

EXHIBIT I



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Special Use Permit S05-0042/Snowline Hospice

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

Contact Person: Lisa Burke, AICP, Senior Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: El Dorado County Federated Church, 1031 Thompson Way, Placerville, CA. 95667

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Snowline Hospice of El Dorado County, Inc., Attn: Susan Dorsey, 670 Placerville Drive, Placerville, CA. 95667

Project Agent's Name and Address: same as above

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Arktegraf Inc., Attn: Jeff Peterson, 1800 27th Street, Sacramento, CA 95816

Project Location: South side of Pleasant Valley/State Route 49, approximately 500 feet east of the intersection with Oakdell Road, in the El Dorado area of El Dorado County.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 331-301-15

Zoning: One -family Residential (R1)

Section: 35 and 36 **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Multi-family residential

Description of Project: Special use permit request to construct a 15,000 square foot building on 8.89 acres located on Pleasant Valley Road. The building will be separated into two areas. One area will be the in-home services which will house the out patient clinical team and administrative staff of Snowline Hospice. This area will encompass approximately 8,700 square feet of space. The other portion of building will be used as a Hospice Home. The Hospice Home is a six bed, inpatient facility designed to provide a homelike setting for patients requiring a level of care that cannot be provided in a private residence. This area will encompass approximately 6,300 square feet of space. The building is set back approximately 650 feet from Pleasant Valley Road. An access driveway is proposed within a 40 wide access/utility easement along the northwestern border of parcel "A" that leads to Pleasant Valley Road.

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:	R1	MFR	undeveloped
North:	MP	HDR	mobile home park
East:	RIA	HDR	Single Family Residential
South:	A	PF	Charles Brown School
West:	R1/R2	MDR	Residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The property is located at an elevation of approximately 1,500 feet. Vegetation on the project site is characterized by oak trees, pine trees, manzanita and other brush/grasses. No improvements currently exist on the subject parcel.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado County Development Services Department, Building Services: Building Permit; Cal Trans Encroachment Permit

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
X	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: July 17, 2006

Printed Name: Lisa Burke, AICP 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, 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

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

Discussion:

a. The project is for construction of a 15,000 square foot building to be used as a hospice. There are no scenic vistas in the vicinity of the project, thus there is no potential for creation of an adverse impact.

b. The proposed project will not substantially damage existing scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources within a corridor defined by as State Scenic highway adjacent to the project site. The applicant is proposing landscaping around the perimeter of the project and in the parking lot areas. The applicant will also replace removed oak trees on a 1:1 ratio.

c. The introduction of 15,000 square foot building that is landscaped around the perimeter is consistent with surrounding land uses, and will result in a minor change in the overall visual character of the site and its surroundings. The impact is considered less than significant.

d. Some limited light and glare may result from the addition of the proposed building on the parcel. These increases are expected to be normal for the R1 zoning district and are not expected to have a significant effect or adversely affect day or nighttime views adjacent to the project site. All lighting for the building and the parking areas shall be side or top shielded to reduce glare and light from escaping onto adjacent properties or onto public roads or right-of-ways.

FINDING: It has been determined that there will be no significant impacts to aesthetic or visual resources. Identified thresholds of significance for the “Aesthetics” category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <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) Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that no areas of Prime Unique or Farmland of Statewide Importance will be affected by the project. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
 - b) The proposed project will not conflict with any existing agricultural zoning in the project vicinity, and will not adversely impact any properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract.
 - c) No existing agricultural land will be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

FINDING: It has been determined that the project will not result in any impacts to agricultural lands, or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. For this “Agriculture” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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	

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

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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_x, 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 PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, 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) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). The proposed project will not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

b, c) El Dorado County is classified as being in “severe non-attainment” status for particulate matter (PM₁₀) under the State’s standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1998 requires the County’s Air pollution Control Program to meet the States ambient air quality standards. The project will generate additional vehicle trips on Pleasant Valley Road; however, the El Dorado Air Pollution Control District has determined that this will have an insignificant air quality impact.

- d) There is one known sensitive receptor located southwest of the proposed project site, which is Charles Brown Elementary School. The project will be required to comply with El Dorado County Air Quality Management Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2 which addresses regulations and mitigation measures for fugitive dust emissions and asbestos emission. By adhering to the Rules of the Air District, the impact will be less than significant.
- e) The R1 zoning district does not permit activities which could generate objectional odors. There is no potential for significant impact from exposure of a significant number of people to objectional 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 proposed air quality violation, or any exposure to sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <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?		X	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X
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?			X
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?			X
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X	
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?			X

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;
- 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) The proposed building will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, or any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, , or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. A biological resource evaluation was prepared for the project in August 2005 by EN2 Resources. The proposed project is located in Mitigation Area 2, outside the five Ecological Preserve-EP overlay zones, and is outside areas where special-status plants and animals are identified on the Important Biological Resources Map. The Biological Resources evaluation for the project indicates no potentially significant effects to biological resources, however, the following mitigation measure is recommended:

- Visual surveys for nesting raptors in mature oaks and pines within and adjacent to the area of disturbance (i.e., areas slated for construction or grading) will be performed at least one week prior to construction if construction occurs between March and August (raptor breeding season); otherwise surveys are not needed.

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

- b) The United States Department of the Interior national Wetlands Inventory Map for the project area (Placerville Quadrangle, 1995) was reviewed to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project. The review indicates that there are no mapped wetlands or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project.
- c) The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Map for the project area (Placerville, Quadrangle, 1995) was reviewed to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project. The review indicates that there are no mapped wetlands or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project.
- d) Review of the Planning Services GIS Deer Ranges Map (January 2002) indicates that there are no mapped deer migration corridors on the project site. The project does not propose construction therefore will not substantially interfere with the movement of native resident nor migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.
- e) The project will require the removal of four oak trees ranging in diameter from 9 inches to 14 inches in size. The oak trees being removed will be replaced with 41 valley oak trees. The replacement trees will be planted on the parcels where the trees were removed. The tree planting conforms to the 1:1 tree mitigation as outlined in the General Plan. Additionally, the project will retain over 90% of the existing tree canopy. The following mitigation measures apply to this project regarding tree replacement:
 - Plant 41 valley oaks trees on the parcel where trees were removed.
 - Planting. Container trees will be planted in the fall after the leaf drop for best results. When planting container trees, holes shall be dug twice the width and depth of container size. Root mass should be sliced vertically 2 to 3 times on root ball to prevent root girdling. Roots should be gently pulled apart and planted with organic planting mix. Vitamin B-1 is recommended to accelerate root growth. Install dirt mound around the hole to help hold water in around tree. Apply mulch around tree to slow evaporation of water. Install 2 stakes firmly around tree. Use a broad flexible material to attach tree to stakes. Remove stakes after growing season.
 - Tree Care After Planting. Fertilize in the fall when roots are active. Use a slow controlled release formula. Irrigate trees every 2-3 days for the first three months. Irrigation shall be a drip system with automatic controller.
 - Inspect trees weekly for one year for signs of shock; ensure that water is adequate, and that stakes are in place.
- f) The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*) or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to the draft Recovery/Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

FINDING: It has been determined that all potential biological resource impacts as a result of the proposed project are less than significant. Therefore, the established thresholds for significance in the "Biological Resources" category will not be exceeded.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X

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) The applicant has submitted a Cultural Resource Study prepared by Peak and Associates in 1988. The Study concluded that there are no identified archaeological sites, cultural, or historic resources on the project site. Therefore, this project will have a less than significant impact upon historic or cultural resources.
- b) The applicant has submitted a Cultural Resource Study prepared by Peak and Associates in 1988. The Study concluded that there are no identified archaeological sites, cultural, or historic resources on the project site. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact upon archeological resources.
- c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or know fossil locales.
- d) The project includes construction and grading for the building. In the event of accidental discovery of any human remains in any location other than a cemetery, the steps outlined in Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines shall be implemented immediately.

FINDING: The proposed project with have a less than significant impact upon Cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X
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.			X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X
iv) Landslides?			X
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X
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?			X
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?			X
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			X

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) As shown in the Division of Mines and Geology’s publication Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, there are no Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones mapped in El Dorado County. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating structures in the project area will be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.
 - b) The project includes grading and construction of a 15,000 square foot building. The project must meet the provisions contained in the County of El Dorado – Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. Compliance with the ordinance will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.
 - c) The soil on the project site is classified as Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes and not considered an unstable soil. According to the soil survey, surface runoff is slow to medium and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate so the impact will be less than significant.

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

- d) The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has mapped soils on the site as Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam 9 to 15 percent slope (Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974). Review of the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area indicates that properties in which very fine sandy loam is found have a low-shrink-well potential. Based upon this review, the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.
- e) The project will not have a septic system therefore a less than significant impact is anticipated.

FINDING: No significant impacts will result from geological or seismological anomalies on the project site. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that will result in significant impacts. For the “Geology and Soils” category, established thresholds will not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse effects will result from the project.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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;

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

- 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
 - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations. There are no former mines on the project; therefore there will be no impact.
- a) The project is a hospice and may require the removal of medical waste, such as used needles from the site which may require a Medical Waste Permit. The applicant would be required to see a determination from the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department as to whether a permit is required prior to building permit issuance. In event a permit is not required, the applicant will be required to contract with either their waste management provider or the medical vendor for proper disposal of medical/hazardous waste. All hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials, therefore, these impacts are considered less than significant.
 - b) The proposed project does not include the use of hazardous materials and substances, but may include medical waste. Please see discussion for item A above. Therefore, the risk of accidental release is remote.
 - c) The project is located with a quarter mile of the Charles Brown School. Please see the discussion under item A above. Project impacts will be less than significant.
 - d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there will be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.
 - e) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There are less than significant impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations and the over-flight of aircraft in the vicinity of the project.
 - f) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights in the vicinity of the project site.
 - g) The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County.

FINDING: For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance will not be exceeded by the proposed project.

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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;
- 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.

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

- a) The project will not have any impact upon local groundwater supply. The project does not include the use of wells and therefore will not deplete any groundwater supplies.
- b) There is no evidence that the project will substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project.
- c) There is no evidence that grading and ground disturbance activities associated with the project will substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance contains specific requirements which limit the impacts to a drainage system. The standards apply to any discretionary permit which requires a grading permit. Compliance with the Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance will limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site.
- d & e) Compliance with the Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance will limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site, and limit erosion and siltation to a less than significant level.
- f) The project will not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion and siltation to a less than significant level.
- g & h) The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0725D, December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain.
- i) The subject property within the Diamond Springs area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters.
- j) The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. Potential for a mudflow is also considered to be less than significant.

FINDING: No significant hydrological impacts are anticipated from development of the project. For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and therefore no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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;

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

- 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) The project will not result in the physical division of an established community; therefore there will be no impact upon land use.

b) The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, therefore there will be no impact upon land use.

c) The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The project will have a less than significant impact upon land uses.

FINDING: For the “Land Use Planning” section, the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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) The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan.

b) The project is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan. 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.

FINDING: No impacts to any known mineral resources will occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. In the “Mineral Resources” section, the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

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

XI. NOISE. <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 & c)

The project will not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. The project is not located in an area exposed to existing noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. The project will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 of the General Plan.

b & d)

Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration. There will be minimal impact from construction noise during the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on weekends and on federally recognized holidays.

e) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards contained within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport.

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

f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport.

FINDING: As mentioned above, there may be some construction noise associated with the project. For the “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and with the mitigation measures proposed, no significant adverse environmental effects will occur from the proposed development

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <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.

- The proposed project has been determined to have no growth-inducing impact as the project does not include any proposal to extend, or expand infrastructure or roads, and does not include any school or large scale employment opportunities that lead to indirect growth.
- No substantial numbers of existing housing stock will be displaced by the proposed project.
- No substantial numbers of people will be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

FINDING: The project will not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project will not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or expanding infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. <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

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

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. <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>			
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.

- a) **Fire Protection:** The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increased demand for fire protection services, and would not prevent the Fire District from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area.
- b) **Police Protection:** The project site will be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The project is a hospice facility and will not decrease response time for the sheriff’s department.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Mother Lode School District. Impact to the affected school district from the proposed project will be less than significant.
- d) **Parks:** The proposed project will not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities.
- e) No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the project.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project No significant public service impacts are expected. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

XIV. RECREATION.			
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?			X
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?			X

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) The proposed project will not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- b) The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing recreation facilities.

FINDING: No impacts to recreation or open space will result from the project. For this “Recreation” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <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			X

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			

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)

Access to the site is from Pleasant Valley Road. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the project and determined the project will have a less than significant impact upon traffic in the project vicinity. The project will require an encroachment permit from the California Department of Transportation (Cal-Trans) for the driveway.

- c) The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity.
- d) The proposed project does not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that will substantially increase hazards. No traffic hazards will result from the project design.
- e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access to site.
- f) The site plan was compared to the Zoning Ordinance to verify compliance with the County Parking standards. There is adequate parking for the proposed hospice facility.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

FINDING: No significant traffic impacts are expected with this project and mitigation is not required. For the “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X
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?			X

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

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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?			X
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X
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?			X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X

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 ,b and d)

The project will connect to a public wastewater collection water system. There is a 24 inch sewer line in Pleasant Valley Road. According to EID, the sewer line has adequate capacity to serve the Hospice Facility.

c) All required drainage facilities for the project shall be constructed in conformance with the standards contained in the "County of El Dorado Drainage Manual," as determined by the Department of Transportation.

d) Water to the project will be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). See discussion under item A. Impacts will be less than significant.

e) The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) will serve the project and has adequate capacity to service the site. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

f) 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.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other 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

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

655-acre site. Approximately six 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) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. The project has provided locations for collections facilities.

FINDING: No significant impacts will result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the “Utilities and Service Systems” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects will result from the project.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:			
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:

There is no substantial evidence contained in the whole record that the project will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project 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. Any impacts from the project will be less than significant due to existing standards and requirements imposed in the conditioning of the project.

b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (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 project will not result in cumulative impacts.

c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Project mitigation has been incorporated into the project. Mitigation measures have been designed to address biological resources.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

2004 El Dorado County General Plan

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume II - Response to Comment on DEIR
Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR
Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR
Volume V - Appendices

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume I - Goals, Objectives, and Policies

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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.)