



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: S 05-0032, Cameron Park Community Center

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

Contact Person: Lillian MacLeod, Project Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Cameron Park Community Services District

Project Applicant's Name and Address: WLC Architects, Inc., 1110 Iron Point Road #200, Folsom, 95630

Project Agent's Name and Address: Bill Louie, 1110 Iron Point Road #200, Folsom, 95630

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: WLC Architects, Inc., 1110 Iron Point Rd., Folsom

Project Location: The property is located on the south side of Country Club Lane, 0.5 miles west of the intersection with Cambridge Road, in the Cameron Park area.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 108-280-06

Zoning: Single-family Residential (R1)

Section: 5 **T:** 9N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: Public Facilities (PF)

Description of Project: On March 8, 2005, residents registered within the Cameron Park Community Services District (CSD) voted to approve, by the required two-thirds margin, Measure C, which read "To construct and equip a Cameron Park recreational community center, including meeting/classrooms, a youth activity area, facilities for senior meals and programs, recreational and competition pools, gym, exercise/dance room, assembly hall with a theatre and stage for community productions, shall Cameron Park Community Services District issue \$8,500,000 of bonds at legal rates and appoint a Citizens' Oversight Committee to maintain financial accountability, prevent waste and ensure that no bond money is used for operating expenses?"

The proposed project is for a special use permit to implement Measure C with construction of three buildings totaling 22,687 square feet containing an assembly hall, youth activity center, meeting rooms, classrooms, gymnasium, commercial kitchen, and support spaces, along with recreation and competition swimming pools totaling approximately 11,000 square feet in size on the 4.12 acre parcel. An off-site conservation easement will be dedicated to the County protecting 0.94 acres of oak tree canopy. The Cameron Park CSD will maintain the easement.

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	PF	Undeveloped
North:	R1	HDR	Single family residences
East:	R2	MFR	Duplexes, townhomes
South:	R1	PF	Camerado Springs Middle School
West:	R1	PF	El Dorado County Public Library

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The parcel is located within a residential setting adjacent to a middle school and public library. The topography is flat. Vegetation consists primarily of seasonal grasses, with sporadic oak trees throughout the property and riparian vegetation bordering the seasonal stream that runs parallel to Country Club Drive.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Game, Building Services, Department of Transportation, Environmental Health.

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: _____

Printed Name: Lillian MacLeod 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?			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 & b)

The project is not located within a designated scenic vista or state scenic highway.

(c) The proposed construction and use received public approval through the election process. While the site is presently undeveloped, upon completion of construction it will conform to the mixed use development of single-family, multi-family and public facilities that are already established in the surrounding area.

(d) Lighting for the buildings and parking lots will be installed so as to ensure that light and glare do not escape the subject parcel onto neighboring parcels or into any established public street or right-of-way. All on-site lighting will conform to §17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Code, and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation.

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) Soils of the project parcel are classified as Sobrante silt loam (SuC), with 3-15 percent slopes, and Auburn silt loam (Awd), with 2-30 percent slopes. Under the El Dorado County Choice Agricultural Soils definitions as delineated by the USDA-SCS and the El Dorado County Agricultural Commission, the SuC soil type falls under the category of “soils of local importance”. El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use maps. This designation is absent from the land use designation of PF given to this parcel. The project parcel falls within the boundaries of the Cameron Park Community Region as indicated on the General Plan land use map. As such, this is an area to be utilized for the highest intensity of self-sustaining compact urban-type development or suburban type development within the county (Policy 2.1.1.2). Therefore, the agricultural capabilities of the land are incompatible with the intent of the General Plan.

(b & c)

The project parcel is neither designated nor surrounded by land designated for agricultural use, or under a Williamson Act Contract.

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	
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) The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan.

(b & c)

Currently, 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 (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. 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.

Short-term grading and excavation activities associated with the construction of building foundations could result in wind erosion and the introduction of particulate matter (dust) into the atmosphere and adjacent surface water resources. Also, emissions from earth moving equipment may further compound this potential impact. The applicant will be required to comply with the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District's APCD) permitting process in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The project parcel is accessed directly off of Country Club Drive, a County-maintained road that connects directly with Cambridge Road. Country Club Drive and Cambridge Road are designated as urban collectors both presently operating at a level of service (LOS) not greater than LOS C. Based on the *Air Quality Impact Analysis* prepared August 1, 2005 by Carlton Engineering, Inc., the project will generate approximately 41 additional weekday vehicle trips (ADTs) and 338 weekend ADTs onto both roadways. While this increase in traffic will result in short-term and long-term increases in mobile emission sources, the analysis, utilizing URBEMIS 2002 to model a facility size of 24,819 square feet, concluded air quality impacts to be significantly under that which is likely to generate 82 pounds (lbs) of ROG and NOX per day, the level of potential significance established under the APCD *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*. The results were as follows:

	<u>ROG (lb/day)</u>	<u>NOX (lb/day)</u>
Summer	2.99	5.02
Winter	3.61	6.00

Doubling and tripling the trip generation calculations will still maintain an emission rate significantly under the 82 lb. threshold. The APCD has determined that projects the fall below the threshold for ROG and NOX will be insignificant for CO, PM10 and SO2 emission levels as well.

- (d) Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, day-care centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. General Plan Policy 6.7.6.1 requires that the County "Ensure that new facilities in which sensitive receptors are located (e.g., schools, child care centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, and hospitals) are sited away from significant sources of air pollution." The proposed community center is not considered a sensitive receptor site.
- (e) The proposed project will not generate objectionable odors that could impact significant numbers of people.

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, and 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 project parcel contains marginal habitat for several special-status invertebrate and animal species pursuant to the *Biological Resources Evaluation and Jurisdictional Delineation Report* prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. on August 5, 2005. None of these species were observed on the parcel during reconnaissance surveys conducted between the months of April and August. Due to various adverse characteristics of the site that would prevent habitation including its location in a fairly urbanized area, proposed development of the site will have no significant impact on these species.

Two, isolated populations of elderberry shrubs were observed on the site, though no exit holes were observed in the stems indicating the presence of the Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB, *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*). Based on discussion in the report, “VELB are most likely to occur in situations where plants are clustered and not isolated from one another.” Apart from being isolated from each other as well as the nearest population 6.6 miles away, the shrubs have been pruned on a periodic basis limiting the chances of the VELB existing on site to less than significant.

Reconnaissance surveys conducted during the peak propagation and bloom period provided no evidence of rare and endangered plant species existing on site. The biological report concluded that the site did not provide habitat for these species.

- (b) After reviewing the County's *Critical Habitat Area for the California Red-legged Frog*, it has been determined that the project parcel is neither within the critical habitat nor the designated core area for this protected species. Further, based on the biological report, though marginal habitat exists on-site, the ephemeral wetland areas are not sufficiently vegetated nor do they possess the characteristics of still/slow water flow and optimal water temperature to support this or other special-status reptiles.
- (c) Based on the biological report referenced above, jurisdictional wetlands and waters of the U.S. comprise a total of 0.4533 acres of the project site, and consist of the following: four, small ephemeral ponds located in depressions at the base of individual oak trees, four seasonal wetlands measuring 1/100th of an acre at their largest in the northeastern quadrant of the parcel, and a seasonal drainage channel running west to east along the north and northeastern boundaries of the parcel. Hydrology for the seasonal, intermittent wetlands and ephemeral ponds is primarily from rainfall.

Pursuant to the report, the drainage channel, which is partially located in a 40 foot drainage easement maintained by the Cameron Park Community Service District (CSD), has been realigned from its natural flow and appears to have been previously disked and graded. Vegetation removal in the northwest corner of the channel is evident. Willow and cottonwood riparian vegetation grows within the middle portion of the channel causing a blockage in the flow of water that redirects it outside the easement. The applicant proposes to remove this vegetation in order to re-establish the contours of the channel to flow within the drainage easement. Based on the biological report, "discharge of fill into jurisdictional wetlands or below the official high water mark (OHWM) of a channel requires a §404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a §401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and a §1602 Streambed Alteration Permit from the California Department of Fish and Game allowing the applicants to fill or alter the wetlands and drainage channel. **The project will be conditioned so that compliance with these permitting requirements must be demonstrated prior to grading permit issuance.**

Under Policy 7.3.3.4 of the General Plan, minimum setbacks of 50 feet for intermittent streams shall be applied to the drainage channel. However, modifications to the setback can be allowed if they are sufficient to protect the riparian area. The site plan indicates onsite improvements consisting of parking spaces and a gated emergency access road will be located a minimum of 20 feet from the official high water mark (OHWM) of the drainage easement. A drainage report will be required by the Department of Transportation at time of grading permit application demonstrating consistency with the *Drainage Manual* and the *Storm Water Management Plan* regarding attenuation of runoff to preconstruction flows as well as appropriate storm water quality management practices for runoff into the drainage channel. **The project will be conditioned so that prior to any grading or construction activities fencing shall be placed along the southern and western edge of the drainage easement, adjacent to the seasonal stream as delineated in Exhibit 1, attached.** In no case shall grading or construction activities result in the discharge of fill material into this protected wetland area.

General Plan Policy 7.3.4.1 states that streams and wetlands "shall be integrated into new development in such a way that they enhance the aesthetic and natural character of the site while disturbance to the resource is avoided or minimized and fragmentation is limited." The applicant proposes to remove vegetation in the "bulge area" of the channel in order to reconfigure the stream flow into its natural drainage course. Native blue, interior live, and valley oak trees (*Quercus douglasii*, *wislenzii*, and *lobata*, respectively) will be retained in the northeast corner of the parcel that includes the drainage channel. Additional populations of the interior live oak species, as well as native riparian shrubbery such as coffeeberry (*Rhamnus var.*), toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) and California buckeye (*Aesculus californica*) will be used to revegetate the channel and provide screening as required under the *Off-street Parking and Loading Ordinance*. **To further protect and maintain the natural character of the site, the project will be conditioned to prohibit any structures, including signage, from being placed in the northeast corner of the parcel that lies outside of the existing drainage easement.**

- (d) Review of the Department of Fish and Game Migratory Deer Herd Maps and General Plan DEIR Exhibit V-8-4 indicate the absence of mapped deer or wildlife migration corridors on the project site. The project 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) Under Policy 7.4.4.4 of the General Plan, discretionary projects that are on parcels greater than “one acre and have at least one percent total canopy cover by woodlands habitats as defined in this General Plan” are subject to tree canopy retention standards under Option A. Under General Plan Policy 7.4.5.2, the County requires the preservation of “native oaks wherever feasible, through the review of all proposed development activities where such trees are present on either public or private property, while at the same time recognizing individual rights to develop private property in a reasonable manner.” This policy includes procedures for regulating removal of oak trees through the discretionary review process subject to conformance with certain requirements.

Interpretive Guidelines addressing implementation of both 7.4.4.4 and 7.4.5.2 are currently being prepared by County staff and will be subject to Planning Commission review. Pending completion and approval of these Guidelines, 7.4.4.4 is understood to apply to oak woodlands and canopy retention requirements for this project based on the canopy area of existing healthy oak tree stands on the project site. The project site is 4.12 acres and 11 percent of the site is covered by oak tree canopy. Under Option A of 7.4.4.4, the project would be required to retain 90 percent of the existing, healthy, oak canopy. The project proposes to retain 27 percent of healthy oak canopy on-site and secure the preservation of 41,064 square feet of oak canopy off-site.

- (f) Policy 7.4.5.2 requires a certified arborist report to identify all oak trees on site and provide specific information on each regarding location and overall health, along with protection and preservation methods. A preliminary arborist report was prepared and submitted with the subject application, along with the final report and subsequent addendum (Randall Frizzell, Registered Consulting Arborist, August 2005, March 2006, and April 8, 2006). As explained in the arborist reports, the decisions to remove trees were based not only on the site plan, but on the types of trees as well as their overall health. The proposed tree removal not only accommodates the development plan, but insures the safety of the public who will be utilizing the facilities.

There is no physical area on the parcel that would allow the voter approved project to be built while fully retaining the canopy on-site to the extent required under Policy 7.4.4.4. However, with the combination of on-site and off-site retention/preservation proposed by the applicant, and on-site replacement for oak trees required to be removed, consistency with Policy 7.4.4.4 and 7.4.5.2 can be demonstrated. The applicant is proposing an overall preservation mitigation ratio of 2:1 which is also consistent with what would be required under Option B of Policy 7.4.4.4 if that option were currently available. The 2:1 ratio is intended to compensate for fragmentation as well as habitat loss based on the total oak woodland acreage onsite as specified in Option B. The project description includes off-site mitigation in the form of an oak tree preservation easement consistent with the 2:1 mitigation ratio that would be required under Option B. As the proposed project was voter approved and bonded for, and the CSD, as a public entity whose primary mission is to conserve, develop and maintain open space and recreation areas for public use, is willing to dedicate and maintain off-site oak canopy as mitigation for on-site habitat loss, the project, subject to the following mitigation, is found to be consistent with the General Plan.

Mitigation Measure 1:

Prior to grading permit issuance, the Cameron Park Community Service District (CSD) shall dedicate and record a conservation easement on property under their ownership that contains oak tree canopy in an amount twice that existing on the project parcel, for a total of 0.94 acres of oak tree canopy. The conservation easement shall be set aside for public passive recreational use. The easement will be offered to the County, but the land shall be maintained by the CSD. A 4/5 vote of the Board of Supervisors will be necessary to remove the easement.

On site mitigation will be required consistent with Option A, requiring a 1:1 replacement ratio for removed trees. The following mitigation measure is consistent with the General Plan.

Mitigation Measure 2:

Two valley oaks, one blue oak, and one interior live oak shall be retained on the northeast corner of the site adjacent to the bend in the drainage channel (840, 841, 845 and 846 on Tree-1 Exhibit). Two valley oaks shall be retained along the southwest boundary adjacent to the parking area (802 and 803). Landscaping shall be required along the parking areas that front Country Club Drive and the southern property line for a total of approximately 525 linear feet consistent with Ordinance requirements, for a

minimum of three trees per 100 linear feet, for a total of 16 trees. Over and above these buffering requirements, one 15 gallon tree is required for every 10 parking spaces for an additional 13 trees. As a result, the proposed project shall require a minimum of 29 trees to be planted on site constituting a replacement ratio of 1:1.6. The trees shall be native oak species, preferably valley oak and interior live oak.

Compliance with Mitigation Measures 1 and 2 will reduce impacts from the proposed project on blue oak woodland habitat to less than significant.

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

Based on the *Cultural Resources Study* prepared by Historic Resource Associates, May 2005, an archaeological survey was performed that inspected the project site in 5 to 10 meter transects. The site survey found no evidence of cultural, historical or archaeological resources. **The project will be conditioned that in the event of the discovery of archaeological deposits or human remains during grading and construction, all work will stop and either a qualified archaeologist or the El Dorado County Coroner will be notified immediately.**

- (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 known fossil locales.
- (d) In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the steps outlined in Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines shall be conditioned on the project to be implemented immediately.

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:				
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	
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 waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				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) There are no known faults that transect the project area or are located on the project site, however, there are faults located regionally. The project site could be expected to undergo moderate to severe ground shaking during large magnitude earthquakes. These seismic hazards would be reduced to levels of insignificance, because 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).
- (b) All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the County of El Dorado - *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). This ordinance is designed to limit

erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During site grading and construction of the new building foundations, there is potential for minor erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions. To reduce the potential for erosion and loss of topsoil, the applicant will be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance.

- (c) The SuC and AwD soil types are not considered to be unstable soils. Topography on the site is gentle with slopes of approximately 2 percent. Compliance with the County of El Dorado *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance 3983, adopted 11/3/88) should limit any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
- (d) Expansive soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. The expansiveness boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. As identified in the *Soil Survey of El Dorado County*, the subject property has a low shrink-swell rating. It has been determined that the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.
- (e) The project will utilize public sewer provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District.

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;
 - 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.
- (a) Being a community center, there will be a minimum of any hazardous materials or substances used during construction, or remaining on the premises after construction. The proper use and storage of any such hazardous material or substances should limit exposure and the potential for explosion or spills. If explosives are used for grading, such activity would only occur in conformance with State and County applicable laws. In this case, the El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan serves as the implementation program for the management of any hazardous wastes in order to protect the health, safety, and property of residents in the vicinity of the project. The project does not involve transport of significant amounts of hazardous substances or materials, and no hazardous material or substances will be removed from the site as a result of the project.
- (b) The project will not result in any reasonably foreseeable upsets or accidents involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Chemicals for the pool operations to be stored and used onsite in quantities greater than 55 gallons for liquids, 500 pounds for solids, and/or 200 scf (standard cubic feet) for gases will require an annual business plan to be submitted to Environmental Management Hazmat Division. If the facility uses gaseous chlorine, or liquid held under pressure in quantities greater than 100 pounds for pool maintenance, compliance with the State Office of Environmental Safety's California Accidental Release and Prevention (CalARP) provisions, including "Off-site Consequence Analysis" and "Worst Case Analysis" will be required.
- (c) The project is located adjacent to a middle school, however, no hazardous emissions will be created as part of the project, and no hazardous materials will be handled or transported to and from the site. Compliance with section VII (b) of this document will insure that impacts from the project on the adjacent school will be less than significant.
- (d) The project parcel is not identified as a hazardous materials site on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5.
- (e & f)
The project is not located within the Cameron Park Airpark CLUP, nor is it located within two (2) miles of a privately operated airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from public or 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 project area. The County emergency response plan is located with the County Office of Emergency Services located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.
- (h) The project site is located in an area of moderate hazard for wildland fire as identified on the El Dorado County Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). Based upon the location of the nearest fire station, availability of multiple access points to the project site, availability of water for fire suppression, and provisions within the County emergency response plan, impacts from wildland fire is less than significant.

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.

(a) General Plan Policy 7.3.2.2 establishes 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. Specific water quality objectives have been established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and any project not meeting those objectives are required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. There is no evidence indicating that the project or activities associated with the project will violate any

water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- (b) 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. Wells are typically drilled to depths ranging from 80 to 300 feet in depth. 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 the 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 that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply to any discretionary permit that requires a grading permit.
- (d) The applicant proposes to remove vegetation within the drainage channel in order to re-establish the contours of the seasonal stream to flow within the drainage easement. Based on the biological report, permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Department of Fish and Game will be required prior to allowing the applicants to fill or alter the wetlands and drainage channel. In addition, a drainage report will be required prior to grading permit issuance demonstrating consistency with the *Drainage Manual* and the *Storm Water Management Plan* regarding attenuation of runoff to preconstruction flows as well as appropriate storm water quality management practices for the drainage channel. Compliance with these permit requirements will reduce erosion, surface run-off and siltation to less than significant.
- (e & 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 control measures on the project site.
- (g & h)
The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map for the project area (Panel No. 0700 D, October 18, 1995) establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.
- (i) 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 that have the potential to inundate residential areas. The subject property is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the area with floodwaters.
- (j) 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 mudflow is considered to be non-existent and having no impact.

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;
- 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 a known community. The location of the community center in an area of residential and public service oriented facilities offers a gathering place for the community and does not affect the future residential development in Cameron Park.
- (b) The development of a community center is subject to special use permit approval by the County Planning Commission. 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.
- (c) The project will not conflict with any known adopted habitat conservation plan. The project site is located in Ecological Preserve Mitigation Area 2. Projects located in Mitigation Area 2 are required to pay the in-lieu fees that support the five ecological preserve areas required by the General Plan.

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 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.

- (b) 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.

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 proposed project, a community center with outdoor recreational facilities, could result in large gatherings of people utilizing the facilities. Any increased noise levels due to activities occurring within the main building will be internalized. The outside facilities, consisting of both a recreation and competition swimming pool, required a noise study analyzing the project's impact on the surrounding residential development. Based on the *Environmental Noise Analysis* prepared by J.C. Brennan & Associates, Inc. on August 16, 2005, two primary noise sources, the parking lot and the outdoor pool areas, were analyzed for impacts on the residential town homes to the east. It was determined that parking lot noise would not exceed General Plan standards established under Table 6-2 for daytime and evening hours, but would exceed nighttime standards. **Restricting the hours of operation from 7am to 10pm will reduce this impact to less than significant.**

The recreational pool is located approximately 220 feet from the nearest sensitive receptor, which are the town homes to the east. Based on noise level data collected from similar pool facilities, it was determined that the pools would generate noise in excess of standards for all hours of the day and night. Noise impacts will be reduced to less than significant for all but nighttime hours (10pm to 7am) if the intervening buildings are at least

19 feet in height. Elevation plans indicate that the proposed buildings exceed this height. Based on recommendations within the *Analysis*, conditions will be applied restricting the hours of operation, bleacher orientation and outdoor sound system in order to reduce project-related noise impacts to less than significant.

- (b) Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of project construction or upon completion of the project.
- (d) Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the project vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. All storage, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas are required to be located as far as practicable from any residential areas.
- (e) 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 shall 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) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project will not be subjected excessive noise from a private airport.

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.

(a) The project will not induce substantial growth above what was contemplated in the General Plan EIR. There will not be indirect growth resulting from the infrastructure and roadways associated with the project, since water, sewer and roads exist to the project site.

(b & c)

No substantial numbers of existing housing stock will be displaced by the proposed project, nor will substantial numbers of people be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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	
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 Cameron Park Fire District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. However, as no comments were received by the Fire District, it can be assumed that the project would not cause the level of service to fall below the minimum requirements. The established minimum level of service for the fire district in a Community Region is an 8-minute response to 80 percent of the population. The project site is within that response range through the existing fire station on Country Club Drive west of Cambridge Road. The Fire District will review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards including, but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking lots, fire sprinklers within buildings, building identification and construction phasing. Any alterations to the approved site plan as a result may require further revision to the special use permit.

(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 percent of the population within Community Regions. Currently, the County has 0.89 sworn officers per 1,000 daytime population compared with the statewide average of 1.8 officers per 1,000 residents. However, this comparison is not valid based upon the large rural tracts in the County with sparse population, large concentrations of Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands, and an overall low crime rate. The Sheriff Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of 1 sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The addition of the proposed office center and the related uses will not significantly impact the achievement of this goal, or significantly impact current response times to the project area.

(c) Schools: No impact on schools will result from the proposed community center.

(d) Parks & Recreation: No Quimby Act requirements will result from this type of non-residential project.

(e) No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the project.

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, a recreational facility in its own right, would reduce the impact of public use on other parks and recreational facilities, rather than increase it.
- (b) The project proposal consists of on-site recreation facilities, which will require filling in ephemeral ponds and seasonal wetlands. A seasonal stream will be reconfigured to its original course and will be revegetated and maintained within an existing drainage easement. Compliance with all permitting requirements for fill and grading in or around these resources will reduce impacts on wetland habitat to less than significant.

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 transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X	

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)

Based on the *Traffic Impact Analysis for Cameron Park Community Center Master Plan* prepared by kdAnderson on April 11, 2006, “from a Level of Service (LOS) standpoint, the operation of the Community Center could exacerbate the poor conditions that already occur during the peak period before the school day begins” at the intersection of Cambridge Road and Country Club Drive. During AM peak hours (7 to 9:00am) this intersection will go from LOS D to LOS F, while during the PM peak hours (4 to 6:00pm) the intersection will remain at LOS C. A traffic signal would be warranted at the intersection as mitigation; however, it would only be justified for a 15 minute time frame before the start of the school day.

Under General Plan Policy TC-Xf, projects that worsen traffic beyond LOS E in the Community Regions are required to either construct the improvements needed to maintain level of service standards or insure improvements are programmed and funded through the CIP. Traffic increases from the project require either the traffic signal improvement or the coordination of scheduled activities around school start times in order to reduce impacts to less than significant. The applicant has agreed to adjust the schedule of activities in order to reduce LOS impacts to less than significant. In addition, the Department of Transportation is requiring improvements be made to both Country Club and Meadow Drives in the form of either widening for an unloading lane, sidewalk improvements, or both that will reduce project generated traffic impacts to less than significant, as well.

- (c) The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing fields in the project vicinity.
- (d) No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Traffic volume at the project’s entrance across from Placitas Drive was analyzed to determine if a dedicated left turn lane would be required to mitigate delay and the potential for rear end accidents. As guidelines have been adopted by El Dorado County in this regard, guidelines from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials were utilized. However, these guidelines are based on rural roads with higher speeds (40-60 miles per hour) than the 35 mile per hour speed limit that exists on Country Club Drive. Therefore, the results are an approximation of the need for this improvement. The Department of Transportation is requiring improvements to the road that will preclude the need for a left turn lane at this time.

A sidewalk along the County Club Drive frontage is also being required by the Department of Transportation, along with a pedestrian connection from the sidewalk to the site that will insure pedestrian safety from vehicles accessing the parking lot. The site plan indicates a bridge way over the drainage channel connecting the sidewalk to an on site crosswalk that will satisfy this condition.

- (e) Two points of access have been provided to insure through access to the site and are shown on the proposed site plan. Comments were requested but not received from the Cameron Park Fire District that would indicate emergency access to be inadequate.
- (f) The submitted site plan was reviewed to verify compliance with Zoning Ordinance on-site parking requirements. Section 17.18.060 of the Zoning Ordinance lists the parking requirements by use. For community center uses the parking requirement is one space per 300 square feet of gross floor area. The proposed project requires a total of 76 spaces, of which 4 must be ADA compliant with one van accessible. The site plan indicates 128 parking spaces, of which five are ADA compliant with two van accessible, exceeding both County and ADA requirements based on structural floor area. However, the outdoor bleacher areas will be utilized during swim lessons and competitions, also. The additional 52 spaces will help to insure that on-street parking will be kept to a minimum during largely attended events. In addition, a *Facility Use Agreement*

between El Dorado County and the CSD allows shared parking between the library and community center facilities further reducing impacts from on-street parking to less than significant.

- (g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

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	
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) 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 will be subject to complying with the County's 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) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required as a result of the project.
- (c) On-site storm water drainage facilities are required as needed so as to reduce runoff to discharge levels which do not exceed site discharge levels which existed prior to development of the site. All such drainage facilities shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the County of El Dorado *Drainage Manual* and as provided for in General Plan Policy 5.4.1.1.
- (d) Water will be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District in the form of public water. In the *Facility Improvement Letter* dated September 29, 2005, the El Dorado Irrigation District states that an 8-inch water line located in the public utility easement (PUE) along Country Club Drive could serve the project site with the construction of a water line extension. The resultant system will provide adequate capacity and pressure to serve the project's potable water and fire flow needs, established as 1,500 GPM for 2-hour duration while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. The District recommends that a second connection be made to the existing 6-inch water line located within the PUE along Meadow Lane.

Landscape irrigation is required to utilize recycled water pursuant to the District's Regulation 31. A 16-inch recycled water line exists in Country Club Drive. However, the system currently does not have enough storage capacity to meet the needs of the project. Until such time as the District completes design and construction of system improvements intended to increase supply of recycled water, the project will utilize potable water supplies to offset the system's deficiencies.

In regard to water supply, as of January 1, 2005, the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region presently has 2,434 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) available. The project will require 4 EDUs of water supply to serve it.

- (e) In the *Facility Improvement Letter* provided by the applicant, the El Dorado Irrigation District states that 8 and 18-inch sewer lines exist in Country Club Drive along with an 8-inch sewer line in Meadow Lane. The proposed development can be serviced by any of these facilities with the construction of adequately sized sewer line extensions within the respective PUEs.
- (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.) 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 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. For commercial development some on-site separation of materials is required and areas are required to be set aside for the storage of solid waste in accordance with Ordinance No. 4319.

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:

- (a) The proposed project has two potentially significant environmental issues associated with it. They are: on-site delineated wetlands and woodland habitat tree canopy retention. Mitigation Measures 1 and 2, as defined in this document and as accepted by the applicant, along with federal and State permitting, and County setback requirements will reduce any impacts placed on these resources by the project to a less than significant level.
- (b) A substantial adverse effect on traffic would occur if the implementation of the project would generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative). An impact is considered significant in Community Regions if the project causes an adjacent intersection to change from LOS E to LOS F. The Cambridge Road/Country Club Drive intersection operates at LOS D in the AM peak hour. The project will worsen road volumes to LOS F briefly during this period. Rescheduling activities during this time, as well as completing road improvements required by the Department of Transportation will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- (c) The proposed community center facility, as conditioned and mitigated, will not generate any substantially adverse environmental effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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.)

Facility Improvement Letter, El Dorado Irrigation District, (September 29, 2005).

Air Quality Impact Analysis for Cameron Park Community Center, Carlton Engineering, Inc., (August 2005).

Cultural Resources Study of Assessor's Parcel No. 108-280-06, Historic Resource Associates, (May 2005).

Environmental Noise Analysis, J.C. Brennan & Associates, Inc., (August 16, 2005).

Biological Resources Evaluation and Jurisdictional Delineation Report, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., (August 8, 2005).

Preliminary Arborist Report, (August 2005), Arborist Report (March 2006), Addendum to the Arborist Report (April 8, 2006), Randall Frizzell for Carlton Engineering,

Traffic Impact Analysis for Cameron Park Community Center Master Plan, kdAnderson Transportation Engineers, (April 11, 2006).

Facility Use Agreement, Document No. 540-00610, February 28, 2006.