

EL DORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES STAFF REPORT



Agenda of: November 9, 2006
Item No.: 11.a.
Staff: Peter Maurer

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

FILE NUMBER: A06-0006

APPLICANT: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

REQUEST: Amend the land use designation from MDR, Medium Density Residential, to C, Commercial.

LOCATION: On the east side of State Route 49, at the northerly intersection with Grand Fir Circle, in the Cool area. (Exhibit A)

APN: Portion of 071-280-51

ACREAGE: 1.05 acre northerly portion of the 3.39-acre parcel.

ZONING: General Commercial (Exhibit C)

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Negative Declaration, 2004 El Dorado County General Plan E.I.R.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Recommend approval

BACKGROUND: The zoning and General Plan land use designation of Commercial was established in 1993 as a result of a General Plan amendment and zone change application filed by the former owners of the property (AZ92-03/Ordinance 4292/Resolution No. 124-93.) The land use designation was retained with the adoption of the 1996 General Plan, based in part on the Planning Commission's direction to designate as Commercial all parcels that were zoned commercial. The site was also included in the Cool Rural Center. At that time, the maps were hand drawn, before the County's GIS mapping was fully in place. When the land use maps were digitized, it appears that the technician drew the line around the parcel that is part of the County right-of-way for Grand Fir Circle, rather than the northern 1.05 acre of the subject parcel. This

error was identified in 2002, and an item was on the July 16, 2002, to correct Ordinance No. 4292, however, it was continued off-calendar when it was realized that the ordinance only applied to the zoning, and could not change the land use designation. The County was also under the restrictions imposed by the General Plan lawsuit writ of mandate, so the change to the land use map could not be made at that time. Unfortunately, this was not picked up with the adoption of the 2004 General Plan, therefore, this amendment is required to make the correction. The Board of Supervisors initiated this amendment on April 18, 2006, with the adoption of Resolution No. 108-2006.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Project Description: Amendment to the land use designation for the northerly 1.05-acre portion of the 3.39-acre parcel identified by Assessor’s Parcel Number 071-280-51 from MDR, Medium Density Residential, to C, Commercial, to correct a mapping error that unintentionally did not carry over that previously approved amendment.

Site Description: The 1.05-acre subject portion is vacant and predominately covered by annual grasses. The only trees are six valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) lining both sides of the driveway. The subject portion is surrounded on three sides by roads. To the south on the 2.34-acre portion of the parcel, which is not subject of this request, there is a single-family residence, barn, shop, and second residential unit surrounded by non-native sycamore trees. Knickerbocker Creek travels into the parcel from a culvert underneath Grand Fir Circle into the northeast corner and travels parallel to the driveway on the east parcel boundary then follows the southern boundary in a westerly direction and exits the parcel through a culvert under State Route 49. Knickerbocker Creek does not enter the 1.05-acre portion subject of this request.

Adjacent Land Uses:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	CG	MDR	Vacant
North	CG	C	Vacant/Caltrans owned
South	R2A	MDR	Vacant
East	R3A	MDR	Single-family residence
West	R2A	MDR	Single-family residence

Discussion: The subject 1.05-acre portion of the 3.39-acre parcel identified by Assessor’s Parcel Number 071-280-51 is located on an island of land along with two other parcels and are isolated by being surrounded on all sides by roads. The parcel adjoining to the south is currently vacant, and the third parcel further to the south that shares the island contains a single-family residence. The parcels to the west and east across the roads have single-family residences combined with agricultural uses. The small parcel directly to the north is owned by Caltrans and is part of this right-of-way.

Policy 2.1.2.1 establishes Cool as a Rural Center. The subject 1.05-acre portion of the 3.39-acre parcel is located within the Cool Rural Center boundary. **Policy 2.1.2.2** directs that Rural Center boundaries establish areas of higher intensity development throughout the rural areas of the County based on the availability of infrastructure, public services, existing uses, parcelization, impact on natural resources, etc. **Policy 2.1.2.3** directs that Rural Centers are intended to meet the commercial and service needs of the residents of the Rural Centers and Rural Regions, and the predominant land use type within Rural Centers shall be commercial and higher density residential development.

The prior approval and establishment of the zoning designation of General Commercial (CG) and the General Plan land use designation of Commercial (C) established the precedent for the consistency with these designations with those above stated policies seeking to meet the objectives of Rural Centers. The subject application is about correcting a mapping error, and the re-approval of the change in land use designation from Medium Density Residential to Commercial can be found to be consistent with General Plan directives today as it was in 1993. Support utilities and infrastructure are currently available at the site, and the impacts on natural resources were examined by an Initial Study that recommends approval of a Negative Declaration that tiered off information contained in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR, (EDAW, May 2003).

Zoning: The subject 1.05-acre portion of the 3.39-acre parcel identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 071-280-51 is currently zoned General Commercial. The purpose of Sections 17.32.170 through 17.32.220 direct that General Commercial designated land is intended to provide for the conduct of sales, storage, distribution, and light manufacturing businesses of the type which do not ordinarily cause more than a minimal amount of noise, odor, smoke, dust, or other factors tending to disturb the peaceful enjoyment of adjacent residential or agricultural land use zones; and further, to provide a close relationship between warehousing, distribution, and retail sales. Section 17.32.200 requires a minimum parcel size of 10,000 square feet. The General Plan land use of Commercial and the Zone District designation of General Commercial are listed as compatible on the 2004 General Plan Table 2-4 Consistency Matrix.

Section 17.14.130, Architectural Supervision, requires all parcels located on a State highway be subject to design review. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required design review process.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has prepared an Initial Study (Environmental Checklist with Discussion attached) to determine if the project has a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study and tiering from the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan EIR, staff has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration has been prepared.

This General Plan amendment request is found to be de minimis (having no effect on fish and game resources).

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to:

1. Adopt the Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff; and
2. Approve A06-0006 based on the findings in Attachment 2, subject to the conditions in Attachment 1.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

Attachments to Staff Report:

Attachment 1	Conditions of Approval
Attachment 2	Findings
Exhibit A	Vicinity Map
Exhibit B	General Plan Land Use Map
Exhibit C	Zoning Map
Exhibit D	Assessor's Parcel Map
Exhibit E	Site Plan/Proposed Limit Line of Amendment
Exhibit F.....	Cool Rural Center Boundary
Exhibit G.....	Soils Map
Exhibit H.....	Auburn and Pilot Hill U.S.G.S. Quadrangles
Exhibits I1, I2.....	Site Visit Photos from June 18, 2006
Exhibits J1, J2	Aerial Photos
Exhibit K.....	Initial Study/Environmental Checklist

ATTACHMENT 2 FINDINGS

FILE NUMBER A06-0006

1.0 CEQA FINDING

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Negative Declaration together with the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan E.I.R. The Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and is adequate for this proposal.
- 1.2 No significant impacts to the environment as a result of this project were identified in the initial study.
- 1.3 The project will not affect wetland, watercourses, riparian lands, unique plant or animal life and habitats, or other terrestrial matters under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Fish and Game. Therefore, the project has a de minimis impact on the environment and a Certificate of Fee Exemption (DFG 753.5-5/91) is applicable.
- 1.4 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.

2.0 General Plan Findings

- 2.1 The change in land use is a correction of a mapping error and conforms the land use designation to the existing zoning, consistent with the direction of the Planning Commission in their adoption of the 1996 General Plan.

EXHIBIT K



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: A06-0006 General Plan Amendment

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

Contact Person: Peter Maurer

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's/ Applicant's Name and Address: El Dorado County for Steven and Nancy Costa, 921 Orchard Court, Pilot Hill, CA 95664

Project Location: On the east side of State Route 49, at the northerly intersection with Grand Fir Circle, in the Cool area.

Assessor's Parcel Number: 1.05-acre portion of 3.390-acre 071-280-51

Zoning: General Commercial (CG)

Section: 19 **T:** 12N **R:** 9^E

General Plan Designation: Medium-Density Residential (MDR)

Description of Project: Amend the land use designation from MDR, Medium Density Residential to C, Commercial.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	CG	MDR	Vacant
North:	CG	C	Vacant
East:	R3A	MDR	Single-Family Residence
South:	R2A	MDR	Vacant
West:	R2A	MDR	Single-Family Residence

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 1.05-acre subject portion is vacant and predominately covered by annual grasses. The only trees are six valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) lining both sides of the driveway. The subject portion is surrounded on three sides by roads. To the south on the 2.34-acre portion of the parcel which is not subject of this request, there is a single-family residence, barn, shop and second residential unit surrounded by non-native sycamore trees. Knickerbocker Creek travels into the parcel from a culvert underneath Grand Fir Circle into the northeast corner and travels parallel to the driveway on the east parcel boundary then follows the southern boundary in a westerly direction and exits the parcel through a culvert under State Route 49. Knickerbocker Creek does not enter the 1.05-acre portion subject of this request.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described in attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, pursuant to applicable standards; and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____ Date: October 9, 2006

Printed Name: Peter Maurer, Principal Planner 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?			X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?		X	
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character quality of the site and its surroundings?		X	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X	

Discussion:

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

- (a) Scenic Vista. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- (b) Scenic Resources. The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>)).
- (c) The project is located on a commercially zoned, 1.05-acre portion of a 3.39-acre parcel that currently is vacant. The view into this new portion of the project from SR 49 will be fully analyzed as to the landscaping, parking, lighting and other visual and aesthetic elements during the Design Review process. Section 17.14.130 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance requires multifamily and commercial development along a state highway to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. A Design Review application is required for any future proposed development. The purpose of the review is to ensure the proposed structure is in keeping with the architectural character of the neighborhood.
- (d) During the required Design Review process, all future outdoor lighting shall conform to Section 17.14.170 of the County Code and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) full cut-off designation so as to minimize impacts from glare to less than significant.

Finding: No impacts to views and viewsheds are expected with the development of the storage facility either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding buildings in the direct vicinity. For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
 - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
 - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- (a) El Dorado County has established the Agricultural District (-A) General Plan land use overlay designation and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural District (-A) General Plan land use overlay designation adjacent to the project site. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- (b & c)
The project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. No existing agricultural land will be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed request.

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality

Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or

- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- (a) The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed amendment will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan.
- (b & c) Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (O3). Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM10) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to meet the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:
- Short-term impacts related to construction activities; and
 - Long-term impacts related to the project operation.

Short-term minor grading and excavation activities associated with any future proposed development will be required to comply with the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District's permitting process requiring adherence to District Rule #223 for fugitive dust emissions. Additionally, a Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control Plan shall be submitted prior to any grading.

Mobile emission sources such as automobiles, trucks, buses, and other internal combustion vehicles are responsible for more than 70 percent of the air pollution within the County, and more than one-half of California's air pollution. In addition to pollution generated by mobile emissions sources, additional vehicle emission pollutants are carried into the western slope portion of El Dorado County from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area by prevailing winds.

- (d) Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, daycare centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. General Plan Policy 6.7.6.1 requires that the County ensure that new facilities in which sensitive receptors are located (e.g., schools, child care centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, and hospitals) are sited away from significant sources of air pollution. The Cool Community Church is located approximately 0.4 miles to the southwest of the subject parcel portion. Any future development proposal will address possible pollution concentrations during the required Design Review process.
- (e) The Commercial zone district does not permit activities, which could generate objectionable odors. Those activities, which might result in objectionable odors, dust, or smoke, require the review and approval of a special use permit. This subsequent discretionary permit would require environmental review addressing the potential impacts resulting from the proposed activity.

Finding: A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the proposed amendment would not directly impact air quality. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed during the required Design Review process. For this "Air Quality" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X	

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

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;
- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species; or
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

(a) The 1.05-acre subject portion is vacant and predominately covered by annual grasses. The only trees are six valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) lining both sides of the driveway. The subject portion is surrounded on three sides by roads. Knickerbocker Creek travels into the parcel from a culvert underneath Grand Fir Circle into the northeast corner and travels parallel to the driveway on the east parcel boundary then follows the southern boundary in a westerly direction and exits the parcel through a culvert under State Route 49. Knickerbocker Creek does not enter the 1.05-acre portion subject of this request. Any future development proposal however, would be further analyzed as to all potential environmental impacts to the Knickerbocker Creek riparian habitat and the mature valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) during the required Design Review process.

The parcel does not fall within designated critical habitat or core areas for the Red-legged and Yellow-legged frog species. (El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7).

(d) Review of the Department of Fish and Game's *Migratory Deer Herd Maps* indicate the project site does not lie within the range of a recognized deer herd. Any impact on thee riparian corridor of Knickerbocker Creek will be analyzed pursuant to the interim guideline of General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4. Impacts to surrounding valley oaks, native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, and to established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors and native wildlife nursery sites, would be fully analyzed during the required Design Review process based on the specific design of the subsequent commercial development.

- (e) The 1.05-acre portion subject of this amendment request has valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) on both sides of the driveway creating oak tree canopy coverage of less than 10 percent. Pursuant to the Policy 7.4.4.4, that means any future development will be required to retain 90 percent of that canopy. As of the time of this report, there is no Option B available but may be so at the time of a future development application.
- (f) The project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted or approved habitat conservation plan as the currently is not one involving or in the vicinity of the subject parcel.

Finding: Direct impacts to biological resources by this amendment alone, are determined to be less than significant. Any potential impact to biological resources would be further fully analyzed and mitigated during the required Design Review process. This Design Review process requires review by the Planning Commission, and will occur prior to the issuance of any building or grading permit for the subject 1.05-acre portion. For this “Biological” category, and in reference to this amendment alone, the thresholds of significance have not been 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?			X	
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			X	
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

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

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

(a-d) An Archeological Survey Report was completed for Assessor’s Parcel Number 071-280-51 in March of 1992 which stated that no archeological features or historic artifacts were found within the said parcel. (Archeological Survey Report of Assessor’s Parcel Number 071-280-51, Dana Supernowitz, Archeological/Historical Consultant, March, 1992). Because of the common possibility that any parcel in the County may turn up archeological finds during grading, any future Design Review application/proposal would be conditioned with the following condition:

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. The project grading plans shall include this mitigation on the plans. The Planning Department shall review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Finding: Based upon the cultural resource survey prepared for the site, and the fact any future development of the subject 1.05-acre portion would require further review under the Design Review process. For this amendment request, and for this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X	

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
 - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- (a) There are no known faults which transect the project area or are located on the project site, however, there are faults located regionally. The subject parcel portion is approximately 3 miles northwest of a portion of the East Bear Mountain Fault. The project site could be expected to undergo moderate to severe ground shaking during large magnitude earthquakes, however, the occurrence of one of these events in this area has been historically rare and any future building permit would address that potential shaking with requirements to mitigate that. The impact from a major seismic event could be considered less than significant.
- (b) All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the County of El Dorado - *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). This ordinance is designed to limit

erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use, in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During site grading and construction of any potential future development, there is potential for minor erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions. To reduce the potential for erosion and loss of topsoil, any future development will be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts further analyzed during the required Design Review process.

- (c - d) Based on the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, CA*, issued April 1974, the project soil is classified as Loamy Alluvial Land (LaB), with 2 to 5 percent slopes, and is moderately well drained. Surface runoff is slow to medium, permeability is moderate to moderately slow, and the erosion hazard is slight. The impact on soils by any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed during the required Design Review process.
- (e) The subject site is located on soils of moderate to moderately slow permeability that are considered “moderate” in limiting a septic system on slopes less than 10 percent, as determined by the Soil Survey of El Dorado County. Prior to issuance of a building permit, Environmental Management would review the septic system design. Design and installation of any on-site sewage systems must be in accordance with applicable Federal, State and County guidelines and codes. County regulations for the proper design and installation of on-site systems have been adopted by the County Board of Supervisors and have been reviewed and accepted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Any future development proposal must adhere to these regulations under the El Dorado County Sewage Disposal Ordinance.

Finding: No significant geophysical impacts are expected from this amendment request. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts further analyzed during the required Design Review process. For this “Geology and Soils” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
 - Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
 - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- (a) The Cool Community Church is located approximately 0.4 miles to the southwest of the subject parcel portion. The proper use and storage of any hazardous material or substances will limit exposure and the potential for explosion or spills. If explosives will be used for road or site construction, such activity would only occur in conformance with State and County applicable laws. In this case, the El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan serves as the implementation program for the management of any hazardous wastes in order to protect the health, safety, and property of residents in the vicinity of the project. Any future development proponent will be required under State and local law to provide a Hazardous Materials Management Plan for the site. This plan identifies the location of all hazardous and toxic materials and provides a plan of action in the event of a spill or leak of hazardous materials. This compliance would mitigate the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. Any future development proponent will also be required to comply with applicable provisions of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations Parts 100-185 and all amendments through September 30, 2001 (Hazardous Materials Regulations).
- (b) No significant amounts of hazardous materials are projected to be utilized for the project. The amendment will not directly result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- (d) There are no hazardous material sites in the project vicinity that have been identified on the Facility Inventory Data Base: Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5.
- (e & f) The project parcel is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or private airport.
- (g) The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the project area.
- (h) The project site is in an area of moderate hazard for wildland fire pursuant to Figure V.4-2 of the 1996 General Plan Draft EIR and Figure 5.8-4 of the 2004 General Plan Draft EIR. The commercial portion of the site has been cleared and graded in the past, with the existing portion having been paved. Compliance with the conditions required by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District as well as California Building Codes will reduce the impact of wildland fire on the commercial development to less than significant.

Finding: No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected because of the amendment alone. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process. For this “Hazards” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

(a & f) Human activities such as agriculture, animal husbandry, municipal, industrial, recreational, and mining uses can result in runoff that could contribute to water quality problems in surface water bodies. Water quality standards for development of the project site are governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) through the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Any construction project affecting one acre or more of disturbed soil is required to comply with the SWRCB General Permit conditions for stormwater runoff from construction activities and is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program (NPDES) permit.

- (b) El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. The geology of the Western Slope portion of El Dorado County is principally hard crystalline, igneous or metamorphic rock overlain with a thin mantle of sediment or soil. Groundwater in this region is found in fractures, joints, cracks, and fault zones within the bedrock mass. These discrete fracture areas are typically vertical in orientation rather than horizontal as in sedimentary or alluvial aquifers. Recharge is predominantly through rainfall infiltrating into the fractures. Movement of this groundwater is very limited due to the lack of porosity in the bedrock. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are identified in El Dorado County. Should a well be used in the future, the well permit and production report would need to be reviewed and approved by El Dorado County Environmental Division. Any future development that would need water from the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District would need a letter from them proving that there was enough water to serve the proposal.
- (c – e) The project will be subject to conditions of approval that will separate runoff between the fuel dispensing area and the rest of the site pursuant to the County’s Storm Water Management Plan. Compliance with the Plan as well as the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance’s* Best Management Practices will reduce construction erosion and operational runoff to less than significant.
- (g – i) The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel No. 060040-0175B, dated October 18, 1983, establishes that the subject 1.05-acre portion is within Flood Zone “C”, area of minimal flooding. Impacts from flooding will be less than significant.
- (j) A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. As the project’s operational facilities are sited outside of the 100-year event, the potential for a mudflow is considered to be less than significant.

Finding: No significant hydrological impacts are directly expected from this amendment. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process. For this “Hydrology” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

- (a) The proposed project will not physically divide an established community as it is essentially on an island of land, along with two other parcels that is surrounded by roads.

- (b) Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process. The amendment is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the 2004 General Plan, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.
- (c) As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is not located in an ecological preserve mitigation area established for the Pine Hill rare plants or red-legged frog core area. The project will not conflict with any known habitat conservation plan.

Finding: No significant impacts are expected directly from this amendment to any current land use policies. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process. For this “Land Use Planning” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- (a) The project site is not mapped as a known Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology as shown on the Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn 15-minute Mineral Resource Zone quadrangles or by El Dorado County as depicted on the 1996 General Plan Exhibit V-7-4 and 2004 General Plan Exhibit 5.9-6. It can be found that no potential mining of important mineral resources will be prevented by the proposed amendment.
 - (b) The western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four 15-minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value, but as stated above, it can be determined that this specific site does not contain them.

Finding: No direct significant impacts are expected with the proposed amendment to any current land use policies. For this “Mineral Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

(a) The 1.05-acre parcel portion could potentially have a future project proposed that has a use listed under Table 6-1 of the General Plan as being a use subject to maximum allowable noise exposures from transportation sources such as SR Highway 49. As such, an acoustical analysis would potentially be required for noise inward and outward depending on the proposal for any future development proposal.

(b – d) Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the project vicinity during developments. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. All storage, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas are required to be located as far as practicable from any residential areas.

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

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

Finding: No impacts to or from noise is expected directly as a result of this amendment proposal. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

- (a) The proposed amendment will not induce growth directly or indirectly by providing infrastructure that would create development beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. The amended land use to commercial, in keeping with Policy 2.2.1.2, gives the subject parcel portion the potential to offers uses that will benefit the local residents.
- (b – c) The proposed project will not displace people or existing housing, which will prevent the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Finding: There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the amendment either directly or indirectly. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>				
a. Fire protection?			X	
b. Police protection?			X	
c. Schools?				X
d. Parks?				X
e. Other government services?			X	

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

- Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department’s/District’s goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;
- Substantially increase or expand the demand for public law enforcement protection without increasing staffing and equipment to maintain the Sheriff’s Department goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents;
- Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services;
- Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources;

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.

(a - b, & d - e) General Plan Policy 5.1.2.2 establishes that the provision of public services to new discretionary development shall not result in a reduction of service below minimum established standards to current users, pursuant to Table 5-1. Table 5-1 establishes Minimum Levels of Service for public services such as schools, parks, fire districts, ambulance and sheriff. 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 demand for fire protection services, however, no factual information was provided by the fire district stating that the minimum level of service would fall below the minimum response time of 15-45 minutes, as designated in Table 5-1. The current staffing within the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department is approximately 1 to 1.2 officers per 1,000 County residents compared with the statewide average of 1.8 officers per 1,000 population. The department will serve the project site with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The project site is immediately adjacent to a federal highway, so impact of the project to the level of service provided by the Sheriff's Dept. will be less than significant.

(c) The state allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project should have no impact on local school districts.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services with the amendment proposal. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process. For this "Public Services" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

(a - b) The land use amendment to commercial would have no impact on the use of recreational facilities in the area, nor does it include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities in its proposal.

Finding: No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected storage facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Recreation" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

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

(a - b) Access to the site is off of Grand Fir Circle which is maintained by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation. Impacts of adding 1.05 acres of commercial land use to Market Area #10 would amount to around 0.46 of 1% increase to the Market area which could be considered a less than significant impact. (El Dorado County General Plan E.I.R., Table 3-5, page 3-29, EDAW, May, 2003). Specific traffic impacts from the future development of the site will be addressed during the required Design Review process.

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

(d, e & f). Access to the project parcel is via an existing encroachment onto Grand Fir Circle. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process and would be required allow sufficient room for emergency vehicle turn-around as directed during that review process. All parking would be required to comply with Chapter 17.18 of the County Code.

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

Finding: As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts directly expected with amendment of the land use to commercial. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

(a & e) The subject, commercial project is located within the Platted Lands overlay (-PL) designation. Under 2004 General Plan policy 5.3.1.1 commercial projects *shall be required to connect to public wastewater collection facilities as a condition of approval except in Rural Centers*. Any future septic system will be reviewed by the Environmental Health Division to insure adequacy in meeting the standards of the El Dorado County Sewage Disposal Ordinance prior to issuance of a building permit. There is no evidence indicating the amendment of the land use to commercial will violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the RWQCB.

(b) Any new water or expansions of existing well and septic facilities are reviewed by El Dorado County Environmental Management Department during the processing of any future Design Review permit and the building permit.

(c) All new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities proposed by any future commercial project will be reviewed by El Dorado County Department of Transportation with the applicant's grading permit.

(d) The availability of potable water will be further analyzed during any future development proposal and would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process.

- (f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) are allowed to be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal site. All other waste materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.
- (g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. For commercial development some on-site separation of materials is required and areas are required to be set aside for the storage of solid waste in accordance with Ordinance No. 4319. Chapter 8.42.640C of the county Ordinance requires that solid waste, recycling and storage facilities must be reviewed and approved by the County prior to building permit issuance.
- (h) Power and telecommunication facilities are available at the project site. The power demands of a future proposed use would be accommodated through connection to existing lines, which are available at the parcel. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: No significant utility and service system impacts are directly expected by amending the land use to commercial. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:				
a. Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Discussion:

- (a) This amendment of the land use designation to commercial does not directly have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, including effects on animals or plants. Both short-term and long-term environmental effects directly associated with this amendment, in and of itself, will be less than significant. Any potentially significant impacts will be reduced through compliance with existing standards and requirements.
- (b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines as two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study it has been determined that the project will not result in cumulative impacts.

- (c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document it has been determined that the proposed amendment will not have any environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly (no impacts identified, or mitigation has been included in the project design to reduce the impact). Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the required Design Review process.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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.)

Archeological Survey Report of Assessor's Parcel Number 071-280-51, Dana Supernowitz, Archeological/Historical Consultant, March, 1992