

**EL DORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: October 12, 2006

Item No.: 8.a.

Staff: Jason R. Hade

REZONE/SUBDIVISION MAP

FILE NUMBER: Z05-0004/TM05-1395 - Le Caille Estates

APPLICANT: Danny L. Dorkin

ENGINEER: Gene E. Thorne and Associates, Inc.

REQUEST: Zone change request to change zoning from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to One-acre Residential (R1A) and tentative subdivision map (Exhibit E) to create 24 lots ranging in size from 1.0 acre to 2.2 acres. Also proposed is project annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) service area. A design waiver request has been submitted to construct a four-foot wide sidewalk in lieu of the six-foot wide sidewalk required under Standard Plan 101B.

LOCATION: On the south side of Meder Road, approximately 0.9 miles west of the intersection with Ponderosa Road, in the Shingle Springs area. (Exhibit A)

APN: 070-072-44 (Exhibit B)

ACREAGE: 36.51 acres

GENERAL PLAN: Medium Density Residential (MDR) (Exhibit C)

ZONING: Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) (Exhibit D)

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Recommend Approval to Board of Supervisors

BACKGROUND: Z05-0004/TM05-1395 was submitted on October 3, 2005 and deemed complete for processing on February 1, 2006. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting was held on

March 20, 2006. As a result of agency comments and General Plan issues discussed at the TAC meeting, additional map revisions were required and received by staff on May 3, 2006. After the resolution of several issues by the applicant, the submitted traffic study was reviewed and approved by the Department of Transportation (DOT) on July 21, 2006. An addendum to the traffic study was submitted to DOT on July 28, 2006.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Project Description: Zone change request to change zoning from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to One-acre Residential (R1A) and tentative subdivision map to create 24 lots ranging in size from 1.0 acre to 2.2 acres. Also proposed is project annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) service area. A design waiver request has been submitted to construct a four-foot wide sidewalk in lieu of the six-foot wide sidewalk required under Standard Plan 101B.

Site Description: The project site lies at an elevation of approximately 1,480 feet above mean sea level. Topography of the property is level to gently sloped land that is vegetated mostly with oak trees and shrubs. As indicated above, rural residential development surrounds all sides of the proposed development. A preliminary jurisdictional delineation report indicates that the total acreage of potential jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the United States within the project study area are 1.012 acres. Proposed lot 21 contains an existing single-family home and accessory structure while proposed lot 19 includes an existing single-family home and three other accessory buildings. Access to the proposed subdivision is from Meder Road.

Adjacent Land Uses:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	RE-10	MDR	Single-Family Residence/Accessory Buildings
North	RE-10	LDR	Single-Family Residences
South	RE-5	MDR	Single-Family Residences
East	R1A/RE-10	MDR	Single-Family Residences
West	R1A	MDR	Single-Family Residences

General Plan: The General Plan designates the subject site as Medium-Density Residential (MDR), which permits a minimum parcel size of 1 acre. The proposed 1.0 to 2.2-acre lots therefore conform to the General Plan land use designation. The following General Plan policies apply to this project:

Policy 2.2.1.5: The General Plan shall provide for the following building intensities in each land use designation as shown in Table 2-3:

Discussion: As indicated in Table 2-4, General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning District Consistency Matrix, the proposed One-acre Residential (R1A) Zone District is consistent with the MDR land use designation.

Policy 2.2.5.3: The County shall evaluate future rezoning: (1) To be based on the General Plan's general direction as to minimum parcel size or maximum allowable density; and (2) To assess whether changes in conditions that would support a higher density or intensity zoning district. The specific criteria to be considered include; but are not limited to, the following:

1. *Availability of an adequate public water source or an approved Capital Improvement Project to increase service for existing land use demands;*

Discussion: An El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) Facility Improvement Letter, dated June 21, 2005, states that adequate water facilities are available to serve the proposed project upon annexation into the EID service area.

2. *Availability and capacity of public treated water system;*

Discussion: As discussed above, EID has adequate water facilities to serve the projected needs of the project.

3. *Availability and capacity of public waste water treatment system;*

Discussion: The proposed lots will be served by individual on-site sewage disposal systems subject to Environmental Management Department review and approval. The Environmental Management Department submitted a memorandum dated June 21, 2006, indicating that all requested information had been received, and the Department had no conditions for the map.

4. *Distance to and capacity of the serving elementary and high school;*

Discussion: The project site is located within Buckeye Union School District one and a half miles from Ponderosa High School. The affected school district was contacted as part of the initial consultation process, and no specific comments or mitigation measures were received.

5. *Response time from the nearest fire station handling structure fires;*

Discussion: The El Dorado County Fire Protection District is responsible for providing fire protection to the subject site. As such, the District has reviewed the proposal and indicated that adherence to the applicable building and fire codes, as well as conditions of approval regarding the installation of six fire hydrants, provision of established fire flow, submittal of fire safe plan, and construction of road improvements shown on the tentative map, will satisfactorily address all fire related safety issues. No response time concerns are present.

6. *Distance to nearest Community Region or Rural Center;*

Discussion: The project site is located within the Shingle Springs Community Region. As proposed, the project is an in-fill residential project surrounded by compatible existing residential land uses.

7. *Erosion hazard;*

Discussion: According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*, the erosion hazard of soils at the subject site is slight to moderate. The land capability report states, “No rock outcrops of significance were observed. No critically expansive soils were observed. No geological hazards are associated with the site” (*Land Capability Report For Le Caille Estates*. Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc. October 3, 2005). Based upon this information, the impact from expansive soils and erosion hazards is less than significant.

8. *Septic and leach field capability;*

Discussion: The proposed lots will be served by individual on-site sewage disposal systems subject to Environmental Management Department review and approval. The Environmental Management Department submitted a memorandum dated June 21, 2006, indicating that all requested information had been received, and the Department had no conditions for the map.

9. *Groundwater capability to support wells;*

Discussion: The project will be served by EID public water facilities.

10. *Critical flora and fauna habitat areas:*

Discussion: Mitigation Measures 8 through 20 within Attachment 1 are proposed to reduce potential impacts to critical flora and fauna habitat areas to a less than significant level. A detailed discussion of the biological issues at the subject site is provided under Biological Resources in the prepared environmental document attached as Exhibit M.

11. *Important timber production areas:*

Discussion: The project is not located in or near an important timber production area.

12. *Important agricultural areas;*

Discussion: Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that approximately 20 percent of the project area falls into the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Prime Farmland – Rescue Sandy Loam two to nine percent slopes (ReB) category. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use map and included this overlay on the General Plan land use maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are minimal areas of Prime Farmland at the subject site and no properties are designated as

being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. Although the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District expressed concern regarding the loss of the agricultural potential of these productive soils, the project site is surrounded by residential development, and agricultural activities are no longer feasible. Therefore, the project will not result in significant conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

13. *Important mineral resource areas;*

Discussion: The project will not impact an important mineral resource area.

14. *Capacity of the transportation system serving the area;*

Discussion: The El Dorado County Department of Transportation reviewed the submitted traffic study and concluded that Mitigation Measure 25, along with the recommended conditions of approval, will sufficiently address project traffic issues and reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

15. *Existing land use patterns;*

Discussion: The project area is surrounded by existing residential land uses. Staff has determined that the proposed project is consistent with existing land use patterns within the project area.

16. *Proximity to perennial water course;*

Discussion: According to the preliminary jurisdictional delineation report submitted, the total acreage of potential jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. at the subject site are 1.012 acres. General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 requires a minimum setback of 50 feet from the wetlands delineated on Figure 3 within the report. According to the submitted land capability report, "it is the intent of the project to address wetlands by avoidance. Where roads cross drainages identified in the Sycamore report, grading will be minimized and structures will be utilized to cross over, rather than through, the wetlands" (*Land Capability Report for Le Caille Estates October 3, 2005*. Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc. October 3, 2005). Discharge of fill into jurisdictional wetlands or below the OHWM (ordinary high water mark) of a channel requires a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game. Mitigation Measures 16 through 18 are required to address potential wetlands impact concerns.

17. *Important historical/archeological sites;*

Discussion: The applicant submitted a cultural resources study prepared by Historic Resource Associates in August 2004. According to the study, "Since no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts were found, nor were any significant historic buildings, structures, or objects discovered, no additional archaeological work is recommended" (*Resources Study of APN 070:072:44, Bordering Meder Road, Near Shingle Springs, El Dorado County, CA*. Historic Resource Associates. August 2004).

18. *Seismic hazards and present active faults; and*

Discussion: As shown in the Division of Mines and Geology's publication Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, there are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies 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 buildings in the project area will be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards.

19. *Consistency with existing Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions.*

Discussion: No Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions are effective within the project area. Master CC & R's will be reviewed and recorded prior to final map approval.

Policy 2.2.5.21: Development projects shall be located and designed in a manner that avoids incompatibility with adjoining land uses that are permitted by policies in effect at the time the development project is proposed. Development projects that are potentially incompatible with existing adjoining uses shall be designed in a manner that avoids any incompatibility or shall be located on a different site.

Discussion: As discussed above, the subject site is surrounded by residential uses. The proposed subdivision will fit within the context of these existing residential uses.

Policy 5.2.1.2: An adequate quantity and quality of water for all uses, including fire protection, shall be provided for with discretionary development.

Discussion: Upon annexation, the El Dorado Irrigation District will provide water to the subject site, and individual on-site sewage disposal systems will serve each of the proposed lots subject to El Dorado County Environmental Management Department review and approval. According to the *Facility Improvement Letter, Dorkin Annexation (FIL1205-221)* prepared by the El Dorado Irrigation District, December 21, 2005, "in terms of water supply, as of January 1, 2005, there were 2,434 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) available in the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region. [The proposed project as of this date] would require 26 EDUs of water supply." A 16-inch water line exists along the southern property line, and a 10-inch water line exists in Meder Road. In order to provide water service for the project, the applicant must construct a looped water line extension from the existing 16-inch water line along the southern property line to the existing 10-inch water line in Meder Road or connect the two 10-inch lines in Meder Road and extend a line into the project.

Policy 5.2.1.3: All medium-density residential, high-density residential, multi-family residential, commercial, industrial and research and development projects shall be required to connect to public water systems when located within Community Regions and to either a public water system or to an approved private water system in Rural Center.

Discussion: As stated in the submitted EID Facility Improvement Letter, the project will connect to public water.

Policy 5.3.1.2: The creation of lots less than five acres in size in Medium-Density Residential areas relying on on-site septic systems shall only occur when a public water supply is available for domestic use. If public water is not available, such lots shall not be less than five acres.

Discussion: The proposed tentative subdivision map will connect to public water and utilize on-site septic systems subject to the review and approval of the Environmental Management Department.

Policy 5.7.1.1: Prior to approval of new development, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that adequate emergency water supply, storage, conveyance facilities, and access for fire protection either are or will be provided concurrent with development.

Discussion: The El Dorado County Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and stated that the proposed access and on-site roadways are adequate for the development.

Policy 7.3.3.4: Until standards for buffers and special setbacks are established in the Zoning Ordinance, the County shall apply a minimum setback of 100 feet from all perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and 50 feet from intermittent streams and wetlands. These interim standards may be modified in a particular instance if more detailed information relating to slope, soil stability, vegetation, habitat, or other site-or project-specific conditions supplied as part of the review for a specific project demonstrates that a different setback is necessary or would be sufficient to protect the particular riparian area at issue.

For projects where the County allows an exception to wetland and riparian buffers, development in or immediately adjacent to such features shall be planned so that impacts on the resources are minimized. If avoidance and minimization are not feasible, the County shall make findings, based on documentation provided by the project proponent, that avoidance and minimization are infeasible.

Discussion: Pursuant to the General Plan policy above, a 50-foot setback is required from the 1.012 acres of wetlands located at the site and shall be shown on the final map prior to approval. These water features at the subject site are mapped in Attachment 2 of Exhibit M. After applying the 50-foot wetland setbacks, 30-foot building setbacks, septic area, related setbacks, and tree canopy retention standards, buildable areas for each lot were verified and are shown within Exhibit F. The proposed subdivision was also reduced from the originally proposed 26 lots to 24 to accommodate the various constraints identified at the project site. As stated in the land capability report (Exhibit K), the applicant intends to use structures to cross the delineated wetlands rather than disturb them. The proposed wetland crossing structure is shown in Exhibit L.

Policy 7.4.4.4: For all new development projects (not including agricultural cultivation and actions pursuant to an approved Fire Safe Plan necessary to protect existing structures, both of which are exempt from this policy) that would result in soil disturbance on parcels that (1) are over an acre and have at least 1 percent total canopy cover or (2) are less than an acre and have at least 10 percent total canopy cover by woodlands habitats as defined in this General Plan and determined from base line aerial photography or by site survey performed by a qualified biologist or licensed arborist, the County shall require one of two mitigation options: (1) the project applicant shall

adhere to the tree canopy retention and replacement standards described below; or (2) the project applicant shall contribute to the County's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) conservation fund described in Policy 7.4.2.8.

Option A

The County shall apply the following tree canopy retention standards:

Percent Existing Canopy Cover	Canopy Cover to be Retained
80-100	60% of existing canopy
60-79	70% of existing canopy
40-59	80% of existing canopy
20-39	85% of existing canopy
10-19	90% of existing canopy
1-9 for parcels > 1 acre	90% of existing canopy

Discussion: The applicant submitted a tree canopy analysis which determined that existing tree canopy at the site is approximately 82 percent. Estimated tree canopy retention after road improvements and lot development is 66.7 percent. The project will include the removal of approximately 610 trees. Building envelopes included on Exhibit F confirm that the project is consistent with General Plan tree canopy retention policies. Tree canopy retention Mitigation Measures 18 and 19 are included in Exhibit M.

Conclusion: Staff finds after review of the above policies that the project, as conditioned, conforms to the General Plan.

Zoning: The subject site is requested to be rezoned to One-acre Residential (R1A) which permits a minimum parcel size of one acre. Therefore, the proposed 1.0 to 2.2 acre parcels conform to the requested zone change to R1A.

Design Waivers Discussion: As proposed, the Le Caille Estates subdivision map requests the following design waiver:

- a. Request to construct a four-foot wide sidewalk in-lieu of the six-foot wide sidewalk required under Standard Plan 101B.

The proposed design waiver has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Transportation (DOT) and El Dorado County Fire Protection District with findings listed in Attachment 2 of the staff report. Planning staff concurs with DOT and the Fire District recommendation for approval as a four-wide sidewalk will provide sufficient pedestrian circulation and fit well within the rural context of the surrounding area.

Other Issues:

Access/Circulation: The Department of Transportation reviewed the proposed subdivision map and determined that the applicant shall construct on-site roads to Standard Plan 101B and improve the intersection of Meder Road and Resler Way as outlined in the conditions of approval. Additionally, the applicant shall improve the sight distance from Resler Road to the east on Meder Road, to a distance of 385 feet. The sight distance improvement was identified as a necessary mitigation measure within the submitted traffic study and is discussed further within Exhibit M.

The 2004 General Plan Policies TC-Xe and TX-Xf (which incorporate Measure Y) require that projects that “worsen” traffic by 2 percent, or 10 peak hour trips, or 100 average daily trips must construct (or ensure funding and programming) of any improvements required to meet Level of Service standards in the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. This project is located in the Cameron Park Community Region (Figure LU-1: Land Use Diagram of the General Plan), so Level of Service E is allowable (General Plan Policy TC-Xd). Intersections affected by this project will be at Level of Service C for the year 2011. As such, no improvements are required to maintain or attain a higher Level of Service.

Air Quality: The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District reviewed the submitted air quality analysis and determined that the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 1 through 7 in Exhibit M.

Construction Storm Water: The California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region submitted project comments pertaining to storm water discharges associated with construction activities, post construction storm water management, and wetlands. The issues raised above were considered in the prepared environmental document and related mitigation measures.

Cultural Resources: As previously discussed, no significant cultural resources exist at the site.

Drainage and Grading: The El Dorado County Resource Conservation District reviewed the project and expressed concerns regarding the loss of agricultural potential of approximately 20 percent of productive soils at the subject site as well as the presence of several listed or endangered species in and adjacent to the project area. These concerns are addressed within the prepared environmental document. Conditions of approval are included in Attachment 1 that address drainage issues, such as cross-lot drainage, identified by the Department of Transportation.

EID Annexation: The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) reviewed the proposed subdivision and identified the need for the subject site to annex into the EID service area to receive water services. LAFCO recommended the applicant contact LAFCO “near the end of the tentative map process to inquire about annexation into EID.” LAFCO also identified potential issues to be addressed within the Initial Study.

Fire: The El Dorado County Fire Protection District reviewed the proposed tentative map and will require six new fire hydrants for the site as well as road improvements as shown on the tentative map and an approved fire safe plan. Fire issues are addressed within the project’s conditions of approval.

Public Transit: The El Dorado County Transit Authority reviewed the proposed subdivision and had no concerns or specific conditions of approval requested.

Surveyor's Office: The Surveyor's Office reviewed the proposed project and noted that survey monuments must be set and roads named through the Surveyor's Office prior to final map filing.

Utilities: Pacific Gas and Electric Company reviewed the proposal and had no comments.

Wastewater: As proposed, the Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division, initially commented that “a map showing the location and size of usable sewage disposal area for each parcel, along with the accompanying data, including percolation rates and test trench locations, shall be submitted to Environmental Health for review” prior to final map approval. Additionally, all existing wells on the property shall be destroyed by a licensed well driller under a permit from the Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division. Staff received a memo from Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division staff dated June 21, 2006, indicating that all information previously requested from the applicant had been received. As such, the memo noted, “Environmental Health has no conditions for the map.”

Wetlands: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers submitted a letter dated February 24, 2006, requesting a preliminary wetlands delineation be prepared for the proposed project. The applicant prepared such a study and intends to avoid project features which would require the discharge of dredged or fill materials into waters of the United States.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has prepared an Initial Study (Environmental Checklist with Discussion attached as Exhibit M) to determine if the project has a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, staff finds that the project could have a significant effect on air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and transportation/traffic. However, the project has been modified to incorporate the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study which will reduce the impacts to a level considered to be less than significant. Therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared

NOTE: This project is located within or adjacent to an area which has wildlife resources (riparian lands, wetlands, watercourse, native plant life, rare plants, threatened and endangered plants or animals, etc.), and was referred to the California Department of Fish and Game. In accordance with State Legislation (California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4), the project is subject to a fee of \$1,285.⁰⁰ after approval, but prior to the County filing the Notice of Determination on the project. This fee, less \$35.⁰⁰ processing fee, is forwarded to the State Department of Fish and Game and is used to help defray the cost of managing and protecting the State's fish and wildlife resources.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission make the following recommendations to the Board of Supervisors:

1. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff;
2. Adopt the mitigation monitoring program in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15074(d) incorporated as conditions of approval in Attachment 1;
3. Approve Z05-0004 and TM05-1395 as the required findings can be made as noted in Attachment 2, based on the analysis in the staff report and the modification of the project to include the conditions itemized in Attachment 1; and
4. Approve the following design waiver since appropriate findings have been made as noted in Attachment 2:
 - a. Request to construct a four-foot wide sidewalk in-lieu of the six-foot wide sidewalk required under Standard Plan 101B.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

Attachments to Staff Report:

Attachment 1	Conditions of Approval
Attachment 2	Findings
Exhibit A	Vicinity Map
Exhibit B	Assessor's Parcel Map
Exhibit C	General Plan Land Use Map
Exhibit D	Zoning Map
Exhibit E	Tentative Subdivision Map
Exhibit F	Development Constraints Map
Exhibit G	Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan
Exhibit H	Slope Study
Exhibit I	Preliminary Water Plan/Septic Disposal Areas
Exhibit J	Soils Map
Exhibit K	Land Capability Report
Exhibit L	Proposed Wetlands Crossing Structure
Exhibit M	Environmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts

ATTACHMENT 1 CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

FILE NUMBER TM05-1395

MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures are required as a means to reduce potential significant environmental effects to a level of insignificance:

1. Mitigation Measures 1 through 3 as outlined in the attached Air Quality Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision, Cameron Park, CA. Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting. January 11, 2005. (Pages 13 – 17)
2. Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, an asbestos dust mitigation plan (ADMP) shall be submitted with appropriate fees to and approved by the Air Quality Management District (AQMD). Should asbestos-containing rock be exposed during grading, construction of roads, excavation for underground facilities, building foundations, or any construction related activity, County Ordinance No. 4548 shall apply.
3. The applicant shall adhere to District Rule 224 Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials.
4. The applicant shall contact the AQMD prior to commencement of any burning. Burning of vegetative wastes that result from “Land Development Clearing” must be permitted through the AQMD. Only vegetative waste materials are permitted to be disposed of using an open outdoor fire.
5. The applicant shall submit a list of all proposed architectural coatings to the AQMD for approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All architectural coatings shall adhere to District Rule 215 Architectural Coatings.
6. The applicant shall submit a list of equipment to the AQMD stating which of the following mitigation measures will be used to reduce impacts on air quality from equipment exhaust emissions during all construction involved in this project for approval prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit:
 - Use low-emission on-site mobile construction equipment;
 - Maintain equipment in tune per manufacturer specifications;
 - Retard diesel engine injection timing by two to four degrees;
 - Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline or diesel generators;
 - Use reformulated low-emission diesel fuel;
 - Use catalytic converters on gasoline-powered equipment;

- Substitute electric and gasoline-powered equipment for diesel-powered equipment where feasible;
 - Do not leave inactive construction equipment idling for prolonged periods (i.e., more than two minutes);
 - Schedule construction activities and material hauls that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours;
 - Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference; and
 - Develop a construction traffic management plan that includes, but is not limited to: providing; temporary traffic control during all phases of construction activities to improve traffic flow; rerouting construction trucks off congested streets; and provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off-site.
7. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit payment of the mitigation area 1 rare plant fee.
 8. A survey for Northwestern pond turtles and California horned lizards shall be conducted not more than two weeks before the initiation of grading or clearing and submitted to Planning Services for review.
 9. A survey for Loggerhead shrike shall be conducted not more than two weeks before the initiation of grading or clearing and submitted to Planning Services for review. If an active nest is found, construction activities shall be kept 250 feet away from the nest until the young have fledged.
 10. A survey for birds of prey and migratory birds shall be conducted not more than two weeks before the initiation of grading or clearing and submitted to Planning Services for review. If an active nest is found, construction activities shall be kept 250 feet away from the nest until the young have fledged.
 11. Prior to grading permit issuance, the applicant shall notify the Department of Fish and Game at least 10 days in advance of changing the land use, as required under the California Native Plant Protection Act, to allow for salvage of the plants. Evidence of such notification shall be presented to Planning Services at time of grading permit submittal.
 12. Prior to the commencement of grading at the project site, temporary orange fencing shall be installed between construction areas and nearby avoided El Dorado bedstraw plants under the direction of a qualified botanist. The fenced area(s) shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans.
 13. Prior to the commencement of grading at the project site, temporary orange fencing shall be installed between construction areas and nearby avoided El Dorado County mule ears under the direction of a qualified botanist. The fenced area(s) shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans.

14. Prior to the commencement of grading at the project site, temporary orange fencing shall be installed between construction areas and nearby avoided gabbroic northern mixed chaparral under the direction of a qualified botanist. The fenced area(s) shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans.
15. A 50-foot setback shall be shown and recorded on the final map from all wetland areas delineated in Figure 3. Biological Resources and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Map attached as Attachment 1.
16. In order to avoid disturbance to wetland areas, bridges, (similar to those shown in Exhibit L of the staff report), rather than culverts or fill, shall be utilized for all project roadways and driveways proposed to cross the delineated wetlands in Figure 3. Such structures shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans prior to Planning Services approval.
17. Prior to improvement plan approval, applicant shall submit a copy of 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game, or evidence that such an agreement is not required, to Planning Services.
18. The applicant shall retain at least 60 percent of the existing tree canopy at the project site in accordance with Option A of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. Under Option A, the applicant shall also replace woodland habitat removed at a 1:1 ratio. Prior to improvement plan approval, the applicant shall identify on-site tree planting replacement areas on the submitted plans and submit a plan to maintain the replacement trees for seven years for Planning Services review and approval.
19. Option B within General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 is not available at this time pending the development of the County's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP). As such, Option B is an alternative to Mitigation Measure 18 only if and when the INRMP fund is adopted. The project improvement plans shall not be approved by Planning Services prior to the adoption and implementation of the INRMP if Mitigation Measure 19 is used as an alternative to Mitigation Measure 18 above.
20. In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until an archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. If the find is determined to be significant and authenticated, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item. Grading and construction activities may resume after the appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance.
21. In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24

hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission.

22. Construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on weekends and federally-recognized holidays.
23. Motorized construction equipment shall be equipped with intake/exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.
24. Noise-generating equipment, including portable power generators and air compressors, should be located at the furthest distance possible from the nearest occupied residence.
25. Developer shall improve sight distance from Resler Road to the east on Meder Road, to a distance of 385 feet. This work must be substantially complete, as determined by the Department of Transportation, prior to filing the final map.

CONDITIONS

Department of Transportation

26. The developer shall irrevocably offer to dedicate the right of way in fee and construct the half width of Meder Road, along the project frontage to the General Plan requirements for a Two Lane Regional Road standards (i.e. 60 foot right of way and 40 foot roadway) and Standard Plan 101B, with curb and gutter and sidewalk, including signage (i.e. stop signs, street name signs, etc.). This work must be substantially complete, as determined by the Department of Transportation, prior to filing the final map.
27. The developer shall irrevocably offer to dedicate the right of way as easement with a public utilities easement (to be rejected) and construct onsite roads to Standard Plan 101B, with a 50 foot right of way and 40 foot roadway width, including signage (i.e. stop signs, street name signs, "Not a County Maintained Road," etc.). As the lots are all greater than 10,000 square feet, no onsite sidewalks are required. This work must be substantially complete, as determined by the Department of Transportation, prior to filing the final map.
28. The developer shall irrevocably offer to dedicate the right of way as easement with a public utilities easement (to be rejected) and construct an onsite road to Standard Plan 101B with a 50 foot right of way and 28 foot wide roadway from the existing Resler Road to join the easterly entrance road with an intersection of near 90 degrees. No sidewalks are required on this connector road. This work must be substantially complete, as determined by the Department of Transportation, prior to filing the final map. Said irrevocable offer to dedicate may be rejected at the time of the final map in which case a homeowner's agreement and association, or other entity, shall be established in order to provide for the long-term maintenance of the roads.

29. Prior to filing the final map, the developer shall obtain an irrevocable offer to dedicate right of way in easement and public utilities easement for the portion of the easterly entrance that lies on the adjacent offsite lot (Tract 1 of RS 24-19 Document 2000-0005686/APN 0070-072-96).
30. Drainage from Lots 17 and 18 must be collected in a drainage swale at the subdivision boundary and carried away from the existing offsite parcels. Drainage from offsite onto the project must be collected at the boundary and carried by a swale or conduit to the street or to the project drainage system. This work must be substantially complete, as determined by the Department of Transportation, prior to issuance of the first building permit.
31. The developer shall obtain approval of project improvement plans and cost estimates consistent with the Subdivision Design and Improvement Standards Manual from the County Department of Transportation and pay all applicable fees prior to commencement of any improvements on the project facilities.
32. Prior to filing the final map, the project applicant shall form a drainage zone of benefit (ZOB) or other appropriate entity to ensure that all storm water drainage facility maintenance requirements are met.
33. Upon completion of the improvements required, and prior to acceptance of the improvements by the County, the developer will provide a CD to the Department of Transportation with the drainage and geotechnical reports in PDF format and the record drawings in TIF format.
34. The developer shall enter into an Improvement Agreement with the County and provide security to guarantee performance of the Improvement Agreement as set forth within the County of El Dorado Major Land Division Ordinance prior to filing of the final map.
35. The final map shall show all utility, road, and drainage easements per the recommendation of the utility purveyors and the County Engineer. Final determination of the location of said easements shall be made by the County Engineer. Said easements shall be irrevocably offered to the County.
36. The developer shall pay the traffic impact fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued for any parcel created by the subdivision.
37. All lots that front on two roads shall take access on the minor roadway, and a non-vehicular access easement shall be established on the major roadway on the final map.
38. A non-vehicular access easement shall be established along the entire frontage of Meder Road on the final map.
39. A secondary access road, providing permanent or temporary looped circulation for each phase of development, shall be constructed prior to the first building permit being issued for any residential structure except where the issuance of building permits is for model homes,

which shall be unoccupied. Such looped circulation shall be subject to the approval of, or may be modified by, the responsible Fire District.

40. Subdivision improvements shall include rough grading of driveways for all lots with street cuts or fills along the frontage of six feet or more difference in elevation, or as found necessary for reasonable access by the County Engineer. Construction of said driveways shall conform to the Design and Improvements Standards Manual and the Encroachment Ordinance. As an alternative, a Notice of Restriction shall be filed against all downhill lots with fill in excess of six feet which allows structural driveway access only.
41. Sidewalks may be located outside the right-of-way and meander as a means to provide interest and variety in alignment. The alignment and design of the sidewalks shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Transportation prior to filing the final map. Final lane configurations, including the need for additional rights-of-way, shall be subject to review and approval of the Department of Transportation prior to improvement plan approval.
42. All curb returns, at pedestrian crossings, shall include a pedestrian ramp with truncated domes per Caltrans Standard A88A and four feet of sidewalk/landing at the back of the ramp. All curb returns shall be profiled on the improvement plans with elevations shown at least 25 feet before the beginning (BC) and at least 25 feet past the end (EC) of the curb, at the BC and EC, and at a minimum of quarter curve lengths, in a clockwise direction.
43. An irrevocable offer of dedication, in fee, shall be made of 60 feet in radius for cul-de-sacs and knuckles, with slope easements where necessary. Said offer may be rejected at the time of the final map, in which case, a homeowner's agreement and association, or other entity, shall be established in order to provide for the long term maintenance of the roads.
44. The Master Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) shall provide that no parking shall be permitted within cul-de-sac bulbs which have a radius to curb-face which is less than County standards and shall provide for enforcement of such provisions. Additionally, the CC&Rs shall include a provision for off-street parking to compensate for lack of parking normally provided within the cul-de-sac bulb and shall either provide a three-car driveway or provide sufficient depth of driveway (18 feet per parking stall) to accommodate longitudinal and/or lateral parking for three spaces.
45. If the subdivider is required to perform off-site improvements and it is determined that the subdivider does not have or cannot secure sufficient title or interest of such lands where said off-site improvements are required, the County may, at the subdivider's expense and within 120 days of filing the final map, acquire by negotiation or commence proceedings to acquire an interest in the land which will permit the improvements to be made, including proceedings for immediate possession of the property. In such cases, prior to filing of any final map or parcel map, the subdivider shall submit the following to the Department of Transportation Right of Way Agent, and enter into an agreement pursuant to Government Code Section 66462.5 and provide acceptable security to complete the offsite improvements,

including costs of acquiring real property interest to complete the required improvements, construction surveying, construction management and a 20 percent contingency:

- a. A legal description and plat, of the land necessary to be acquired to complete the offsite improvements, prepared by a civil engineer or land surveyor.
 - b. Approved improvement plans and specifications of the required off-site improvements, prepared by a civil engineer.
 - c. An appraisal prepared by a professional appraiser of the cost of land necessary to complete the off-site improvements.
46. The responsibility for, and access rights to, maintenance of any fences and walls constructed on property lines shall be included in the Covenants Codes and Restrictions (CC&Rs).
47. Cross lot drainage shall be avoided. When cross lot drainage does occur it shall be contained within dedicated drainage easements and included in the County Service Area Zone of Benefit (ZOB), Home Owners Association, or other entity acceptable to the County. This drainage shall be conveyed via closed conduit or v-ditch to either a natural drainage course of adequate size or an appropriately sized storm drain system within the public roadway.
48. All new or reconstructed drainage inlets shall have a storm water quality message stamped into the concrete, conforming to Sacramento County Standard Drawing 11-10. All stamps shall be approved by the El Dorado County inspector prior to being used.
49. Prior to approval of the grading and improvement plans:
- a. Grading activities shall incorporate appropriate erosion control measures as provided in the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance and El Dorado County Storm Water Management Plan. Appropriate runoff controls such as berms, storm gates, detention basins, overflow collection areas, filtration systems, and sediment traps shall be implemented to control siltation and the potential discharge of pollutants into drainages.
 - b. The applicant shall submit a soils and geologic hazards report (meeting the requirements for such reports provided in the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance) to, and receive approval from, the El Dorado County Department of Transportation. Grading design plans shall incorporate the findings of detailed geologic and geotechnical investigations.
 - c. The project applicant shall submit and obtain approval of final drainage plans by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation. These final drainage plans shall demonstrate that future post-development storm water discharge levels from the project will remain at existing storm water discharge levels and detention basins will be permanently maintained. The drainage plan shall be prepared by a certified Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the El Dorado County Drainage Manual adopted by the Board of Supervisors in March 1996. The drainage plans shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential

increases in downstream flows, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site and implementation and maintenance responsibilities. The plan shall address storm drainage during construction and proposed BMPs to reduce erosion and alter quality degradation. All onsite drainage facilities shall be constructed using El Dorado County Minimum Construction Site Storm Water Management Practices (March 31, 2004) and to the satisfaction of El Dorado County Department of Transportation. BMPs shall be implemented throughout the construction process and permanent BMPs shall be included in the grading plan.

50. The grading plan shall comply with the provisions of the Grading Ordinance pertaining to terracing on slopes exceeding 25 feet in height, including accessibility, intervals, and cross section geometry.
51. Grading plans shall be prepared and submitted to the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District (RCD) and the Department of Transportation. The RCD shall review and make appropriate recommendations to the County. Upon receipt of the review report by the RCD, the Department of Transportation shall consider imposition of appropriate conditions for reducing or mitigating erosion and sedimentation from the project. The County shall issue no building permits until the Department of Transportation approves the final grading and erosion control plans and the grading is completed.
52. The timing of construction and method of revegetation shall be coordinated with the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District (RCD). If grading activities are not completed by September, the developer shall implement a temporary grading and erosion control plan. Such temporary plans shall be submitted to the RCD for review and recommendation to the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation shall approve or conditionally approve such plans and cause the developer to implement said plan on or before October 15.
53. If blasting activities are to occur in conjunction with subdivision improvements, the subdivider shall ensure that such blasting activities are conducted in compliance with state and local regulations.
54. If burning activities are to occur during the construction of the subdivision improvements, the subdivider shall obtain the necessary burning permits from the California Department of Forestry and air pollution permits from the County prior to said burning activities.
55. Grading and improvement Plans shall incorporate protective measures toward existing oak trees pursuant to Volume IV, Design and Improvement Standards Manual, Oak Tree and Wetlands Preservation Requirements and Specifications (County Resolution No. 199-91).

56. Prior to improvement plan approval, the applicant shall submit a review fee of \$320.00 to the El Dorado County Fire Protection District (EDCFPD)
57. Six Muller model 200 Centurion fire hydrants shall be shown on the improvement plans and installed throughout the subdivision subject to EDCFPD approval.
58. The applicant shall demonstrate a fire flow of 1,500 gpm at 20 psi for two hours for homes greater than 3,600 square feet and 1,000 gpm at 20 psi for two hours for homes less than 3,600 square feet to the satisfaction of the EDCFPD prior to final map filing.
59. A fire safe management plan, acceptable to the EDCFPD and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, shall be prepared and implemented. A letter of compliance with this condition shall be submitted by the fire district to Planning Services prior to filing the map.
60. Gating of the subdivision is prohibited without an approved special use permit.

LAFCO

61. Prior to final map filing, the applicant shall complete the annexation process into EID through LAFCO and submit evidence of the satisfaction of this condition to Planning Services upon completion.

Planning Services

62. A meter award letter or similar document shall be provided by the water purveyor prior to filing the final map.
63. The subdivision is subject to parkland dedication in-lieu fees based on values supplied by the Assessor's Office and calculated in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of the County Code. The fees shall be paid at the time of filing the final map.
64. The subdivider shall be subject to a \$150.⁰⁰ appraisal fee payable to the El Dorado County Assessor for the determination of parkland dedication in-lieu fees.
65. The developer shall enter into an agreement with the School Districts to pay the sum of \$8,288.⁰⁰ per residential unit constructed within the boundaries of the subdivision. The agreement shall provide for an annual adjustment in the fee by the increase in the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index. This annual adjustment is based upon a base amount of \$8,288.⁰⁰ as of January 1, 1997. The increase shall be calculated by the Districts as of January 1 of each year and implemented on July 1 of each year. The applicant should contact the County Office of Education prior to the issuance of any building permits to verify the applicable fee at the time of building permit issuance. The fee shall be payable by the owner of record at the time the building permit is issued and the agreement or a notice of restriction shall be recorded on the property to alert subsequent owners of this obligation

Surveyor's Office

66. All survey monuments must be set prior to the presentation of the final map to the Board of Supervisors for approval; or the developer shall have the surety of work to be done by bond or cash deposit. Verification of set survey monuments, or amount of bond or deposit shall be coordinated with the County Surveyor's Office.
67. The roads serving the development shall be named by filing a completed road name petition with the County Surveyor's Office prior to filing the final map.

ATTACHMENT 2 FINDINGS

FILE NUMBER Z05-0004/TM05-1395

Based on the review and analysis of this project by staff and affected agencies, and supported by discussion in the staff report and evidence in the record, the following findings can be made:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1.0 CEQA FINDING

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration together with the comments received and considered during the public review process. The Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and is adequate for this proposal. A de minimis finding on the project's effect on fish and wildlife resources cannot be found and the project is therefore subject to the payment of State Fish and Game fees pursuant to State Legislation (California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4).
- 1.2 The County finds that through feasible conditions and mitigation placed upon the project, impacts on the environment have been eliminated or substantially mitigated.
- 1.3 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services Department - Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.
- 1.4 Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires the County to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The approved project description and conditions of approval, with their corresponding permit monitoring requirements, are hereby adopted as the monitoring program for this project. The monitoring program is designed to ensure compliance during project implementation.

2.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS

- 2.1 Zone change Z05-0004 is a request to change the subject site zoning from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to One-acre Residential (R1A). Tentative subdivision map TM05-1395 consists of an application to create 24 lots ranging in size from 1.0 to 2.2 acres. A design waiver request was submitted to allow the following: (1) Construct a four-foot wide sidewalk in-lieu of the six-foot wide sidewalk required under Standard Plan 101B.

The zone change and tentative subdivision map shall only be approved or conditionally approved if all of the following findings are made:

2.1.1 In accordance with State law and pursuant to General Plan Policy 2.2.5.3, the County has evaluated the subject rezoning request based on the General Plan's general direction as to minimum parcel size or maximum allowable density and to assess whether changes in conditions are present that would support a higher density or intensity zoning district. The 19 specific criteria found within General Plan Policy 2.2.5.3 have been analyzed with regards to the above-referenced zone change request. Based on this analysis and the conclusions reached in the staff report, the site is found to be suitable to support the proposed density.

2.2.2 The proposed tentative map, including design and improvements, is consistent with the General Plan policies and land use map.

As proposed, the tentative map conforms to the Medium-Density Residential General Plan land use designation and applicable General Plan policies including access, tree canopy retention, water service, wetland setbacks, grading, transportation, fire protection, and wastewater disposal.

2.2.3 The proposed tentative map conforms to the applicable standards and requirements of the County's zoning regulations and the Major Land Division Ordinance.

As proposed and with the approval of the requested design waivers, the tentative map conforms with the development standards within the One-acre Residential (R1A) Zone District and the Major Land Division Ordinance.

2.2.4 The site is physically suitable for the proposed type and density of development.

As shown on the Development Constraints Map (Exhibit F), adequate building areas for each lot are available considering the required septic replacement area, wetland setbacks, tree canopy retention, zoning setbacks, and fire safe standards. As such, the site is physically suitable for the proposed type and density of development.

2.2.5 The proposed subdivision is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage.

The proposed subdivision is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage with the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Attachment 1.

3.0 DESIGN WAIVERS

Construct a four-foot wide sidewalk in-lieu of the six-foot wide sidewalk required under Standard Plan 101B.

3.1 There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver.

The requested two-foot reduction in sidewalk width will reduce potential project grading impacts and still provide adequate pedestrian circulation within the subdivision.

3.2 Strict application of County design and improvement requirements would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property.

Strict application of the design and improvement requirements would require a wider sidewalk resulting in an increased amount of project grading and potential tree removal. The Department of Transportation and El Dorado County Fire Protection District have reviewed the design waiver request and have no objections.

3.3 The adjustment or waivers would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public.

The waiver will not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public as the requested waivers will reduce project impacts to visual resources, such as tree canopy, and earth disturbances. As proposed, the reduced sidewalk width will allow the subdivision to better fit within the context of the surrounding rural residential uses.

3.4 The waivers would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of Article II of Chapter 16 of the County Code or any other ordinance applicable to the division.

EXHIBIT M



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Zone Change Z05-0004 / Tentative Subdivision Map TM05-1395 - Le Caille Estates

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

Contact Person: Jason R. Hade, AICP, Senior Planner **Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

Project Owner's Name and Address: Danny L. Dorkin 3552 Resler Way, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Danny L. Dorkin 3552 Resler Way, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Location: The subject property is located on the south side of Meder Road, approximately 0.9 miles west of the intersection with Ponderosa Road in the Shingle Springs area.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 070-072-44 **Parcel Size:** 36.51 acres

Zoning: Estate Residential (RE-10) **Section:** 35 **T:** 10N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Description of Project: Zone change request to change zoning from RE-10 to R1A and tentative subdivision map application to create 24 lots ranging in size from 1.0 acre to 2.2 acres. Also proposed is project annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) service area. A design waiver request has been submitted to construct a four-foot wide sidewalk in lieu of the six-foot wide sidewalk required under Standard Plan 101B.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
North:	RE-10	LDR	Single-Family Residences
East:	R1A/RE-10	MDR	Single-Family Residences
South:	RE-5	MDR	Single-Family Residences
West:	R1A	MDR	Single-Family Residences

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site lies at an elevation of approximately 1,480 feet above mean sea level. Topography of the property is level to gently sloped land that is vegetated mostly with oak trees and shrubs. As indicated above, rural residential development surrounds all sides of the proposed development. A preliminary jurisdictional delineation report indicates that the total acreage of potential jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the United States within the project study area is 1.012 acres. Proposed lot 21 contains an existing single-family home and accessory structure while proposed lot 19 includes an existing single-family home and three other accessory buildings. Access to the proposed subdivision is from Meder Road.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Section 404 Permit
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board: Section 401 Water Quality Certification
- California Department of Fish and Game: 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement
- El Dorado Irrigation District: Facility Plan Report
- LAFCO: EID service area annexation
- El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Encroachment/Grading 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. The environmental factors checked below contain mitigation measures which reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	X	Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation	X	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: Jason R. Hade, 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, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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) No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway will be affected by this project.
- b) The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on existing scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources as the project is not located within a corridor defined as a State scenic highway.
- c) The proposed project will not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. As proposed, project canopy retention is estimated at 66.7 percent of the approximately 82 percent of existing tree canopy coverage at the subject site. As such, the project will result in the removal of approximately 610 trees. (*Revised Certified Arborist Report for APN 070-072-44, El Dorado County, CA. Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. November 17, 2005*). Proposed lot and road configuration has been designed to avoid disturbance to wetland areas.
- d) The proposed 24 lots will not have a significant effect or adversely affect day or nighttime views adjacent to the project site. All outdoor lighting shall conform to Section 17.14.170 of County Code.

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?			✓
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?			✓
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?			✓

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 approximately 20 percent of the project area falls into the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Prime Farmland – Rescue Sandy Loam two to nine percent slopes (ReB) category. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use map and included this overlay on the General Plan land use maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are minimal areas of “Prime Farmland” at the subject site and no properties designated as being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. Although the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District expressed concern regarding the loss of the agricultural potential of these productive soils, the project site is surrounded by residential development and agricultural activities are no longer feasible. Therefore, the project will not result in significant conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- b) The proposed project will not conflict with 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. The surrounding area is developed with residential development. For this “Agriculture” category, the identified thresholds of significance 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
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			✓
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		✓	
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)?		✓	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓

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 applicant provided *Air Quality Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision Cameron Park, CA* prepared by Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting on January 11, 2005. According to the analysis, “given that the project would develop a total of 30 units, emissions of other criteria pollutants, including PM₁₀, would be considered to have a less-than-significant air quality impact. Long-term operational air quality impacts attributable to the proposed project are, therefore, considered less-than-significant.” (*Air Quality Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision Cameron Park, CA*. Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting. January 11, 2005)

b & c)

The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District reviewed the submitted air quality analysis and determined that with the implementation of the three mitigation measures included in the analysis, the project would have an insignificant impact on the air quality. However, the District also noted that the listed fugitive dust emissions mitigation measure three (page 14) is no longer applicable for this project. As outlined below, the project must comply with Rule 223.2 which addresses asbestos dust emissions from construction projects. Mitigation measures one through three (pages 13 – 17) are attached as part of this initial study (Attachment 1), and are incorporated as mitigation measures to

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

reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. The following additional mitigation measures shall also be implemented:

- (a/b.4) *Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, an asbestos dust mitigation plan (ADMP) shall be submitted with appropriate fees to and approved by the Air Quality Management District (AQMD).*
- (a/b.5) *The applicant shall adhere to District Rule 224 Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials.*
- (a/b.6) *The applicant shall contact the AQMD prior to commencement of any burning. Burning of vegetative wastes that result from “Land Development Clearing” must be permitted through the AQMD. Only vegetative waste materials are permitted to be disposed of using an open outdoor fire.*
- (a/b. 7) *The applicant shall submit a list of all proposed architectural coatings to the AQMD for approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All architectural coatings shall adhere to District Rule 215 Architectural Coatings.*
- (a/b. 8) *The applicant shall submit a list of equipment to the AQMD stating which of the following mitigation measures will be used to reduce impacts on air quality from equipment exhaust emissions during all construction involved in this project for approval prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit:*
 - *Use low-emission on-site mobile construction equipment;*
 - *Maintain equipment in tune per manufacturer specifications;*
 - *Retard diesel engine injection timing by two to four degrees;*
 - *Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline or diesel generators;*
 - *Use reformulated low-emission diesel fuel;*
 - *Use catalytic converters on gasoline-powered equipment;*
 - *Substitute electric and gasoline-powered equipment for diesel-powered equipment where feasible;*
 - *Do not leave inactive construction equipment idling for prolonged periods (i.e., more than two minutes);*
 - *Schedule construction activities and material hauls that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours;*
 - *Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference; and*
 - *Develop a construction traffic management plan that includes, but is not limited to: providing temporary traffic control during all phases of construction activities to improve traffic flow; rerouting construction trucks off congested streets; and provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off-site.*

d) According to the submitted analysis, “the proposed project does not include development or long-term operation of stationary TAC or odor-generating sources. In addition, no existing sources of TACs or odors that could potentially affect the proposed uses have been identified in the project area. Consequently, the long-term exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs and odors are considered less than significant.” (*Air Quality Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision Cameron Park CA*. Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting. January 11, 2005) Therefore, the proposed project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District CEQA Guide. The proposed residential subdivision will not result in significant impacts resulting from odors.

FINDING: Although the project has the potential to create significant impacts to air quality, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project design to reduce the potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. It was

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

determined that a less than significant impact will result from the project in that no sensitive receptors will be adversely impacted, no objectionable odors will be created, and the project will not obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan. Based on the inclusion of mitigation measures proposed, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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?		✓	
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?		✓	
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?		✓	
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?			✓
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		✓	
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?			✓

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 applicant submitted a *Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for APN 070-072-44 El Dorado County, CA*, prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants. The report identified the following special-status species issues at the project site:

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

The project study area provides potential habitat for four special-status animals. Birds-of-prey or migratory birds could potentially nest in or adjacent to the project study area. However, the submitted study concluded that the project will have a less than significant impact on the California red-legged frog, Northwestern pond turtle, California horned lizard, Loggerhead shrike and birds of prey and migratory bird nests with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

- (a.1) *Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit payment of the mitigation area 1 rare plant fee.*
- (a.2) *A survey for Northwestern pond turtles and California horned lizards shall be conducted not more than two weeks before the initiation of grading or clearing and submitted to Planning Services for review.*
- (a.3) *A survey for Loggerhead shrike shall be conducted not more than two weeks before the initiation of grading or clearing and submitted to Planning Services for review. If an active nest is found, construction activities shall be kept 250 feet away from the nest until the young have fledged.*
- (a.4) *A survey for birds of prey and migratory birds shall be conducted not more than two weeks before the initiation of grading or clearing and submitted to Planning Services for review. If an active nest is found, construction activities shall be kept 250 feet away from the nest until the young have fledged.*

- b) The applicant submitted *Botanical Inventory Report for 070-072-44 El Dorado County, CA* prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, September 19, 2005, which identified the following natural community issues:

Two federal-endangered plant species, Pine Hill ceanothus and El Dorado Bedstraw, occur in the project study area (PSA). Take of federal endangered plants requires consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) if a federal nexus exists. Pine Hill ceanothus and El Dorado bedstraw are also designated as rare under the California Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA). El Dorado County mule ears a federal species-of-concern, also occur in the project study area. The project will have a potentially significant impact on Pine Hill ceanothus, El Dorado bedstraw, El Dorado County mule ears and gabbroic northern mixed chaparral. The following mitigation measure, along with the implementation of mitigation measure (a.1), is required to reduce potential natural community impacts to a less than significant level:

- (b.1) *Prior to grading permit issuance, the applicant shall notify the Department of Fish and Game at least 10 days in advance of changing the land use, as required under the California Native Plant Protection Act, to allow for salvage of the plants. Evidence of such notification shall be presented to Planning Services at time of grading permit submittal.*
- (b.2) *Prior to the commencement of grading at the project site, temporary orange fencing shall be installed between construction areas and nearby avoided El Dorado bedstraw plants under the direction of a qualified botanist. The fenced area(s) shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans.*
- (b.3) *Prior to the commencement of grading at the project site, temporary orange fencing shall be installed between construction areas and nearby avoided El Dorado County mule ears under the direction of a qualified botanist. The fenced area(s) shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans.*
- (b.4) *Prior to the commencement of grading at the project site, temporary orange fencing shall be installed between construction areas and nearby avoided gabbroic northern mixed chaparral under the direction of a qualified botanist. The fenced area(s) shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans.*

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

c) According to the preliminary jurisdictional delineation report submitted, the total acreage of potential jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. at the subject site is 1.012 acres. General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 requires a minimum setback of 50 feet from the wetlands delineated on Figure 3 within the report. According to the submitted land capability report, “it is the intent of the project to address wetlands by avoidance. Where roads cross drainages identified in the Sycamore report, grading will be minimized and structures will be utilized to cross over, rather than through the wetlands.” (*Land Capability Report for Le Caille Estates October 3, 2005*. Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc. October 3, 2005.) Discharge of fill into jurisdictional wetlands or below the OHWM of a channel requires a section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game. The following mitigation measures are required to reduce potential wetlands impacts to a less than significant level:

- (c.1) *A 50-foot setback shall be shown and recorded on the final map from all wetland areas delineated in Figure 3. Biological Resources and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Map attached as Attachment 1.*
- (c.2) *In order to avoid disturbance to wetland areas, bridges,(similar to those shown in Exhibit L of the staff report), rather than culverts or fill, shall be utilized for all project roadways and driveways proposed to cross the delineated wetlands in Figure 3. Such structures shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans prior to Planning Services approval.*
- (c.3) *Prior to improvement plan approval, applicant shall submit a copy of 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game, or evidence that such an agreement is not required, to Planning Services.*

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 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) According to the submitted *Revised Certified Arborist Report for APN 070-072-44* prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, November 17, 2005, the existing tree canopy coverage at the subject site is approximately 82 percent of the parcel. The arborist report states, “We estimate project canopy retention of 66.7 percent on the parcel.” (*Revised Certified Arborist Report for APN 070-072-44*. Sycamore Environmental Consultants. November 17, 2005) The report further states, “we estimate the project (proposed and lot development) will remove 610 trees consisting of 309 interior live oaks, 261 blue oaks, 30 black oaks and 10 gray pines.” As such, the proposed tree removal is subject to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A regarding tree canopy retention and replacement. The *Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for APN 070-072-44 El Dorado County, CA* identified 29.084 acres of oak woodlands at the subject site under County jurisdiction in accordance with PRC §21083.4 Road construction is estimated to remove 4.38 acres of mixed oak woodland. The following mitigation measures are needed to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level:

- (e.1) *The applicant shall retain at least 60 percent of the existing tree canopy at the project site in accordance with Option A of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. Under Option A, the applicant shall also replace woodland habitat removed at a 1:1 ratio. Prior to improvement plan approval, the applicant shall identify on-site tree planting replacement areas on the submitted plans and submit a plan to maintain the replacement trees for seven years for Planning Services review and approval.*
- (e.2) *Option B within General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 is not available at this time pending the development of the County’s Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP).*

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

As such, Option B is an alternative to mitigation measure number 18 only if and when the INRMP fund is adopted. The project improvement plans shall not be approved by Planning Services prior to the adoption and implementation of the INRMP if mitigation measure number 19 is used as an alternative to mitigation measure number 18 above.

f) The proposed subdivision will not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan.

FINDING: With implementation of the mitigation measures discussed above, including avoidance of disturbances to the wetland areas, potential impacts to biological resources will be reduced to a less than significant level. 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?		✓		
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		✓		
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			✓	
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		✓		

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)

The applicant submitted *Cultural Resources Study of APN 070:072:44, Bordering Meder Road, Near Shingle Springs, El Dorado County, CA* prepared by Historic Resource Associates in August 2004. According to the study, “Since no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts were found, nor were any significant historic buildings, structures, or objects discovered, no additional archaeological work is recommended” (*Resources Study of APN 070:072:44, Bordering Meder Road, Near Shingle Springs, El Dorado County, CA.* Historic Resource Associates. August 2004) However, the following mitigation measure is required in the event sub-surface historical, cultural or archeological sites or materials are disturbed during earth disturbances and grading activities on the site:

(a/b.1) In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent shall ensure that all such activities

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

cease within 50 feet of the discovery until an archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. If the find is determined to be significant and authenticated, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item. Grading and construction activities may resume after the appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance.

- 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) Due to the size and scope of the project, there is a potential to discover human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the mitigation measure below shall be implemented immediately.

(d.1) In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. . If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission.

FINDING: Although the project has the potential to create significant impacts to sub-surface cultural or historic resources, or disturb human remains located outside of a designated cemetery, the incorporation of the required mitigation measures will reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. Established thresholds of significance will not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			✓	
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.			✓	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			✓	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			✓	
iv) Landslides?			✓	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✓	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			✓	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?			✓	

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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?			✓

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) According to the Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas (Jennings, 1994) and the Peak Acceleration from Maximum Credible Earthquakes in California (CDMG, 1992), no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones (Special Studies Zones) are located on the project site. 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) According to the submitted preliminary grading and drainage plan, proposed project grading includes the cut of 9,530 cubic yards of soil and fill of 2,520 cubic yards of soil. Approximately 95 percent of the subject site contains less than 20 percent slope. All grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which will reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
 - c) The soil on the project site is classified as Rescue sandy loam, 2 -9 percent slopes, and Argonaut clay loam, 3 – 9 percent slopes. (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). Soil permeability on site is moderately slow, runoff is slow to medium and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. All grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which will reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
 - d) According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*, the erosion hazard of soils at the subject site is slight to moderate. The land capability report states, “no rock outcrops of significance were observed. No critically expansive soils were observed. No geological hazards are associated with the site.” (*Land Capability Report For Le Caille*

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

Estates. Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc. October 3, 2005) Based upon this information, the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.

- e) Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division reviewed the proposed tentative subdivision map and initially commented that prior to final map recordation, the applicant shall submit septic percolation testing data to the El Dorado County for review and approval. However, staff received a memo from Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division staff on June 21, 2006, indicating that all information previously requested from the applicant had been received. As such, the memo noted, “Environmental Health has no conditions for the map.”

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 environmental 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?			✓
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?			✓
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			✓
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?			✓
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?			✓
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?			✓
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓
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?			✓

Discussion:

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

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

- 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) No significant amount of hazardous materials will be transported, used or disposed of for the project.
 - b) No significant amount of hazardous materials will be utilized for the project. The project will not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
 - c) As proposed, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
 - 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. This is 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. The County emergency response plan is located within the County Office of Emergency Services in the El Dorado County Government Center in Placerville.
 - h) The El Dorado County Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and concluded that the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area.

FINDING: The proposed project will not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires as discussed above. 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?			✓
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)?			✓
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?			✓
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?			✓
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?			✓
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			✓
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?			✓
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			✓
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?			✓
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			✓

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

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

- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) Proposed project grading avoids disturbance of wetland areas and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
 - 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. The proposed project will be required to connect to public water provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID).
 - c) The proposed grading will avoid disturbance of wetland areas. As such, there is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances 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 this project.
- d & e)
- According to the *Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for APN 070-072-44 El Dorado County, CA*, “the entire PSA [project study area] is drained by Channel 1 and its adjacent wetlands. Channel 1 is tributary to Kelley Creek approximately 0.1 miles north of the PSA. The PSA is in the watershed of the South Fork American River.” Project grading will avoid the wetland areas. Therefore, substantial drainage pattern alteration or runoff will not occur.
- 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 Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0725C, 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 Shingle 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 to be less than significant. Potential for a mudflow is also considered to be less than significant.

FINDING: No significant hydrological impacts will result 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 no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Physically divide an established community?			✓
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?		✓	
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?		✓	

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 an established community.
- b) As proposed, the project is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures identified in this document, specifically pertaining to wetland setback areas and tree canopy retention, the project is also consistent with the applicable policies of the El Dorado County General Plan.
- c) As discussed in Section IV Biological Resources, parts a, b and f, the submitted biological resources evaluation concluded that the proposal will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan with the incorporation of the above-referenced mitigation measures.

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?			✓
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?			✓

Discussion:

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

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 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 and 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.

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.

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?	✓		
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		✓	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	✓		
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓	
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?	✓		
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?	✓		

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;

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

- 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 as it involves the creation of 24 additional lots and related residential noise.

b & d)

Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of project operation. However, persons adjacent to the project vicinity will be subjected to significant short-term ground borne noise and vibration as a result of grading and excavation during construction of the project. The following mitigation measures, developed as part of the *Noise Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision Cameron Park, CA* prepared by Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting, January 11, 2005, will reduce short-term noise impacts attributable to the proposed project to a less than significant level:

- (b/d.1) Construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM PM, Monday through Friday, and 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on weekends and federally-recognized holidays.*
- (b/d.2) Motorized construction equipment shall be equipped with intake/exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.*
- (b/d.3) Noise-generating equipment, including portable power generators and air compressors, should be located at the furthest distance possible from the nearest occupied residence.*

- e) The nearest airport is the Cameron Park Air Park Airport, located approximately 1.5 miles west of the project site. The project site is not located within the 55 dBA noise impact contour zone of the Cameron Park Air Park Airport. According to the submitted noise analysis, "due to the distance to the airport, the project site would not be subject to high levels of aircraft noise and would, therefore, not result in a safety hazard for people at the project site." (*Noise Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision Cameron Park, CA*. Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting. January 11, 2005) This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is necessary.
- 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: For the "Noise" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will occur from the proposed development with the incorporation of the short-term construction mitigation measures.

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

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)?		✓	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			✓
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			✓

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 proposed project has been determined to have a minimal growth-inducing impact as the project includes the creation of 24 additional residential lots and does not include any school or large scale employment opportunities that lead to indirect growth.
- b. No existing housing stock will be displaced by the proposed project.
- c) No persons 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?		✓	
b. Police protection?		✓	
c. Schools?		✓	
d. Parks?		✓	
e. Other government services?		✓	

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

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 El Dorado County Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Fire District from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District will review the project improvement plans and final map submittal for condition conformance prior to approval.
- 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. No specific minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The addition of 24 residential lots will not significantly impact current response times to the project area.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Buckeye Union School District. The affected school district was contacted as part of the initial consultation process and no specific comments or mitigation measures were received.
- d) **Parks:** The proposed project will not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. In this case, the tentative map shall be conditioned to require the payment of an in-lieu park fee consistent with the procedures outlined within Section 16.12.090.
- e) No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the project.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the creation of 24 residential lots at the subject site, either directly or indirectly. 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?			✓
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?			✓

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) Because the project only includes the creation of 24 residential lots, it 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 significant 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)?			✓
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			✓
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?			✓
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		✓	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			✓
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			✓

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative 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)

The Department of Transportation has determined that the project will generate approximately 260 average daily trips (ADT). As such, it will “worsen” traffic as defined by General Plan Policy TC-Xf and a traffic study is required to be prepared. According to the submitted *Traffic Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision* prepared by kdANDERSON Transportation Engineers, December 6, 2004, “this site is expected to generate approximately 287 daily trips. The project will generate 23 trips in the A.M. peak hour and 30 trips in the P.M. peak hour.” The 2004 General Plan Policies TC-Xe and TX-Xf (which incorporate Measure Y) require that projects that “worsen” traffic by 2%, or 10 peak hour trips, or 100 average daily trips must construct (or ensure funding and programming) of any improvements required to meet Level of Service standards in the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. This project is located in the Cameron Park Community Region (Figure LU-1: Land Use Diagram of the General Plan), so Level of Service E is allowable (General Plan Policy TC-Xd). Intersections affected by this project will be at Level of Service C for the year 2011. As such, no improvements are required to maintain or attain a higher Level of Service. Potential project traffic impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

- 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) According to the traffic analysis, “sight distance from Resler Way looking to the east along Meder Road should be improved with this project. Currently, the existing topography along the south side of Meder Road limits sight distance to the east.” (*Traffic Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision* prepared by kdANDERSON Transportation Engineers, December 6, 2004) In order to eliminate this safety hazard and reduce the potential impact to a less than a significant level, the following mitigation measure is needed:

(d.1) *Developer shall improve sight distance from Resler Road to the east on Meder Road, to a distance of 385 feet. This work must be substantially complete, as determined by the Department of Transportation, prior to filing the final map.*

- e) As shown on the tentative map, the developer shall improve on-site roads to Standard Plan 101B and the cul-de-sac to Standard Plan 114 to provide adequate emergency access to the lots as determined by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District.

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

- f) The submitted tentative map was reviewed to verify compliance with on-site parking requirements within the Zoning Ordinance. Section 17.18.060 of the Zoning Ordinance lists the parking requirements by use. Parking requirements for conventional single-family detached homes are two spaces not in tandem. Utilizing the parking standards discussed above, the project requires a minimum of 48 parking spaces. As proposed, the project meets the minimum parking requirements for the conventional single-family detached residential use subject to verification prior to building permit issuance for each proposed home.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. El Dorado Transit reviewed the project and determined that no bus turnouts are required for this tentative map.

FINDING: The implementation of the mitigation measure discussed above will reduce potential traffic impacts to a less than significant level. Potential environmental impacts from the proposed mitigation measure are considered to be less than significant. 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?			✓
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?			✓
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?			✓
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			✓
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?			✓
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			✓
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			✓

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;

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

- 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)

Upon annexation, the El Dorado Irrigation District will provide water to the subject site and individual on-site sewage disposal systems will serve each of the proposed lots subject to El Dorado County Environmental Management Department review and approval. According to the *Facility Improvement Letter, Dorkin Annexation (FILI205-221)* prepared by the El Dorado Irrigation District, December 21, 2005, “in terms of water supply, as of January 1, 2005, there were 2,434 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) available in the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region. [The proposed project as of this date] would require 26 EDUs of water supply.” A 16-inch water line exists along the southern property line and a 10-inch water exists in Meder Road. In order to provide water service for the project, the applicant must construct a looped water line extension from the existing 16-inch water line along the southern property line to the existing 10-inch water line in Meder Road or connect the two 10-inch lines in Meder Road and extend a line into the project. Potential environmental impacts from the required water distribution expansion lines are expected to be less than significant.

- c) On-site drainage from proposed lots 17 and 18 will be collected in a drainage swale at the boundary and carried away from the existing off-site parcels. Drainage from off-site onto the project will be collected at the boundary and carried by a swale to the street or the project drainage system. Development of project drainage facilities will not have a significant impact on the environment.
- d) After project annexation, the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) will provide potable water to the project as discussed above under parts a and b.
- e) As stated above, Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division reviewed the proposed tentative subdivision map and initially commented that prior to final map recordation, the applicant shall submit septic percolation testing data to the El Dorado County for review and approval. However, staff received a memo from Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division staff on June 21, 2006, indicating that all information previously requested from the applicant had been received. As such, the memo noted, “Environmental Health has no conditions for the map.”
- 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 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. On-site solid waste collection for the proposed lots will

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

be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space is available at the site for solid waste collection.

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?			✓
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)?			✓
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			✓

Discussion:

- a) 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, mitigation measures 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 to reduce all potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures have been designed to address air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise and transportation/traffic.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Development Services Department, Planning Services in Placerville:

2004 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.

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.)

PROJECT SPECIFIC REPORTS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Addendum to Meder Road Subdivision (Le Caille Estates) Traffic Study, El Dorado County. kdANDERSON Transportation Engineers. July 28, 2006.

Air Quality Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision, Cameron Park, CA. Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting. January 11, 2005.

Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for APN 070-072-44 El Dorado County, CA. Sycamore Environmental Consultants. September 19, 2005.

Botanical Inventory Report for APN 070-072-44, El Dorado County, CA. Sycamore Environmental Consultants. September 19, 2005.

Cultural Resources Study of APN 070:072:44, Bordering Meder Road, Near Shingle Springs, El Dorado County, CA. Historic Resource Associates. August 2004.

Facility Improvement Letter, Dorkin Annexation (FIL1205-221). El Dorado Irrigation District. December 21, 2005.

Land Capability Report for Le Caille Estates. Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc. October 3, 2005.

Noise Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision, Cameron Park, CA.. Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting. January 11, 2005.

Revised Certified Arborist Report for APN 070-072-44, El Dorado County, CA. Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. November 17, 2005.

Traffic Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision, Cameron Park, CA. kdANDERSON Transportation Engineers. December 6, 2004.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: *Air Quality Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision, Cameron Park, CA.* Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting. January 11, 2005. (Pages 13 – 17)

Attachment 2: Figure 3. Biological Resources and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Map. September 19, 2005.

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING			
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Agency	Time Frame
1. <i>Air Quality</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures 1 through 3 as outlined in the attached Air Quality Impact Analysis for Meder Road Subdivision, Cameron Park, CA. Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting. January 11, 2005. (Pages 13 – 17)</i>	<i>Air Quality Management District</i>	<i>Prior to Grading Permit Issuance and During Project Construction</i>
2. <i>Air Quality</i>	<i>Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, an asbestos dust mitigation plan (ADMP) shall be submitted with appropriate fees to and approved by the Air Quality Management District (AQMD).</i>	<i>Air Quality Management District</i>	<i>Prior to Grading or Building Permit Issuance</i>
3. <i>Air Quality</i>	<i>The applicant shall adhere to District Rule 224 Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials.</i>	<i>Air Quality Management District</i>	<i>Prior to Grading Permit Issuance and During Project Construction</i>
4. <i>Air Quality</i>	<i>The applicant shall contact the AQMD prior to commencement of any burning. Burning of vegetative wastes that result from “Land Development Clearing” must be permitted through the AQMD. Only vegetative waste materials are permitted to be disposed of using an open outdoor fire.</i>	<i>Air Quality Management District</i>	<i>Prior to Grading Permit Issuance and During Project Construction</i>
5. <i>Air Quality</i>	<i>The applicant shall submit a list of all proposed architectural coatings to the AQMD for approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All architectural coatings shall adhere to District Rule 215 Architectural Coatings.</i>	<i>Air Quality Management District</i>	<i>Prior to Building Permit Issuance</i>
6. <i>Air Quality</i>	<i>The applicant shall submit a list of equipment to the AQMD stating which of the following mitigation measures will be used to reduce impacts on air quality from equipment exhaust emissions during all construction involved in this project for approval prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Use low-emission on-site mobile construction equipment;</i> ▪ <i>Maintain equipment in tune per manufacturer specifications;</i> 	<i>Air Quality Management District</i>	<i>Prior to Grading or Building Permit Issuance</i>

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retard diesel engine injection timing by two to four degrees; ▪ Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline or diesel generators; ▪ Use reformulated low-emission diesel fuel; ▪ Use catalytic converters on gasoline-powered equipment; ▪ Substitute electric and gasoline-powered equipment for diesel-powered equipment where feasible; ▪ Do not leave inactive construction equipment idling for prolonged periods (i.e., more than two minutes); ▪ Schedule construction activities and material hauls that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours; ▪ Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference; and ▪ Develop a construction traffic management plan that includes, but is not limited to: providing temporary traffic control during all phases of construction activities to improve traffic flow; rerouting construction trucks off congested streets; and provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off-site. 		
7. Biological Resources	Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit payment of the mitigation area 1 rare plant fee.	Planning Services	Prior to Building Permit Issuance
8. Biological Resources	A survey for Northwestern pond turtles and California horned lizards shall be conducted not more than two weeks before the initiation of grading or clearing and submitted to Planning Services for review.	Planning Services	Not More than Two Weeks Prior to Project Grading
9. Biological Resources	A survey for Loggerhead shrike shall be conducted not more than two weeks before the initiation of grading or clearing and submitted to Planning Services for review. If an active nest is found, construction activities shall be kept 250 feet away from the nest until the young have fledged.	Planning Services	Not More than Two Weeks Prior to Project Grading
10. Biological Resources	A survey for birds of prey and migratory birds shall be conducted not more than two weeks before the initiation of grading or clearing and submitted to Planning Services for review. If	Planning	Not More than Two Weeks Prior

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING			
	<i>an active nest is found, construction activities shall be kept 250 feet away from the nest until the young have fledged.</i>	<i>Services</i>	<i>to Project Grading</i>
<i>11. Biological Resources</i>	<i>Prior to grading permit issuance, the applicant shall notify the Department of Fish and Game at least 10 days in advance of changing the land use, as required under the California Native Plant Protection Act, to allow for salvage of the plants. Evidence of such notification shall be presented to Planning Services at time of grading permit submittal.</i>	<i>Department of Fish & Game/ Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Grading Permit Issuance</i>
<i>12. Biological Resources</i>	<i>Prior to the commencement of grading at the project site, temporary orange fencing shall be installed between construction areas and nearby avoided El Dorado bedstraw plants under the direction of a qualified botanist. The fenced area(s) shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Improvement Plan Approval</i>
<i>13. Biological Resources</i>	<i>Prior to the commencement of grading at the project site, temporary orange fencing shall be installed between construction areas and nearby avoided El Dorado County mule ears under the direction of a qualified botanist. The fenced area(s) shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Improvement Plan Approval</i>
<i>14. Biological Resources</i>	<i>Prior to the commencement of grading at the project site, temporary orange fencing shall be installed between construction areas and nearby avoided gabbroic northern mixed chaparral under the direction of a qualified botanist. The fenced area(s) shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Improvement Plan Approval</i>
<i>15. Biological Resources</i>	<i>A 50-foot setback shall be shown and recorded on the final map from all wetland areas delineated in Figure 3. Biological Resources and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Map attached as Attachment 1.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Final Map Approval</i>
<i>16. Biological Resources</i>	<i>In order to avoid disturbance to wetland areas, bridges, (similar to those shown in Exhibit L of the staff report), rather than culverts or fill, shall be utilized for all project roadways and driveways proposed to cross the delineated wetlands in Figure 3. Such structures shall be shown on the submitted project improvement plans prior to Planning Services approval.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Improvement Plan Approval</i>
<i>17. Biological Resources</i>	<i>Prior to improvement plan approval, applicant shall submit a copy of 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game, or evidence that such an agreement is not required, to Planning Services.</i>	<i>Department of Fish & Game/ Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Improvement Plan Approval</i>
<i>18. Biological Resources</i>	<i>The applicant shall retain at least 60 percent of the existing tree canopy at the project site in accordance with Option A of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. Under Option A, the applicant shall also replace woodland habitat removed at a 1:1 ratio. Prior to improvement plan approval, the applicant shall identify on-site tree planting replacement areas on the</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Improvement Plan Approval</i>

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING			
	<i>submitted plans and submit a plan to maintain the replacement trees for seven years for Planning Services review and approval.</i>		
19. <i>Biological Resources</i>	<i>Option B within General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 is not available at this time pending the development of the County's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP). As such, Option B is an alternative to mitigation measure number 18 only if and when the INRMP fund is adopted. The project improvement plans shall not be approved by Planning Services prior to the adoption and implementation of the INRMP if mitigation measure number 19 is used as an alternative to mitigation measure number 18 above.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Improvement Plan Approval</i>
20. <i>Cultural Resources</i>	<i>In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until an archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. If the find is determined to be significant and authenticated, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item. Grading and construction activities may resume after the appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance.</i>	<i>Department of Transportation</i>	<i>During Project Grading/ Construction</i>
21. <i>Cultural Resources</i>	<i>In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission.</i>	<i>Department of Transportation</i>	<i>During Project Grading/ Construction</i>
22. <i>Noise</i>	<i>Construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM PM, Monday through Friday, and 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on weekends and federally-recognized holidays.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>During Project Grading/ Construction</i>
23. <i>Noise</i>	<i>Motorized construction equipment shall be equipped with intake/exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>During Project Grading/ Construction</i>
24. <i>Noise</i>	<i>Noise-generating equipment, including portable power generators and air compressors, should be located at the furthest distance possible from the nearest occupied residence.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>During Project Grading/ Construction</i>
25. <i>Traffic</i>	<i>Developer shall improve sight distance from Resler Road to the east on Meder Road, to a distance of 385 feet. This work must be substantially complete, as determined by the</i>	<i>Department of</i>	<i>Prior to Filing Final Map</i>

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING			
	<i>Department of Transportation, prior to filing the final map.</i>	<i>Transportation</i>	

**Mitigation Measure Agreement for Z05-0004/TM05-1395
Le Caille Estates**

As the applicant, owner, or their legal agent, I hereby agree to amend the above named project by incorporating all required mitigation measures, as identified in the related Environmental Checklist, which are necessary in order to avoid or reduce any potentially significant environmental effects to a point where clearly no significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

I understand that by agreeing to amend the proposed project through incorporation of the identified mitigation measures, or substantially similar measures, all potentially adverse environmental impacts will be reduced to an acceptable level and a "Proposed Negative Declaration" will be prepared and circulated in accordance with County procedures for implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). I also understand that additional mitigation measures may be required following the review of the "Proposed Negative Declaration" by the public, affected agencies, and by the applicable advisory and final decision making bodies.

I understand the required mitigation measures incorporated into the project will be subject to the El Dorado County Mitigation Monitoring program adopted in conjunction with the Negative Declaration, and that I will be subject to fees for the planning staff time to monitor compliance with the mitigation measures.

This agreement shall be binding on the applicant/property owner and on any successors or assigns in interest.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Planning Director or his assign, representing the County of El Dorado, and the applicant/owner or his legal agent have executed this agreement on this _____ day of _____, _____.

El Dorado County Planning Services
Jason R. Hade AICP, Senior Planner

Signature of Applicant / Owner / Agent:

By _____

Print Name and address below

Print Name and title above

