District. There would be no additional increase in demand for potable water from the ground for this project parcel.

(c – f) **Erosion Control Plan.** The Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (§ 15.14.440 and 15.14.590). The standards apply to any grading that involves more than 250 cubic yards of earth, which would require a permit. General Plan Policy 7.3.2.2 states that projects requiring a grading permit shall have an erosion control program approved, where necessary. The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit storm water runoff and discharge from a site. However, a grading permit would not be required in this case because there would not be any grading or construction after the rezone. There is no evidence that the subject site has substantially reduced or altered the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity in the past, or materially interfered with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project.

(g & i) **Flooding.** No portion of the subject property is within the limits of the 100 year flood plain, as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate map. Therefore, no flooding impacts are anticipated.

(j) **Inundation.** The California Dam Safety Act requires dam owners to submit inundation maps to the California Office of Emergency Services showing the extent of inundation resulting from a potential dam failure. This Act also requires that local jurisdictions adopt emergency evacuation and control procedures for areas located below dams to limit loss of life, injury, and property. El Dorado County has adopted a Multi-Hazard Functional Plan to be implemented by the County's Office of Emergency Services. This Plan and the EIR adopted for the General Plan identify those dams which have the potential to inundate residential areas. The subject property is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee which has the potential to fail and inundate the area with flood waters.

(k) A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. There is no potential for a seiche or tsunami on the site. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. The potential for a

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

mudflow is considered to be insignificant because the terrain of the project site is relatively flat.

**Finding**

No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the Project. For this “Hydrology” category, the thresholds of significant have not been exceeded.

<b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Physically divide an established community?			X
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Land Use would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
- Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
- Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
- Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.

(a) **Established Community.** The project site is located in a neighborhood developed primarily with commercial and light manufacturing uses on the north side of Mother Lode Drive. Several single-family homes are located across Mother Lode Drive to the southeast of the subject site. Impacts to these residential uses, after the rezone, are considered minimal and no more significant than previous uses under the current zoning. Moreover, the fully developed project site, by virtue of the lot and building size limitations would preclude development of a more intensive nature than the office and warehouse as proposed. Staff has determined that the project parcel, after the rezone, is consistent and integrates well with the existing mix of commercial and light manufacturing land use patterns in the project vicinity on the north side of Mother Lode Drive. The rezone request would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact.

(b) **Land Use Plan.** The purpose of the rezone from Professional Commercial (CP) to General Commercial (CG) is to allow a more expanded, and less restrictive commercial uses for the existing building. Section 17.32.170 of the Zoning Ordinance regulating General Commercial (CG) provides for “the conduct of sales, storage, distribution and light manufacturing businesses of the type which do not ordinarily cause more than a minimal amount of noise, odor, smoke,

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

*dust or other factors tending to disturb the peaceful enjoyment of adjacent residential ...use.....and to provide a close relationship between warehousing, distribution and retail sales.”*

The future owner may propose to conduct a wholesale automobile parts business with a 2,598 sq.ft office space and a 4,902 sq.ft. warehouse space within the existing building. The current General Plan land use designation is Commercial and the zoning classification after the rezone would be General Commercial (CG). Both the CP and the proposed CG zone would be consistent with the Commercial General Plan land use designation. However, the CG zoning under the Commercial designation would be less restrictive and would allow a more intensive and a broader range of commercial and light manufacturing uses. It would also allow uses that would integrate better with the adjacent neighborhood than the current zoning. The proposed rezone would have no impact to land use plan.

(c) **Habitat Conservation Plan.** The Project will not conflict with any know adopted habitat conservation plan. The project site is not located in an ecological preserve area. There would be no impact to rare plants with this Project.

**Finding**

The proposed rezone would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Commercial. There will be no impact from this project due to conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for uses of the property. For this land use category the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>			
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X
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?			X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Mineral Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

(a - b) **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not mapped as a known Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology as shown on the Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn 15-minute Mineral Resource Zone quadrangles or by El Dorado County as depicted on General Plan Exhibit V-7-4.

The western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four 15-minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

<b>XI. NOISE.</b> <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect due to Noise would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL;
- Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
- Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.

(a-d) **Short-term and Long term Noise Levels.** The proposed rezone to CG will not, in and of itself, result in an increase in noise levels, temporary, permanent or otherwise, in the project vicinity. The rezone to CG would allow, by right, the proposed office and warehouse use, which would be conducted entirely within the existing building as well as other permitted uses listed under the same zone. All these permitted uses would not ordinarily cause more than a minimal amount of noise, and would not generate much more than those uses permitted under the current zone of CP. The daily few trips that would be generated by the delivery of the wholesale automobile parts business would not generate significant ambient noise. Should there be changes in tenancy of the existing building or in the dimension of the office and warehouse space, the subject property would be brought into compliance with both El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and General Plan Table 6-2 Noise Level Performance Protection Standards. Therefore, no significant impacts would be expected on short-term or long term noise.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

(e) **Airport Noise.** General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including single-family residential, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a county owned/operated airport facility.

(f) **Private Airstrip Noise.** The project parcel is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip and, as such, will not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport.

<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Population and Housing would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
- Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
- Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.

(a-c) **Population Growth.** The Project is in an area zoned for Planned Commercial and General Commercial uses, and utility services are in place for the project site. No housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required with the Project.

**Finding**

The Project will not displace housing because no construction would be planned. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth either directly or indirectly with the project parcel. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 public services:</i>			
a. Fire protection?			X
b. Police protection?			X
c. Schools?			X
d. Parks?			X
e. Other government services?			X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Public Services would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department's/District's goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;
- Substantially increase or expand the demand for public law enforcement protection without increasing staffing and equipment to maintain the Sheriff's Department goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents;
- Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services;
- Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources;
- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.

**Fire Protection.** The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. The nearest fire station is located only ½ mile northeast of the project site. The proposed office/warehouse business would not result in a greater demand for fire protection services than the former office/warehouse uses. Additionally, there is no factual information was provided by the fire district stating that the minimum level of service would fall below the minimum response time of 15-45 minutes, as designated in Table 5-1. For fire safety, the Fire District required that the commercial dumpster on the project site be relocated to allow a separation of a minimum 5' from the existing building. The applicant has since revised the site plan to reflect this change. Impact of the project to the level of service provided by the Sheriff's Dept. will be less than significant.

**Police Protection.** The El Dorado County Sheriff's Department will serve the project site with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The current staffing is approximately 1 to 1.2 officers per 1,000 County residents compared with the statewide average of 1.8 officers per 1,000 population. Impact of the this zone change to the level of service provided by the Sheriff's Department will be less than significant.

(c) **Schools.** The state allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project site was already developed and building permits were

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

obtained since 1987 for the various past commercial uses, therefore school fees would have been assessed prior to those permits. The zone change, with its new commercial use, should not generate new impact on local school districts.

(d) **Parks.** Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, and an in-lieu fee amount for the subdivision of residential land. Provisions to provide parkland were not included as part of the rezone in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of County Code because the rezone is not for a residential subdivision. The rezone will not increase the demand for parkland.

(e) **Other Facilities.** No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the Project.

**Finding**

As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected with the rezone either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>XIV. RECREATION.</b>			
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			<b>X</b>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Recreational Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.

(a & b) **Recreation Facilities.** The rezone would have no impact on the use of recreational facilities in the area, nor does it include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities in its proposal.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X
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?			X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X

A substantial adverse effect on Traffic would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
- Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
- Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Traffic would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
- Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
- Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.

(a – b) **Level of Service.** The project parcel is accessed off of Mother Lode Drive, a thirty-two foot wide paved County-maintained Rural Minor Arterial, with a 100 foot wide right-of-way via Production Drive, which is a private twenty-four foot

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

wide paved road. Mother Lode Drive, west of Pleasant Valley Road, is currently operating at a Level of Service (LOS) C with an ADT of 10,526, and 381 a.m. and 355 p.m. peak trips based on the Department of Transportation 2005 Traffic Count Summary.

Because the project, after the rezone, would keep the same square footage for commercial and warehouse uses within the existing building as the site plans approved by building permit no. 92078272, and building permit no. 93085543, the project would generate the same number of Average Daily Traffic (ADT) after the rezone, as past uses under the current zone (Department of Transportation analysis, April 2006). Based on Department of Transportation (DOT) analysis, the 2,598 square foot of office space at 24.6 ADT per square feet, would generate 63.91 ADT, while the 4,902 square feet of warehouse at 4.88 ADT per square foot would generate 23.92 ADT. The total ADT of 87.83, before and after the rezone, would be minimal and does not worsen traffic per General Plan Policy TC-Xf.

The Department of Transportation has, therefore, determined that no traffic study is warranted for this rezone request. In addition, because project site is fully developed, there is no more space left for any more parking intensive uses (such as a hotel, or a motel) that are permitted by the proposed rezone. In the event of future changes in tenancy or interior alteration of uses, or changes in the proportion of office to warehouse space, the subject parcel would be subject to a Site Plan Review by the Planning Director and building permit requirements. Therefore, there would be minimal impacts on adjacent traffic as a result of this rezone.

(c) **Air Traffic.** The zone change will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns as there are no publicly or privately operated airports or landing fields in the project vicinity.

(d) **Traffic Hazards.** No traffic hazards will result from the proposed project.

(e) **Emergency Access.** The project parcel was already developed and would have already complied with requirements of the Diamond Springs/El Dorado County Fire Protection District for emergency access, and fire safety and fire flow requirements.

(f) **Parking Capacity.** The subject parcel's parking lot configuration on the site plan, approved in 1987 with a building permit under current zoning, did not reflect accurately what is on the site. The proposed site plan with a reconfigured parking plan submitted by the applicant for the rezone would conform to Section 17.18.030 Parking Design Standards B of the Zoning Ordinance (Exhibit D, Site Plan). Additionally, it would meet Section 17.18.060 of the parking code by providing a total of 16 parking spaces while 15 spaces are required. The project provides, out of the total of 16 spaces, 10 spaces for office at 1space per 250 sq.ft, and 5 spaces for warehouse at 1 space per 1,000 sq.ft. The total 16 spaces would include one handicapped space. There are two 12'X40' loading spaces which can be located either inside or in front of the existing building.

Current landscaping on the site has deteriorated and has become sparse and spotty in areas. It longer conforms to the landscaped plan previously approved in 1987. The proposed conceptual landscape plan under this rezone application would constitute 31% of the site and would conform to Section 17.18.090 of the Zoning Ordinance by providing a denser landscape buffer to screen the parking lot from the adjoining streets.

(g) **Alternative Transportation Modes.** The Project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			<b>X</b>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			<b>X</b>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			<b>X</b>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Utilities and Service Systems would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
- Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
- Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.

(a & c) **Waste Disposal.** The project site is located in the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) Central Valley Region (Region V). The RWQCB is responsible for the preparation and implementation of basin water quality control plans for defined regions that are consistent with the Federal Clean Water Act. Specific criteria for discharging pollutants or storm water into surface waters are established for the various basins within the defined regions of California.

The project site has already been fully built out. If there is future development on the site (which does not seem plausible given the development constraints) the subject parcel, after the rezone, would continue to comply with the County's

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

regulations regarding the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that describes the site, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste control, implementation of local plans required by the Resource Conservation District, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control, and non-stormwater management controls.

(b) **New Wastewater Treatment Plants** No new water or wastewater treatment plants or expansion of existing facilities are proposed or are required for the proposed rezone.

(c) **Stormwater Drainage.** No new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities are proposed or are required for the proposed rezone.

(d) **Potable Water.** General Plan Policy 5.2.1.3 states, *all medium-density residential, high-density residential, multifamily residential, commercial, industrial and research and development projects shall be required to connect to public water systems when located within Community Regions.* The project parcel lies within the Diamond Springs Community Region, and as such, has already met these requirements when the building was built in 1987.

(e). **Waste Water.** General Plan Policy 5.3.1.1 states, *high-density and multifamily residential, commercial, and industrial projects shall be required to connect to public wastewater collection facilities as a condition of approval except in Rural Centers and areas designated as Platted Lands (-PL).* The project parcel has already demonstrated compliance with this policy after the site was first developed in 1982.

(f) **Landfill.** In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) are allowed to be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal site. All other waste materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30 year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655 acre site. Approximately 6 million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.

(g) **Federal, State and Local Solid Waste Regulations.** County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. For commercial projects some on-site separation of materials may be required and areas are required to be set aside for the storage of solid waste in accordance with Ordinance 4319. The subject property was already developed and would have complied with the above ordinance requirements.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:</b>			
a. Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X
b. 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)?			X
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X

**Discussion:**

(a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the whole record that the rezone will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The rezone does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. The subject site was fully developed and improved. Any potential impacts from the commercial rezone can be reduced to less than significant through the continued application of existing standards and requirements.

(b) Cumulative impacts are defined in §15355 of the CEQA Guidelines as two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study it has been determined that the rezone will not result in cumulative impacts.

(c) The proposed rezone will not generate any substantially adverse environmental effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly because it was already fully developed.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Planning Services in Placerville.

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report  
Volume 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6  
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9  
Appendix A  
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

El Dorado County General Plan – A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; a Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief (Adopted July 19, 2004)

Findings of Fact of the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors for the General Plan

El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 - County Code)

County of El Dorado Drainage Manual (Resolution No. 67-97, Adopted March 14, 1995)

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170)

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinances (Title 16 - County Code)

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.)

Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (Section 15000, et seq.)

