

**EL DORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: November 9, 1006
Item No.: 9.a.
Staff: Jason R. Hade

SPECIAL USE PERMIT

FILE NUMBER: S04-0045/Camp Fleming Girl Scout Camp

APPLICANT: Tierra Del Oro Girl Scout Council

AGENT: Aspen Street Architects, Inc./Rob Westerhoff

REQUEST: To allow the construction of a 2,000 square foot lodge with kitchen facilities and restrooms to be served by a separate well and on-site septic disposal system.

LOCATION: North of Happy Valley Road, approximately four miles east of the intersection with Mt. Aukum Road in the Somerset area. (Exhibit A)

APN: 093-021-09 and -10

ACREAGE: 443.2 acres

GENERAL PLAN: Natural Resources (NR) (Exhibit B)

ZONING: Residential Agricultural-80 (RA-80) (Exhibit C)

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Conditional Approval

BACKGROUND

The subject site has been operated as the Camp Fleming Girl Scout Camp by the Tierra Del Oro Girl Scout Council since 1956 and includes many existing structures. On May 20, 1980, the Planning Director submitted the request of Mrs. Loellen Bonser for a waiver of Zoning Ordinance requirements to allow construction of a recreation building without a special use permit at the Girl Scout Camp facility located in Happy Valley, consisting of 400 acres of land zoned Unclassified. On a motion by Supervisor Walker, seconded by Supervisor Todd, and unanimously carried, the

Board of Supervisors instructed Planning Services to approve the building permit on the basis that this is accessory to an existing use.

On January 3, 2002, the applicant applied for a building permit (#137000) to construct the proposed lodge. It was subsequently determined by Planning Services that a special use permit was never obtained by the applicant and was required prior to building permit approval. Special Use Permit S04-0045 was submitted to Planning Services for review on December 10, 2004, and revised on January 14, 2005. The project requires State Fire Marshall (SFM) approval which was received on August 31, 2006.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff has reviewed the project for compliance with the County's regulations and requirements. An analysis of the permit requests and issues for Planning Commission consideration are provided in the following sections.

Project Description

A special use permit request to construct a 2,000 square foot lodge to accommodate up to 30 campers with kitchen facilities and restrooms to be served by a separate well and on-site septic disposal system. Several new parking areas are also proposed. The project description submitted by the applicant is attached as Exhibit I. The proposed lodge is referenced as a "rustic cabin" by the applicant on the submitted site plan attached as Exhibit E. As proposed, the lodge represents an expansion of a legal non-conforming use.

Site Description

The project site lies at an average elevation between 2,450 and 2,925 feet above mean sea level. Topography on the site is moderate with rolling hills and slopes ranging from 10 percent to 35 percent. The site is bisected by Butte Creek as well as several small drainages flowing into Butte Creek. Vegetation on the parcels consists of oak woodland with mixed scrub and grasses as well as riparian vegetation along Butte Creek and the drainages. There are many rock outcroppings scattered throughout the site. Existing site improvements include: a 6,793 square foot two-story lodge with a commercial kitchen, restrooms, conference room, dining room, infirmary, and dormitory with shower and restrooms; 912 square foot maintenance/garage building; 616 square foot wood storage shed; 880 square foot restroom/shower building with six shower stalls and eight toilet stalls; 640 square foot troop shelter; 285 square foot nature display; six portable restrooms adjacent to campsites; 12 outdoor tent camp sites; 1,200 square foot manufactured home/care taker's residence; three 2,000 gallon water storage tanks and well and pump house; and tree house/platform. There is a network of dirt roads and paths crossing the property providing access to camping areas.

Adjacent Land Uses

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	RA-80	NR	Camp Fleming Girl Scout Camp
North	RA-160	NR-NJ	National Forest Land
South	RE-10/ RA-40	RR-PL/NR	Undeveloped/Single-family residence
East	RA-80/A-40	NR	Undeveloped/Single-Family Residence/National Forest
West	RA-40/ RA-20	NR	Undeveloped/Single-family residence

Access

Access to the project site is from Happy Valley Road which is an 18 to 20 foot wide paved County maintained road. General Plan Policy 6.2.3.2 requires that for new development the applicant shall demonstrate that adequate access exists, or can be provided, to ensure that emergency vehicles can access the site and private vehicles can evacuate the area. The Pioneer Fire Protection District (PFPD), in cooperation with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, reviewed the proposed project and submitted comments to Planning Services on February 25, 2005. The District requested that the project be sent to the State Fire Marshall (SFM) for further review and that the “a more detailed plot plan” be provided to the District for further review as well. SFM approval was granted on August 31, 2006. After SFM approval, the PFPD submitted comments indicating that they had no additional project concerns. Staff conducted a site visit on October 6, 2005, to review the project and related fire safe issues. Based on the site visit observations as well as the SFM and PFPD comments, all project access issues have been addressed.

Building Design

As indicated in the project’s exterior elevations (Exhibit F), the proposed 2,000 square foot lodge will include stone veneer, horizontal T1-11 plywood siding, and forest green colored metal roofing. The lodge has been designed to fit within the context of the existing structures at the Girl Scout Camp.

Circulation

The proposed lodge is intended to serve up to 30 campers. It is estimated that a group of this size will utilize two vehicles to reach the site. The proposed lodge may be used year-round, and camp usage records indicate the existing lodge is used three to four weekends per month on average. Total camp users for one year utilizing all camp facilities are estimated to be 3,125 persons. The addition of the proposed lodge is expected to slightly increase the number of yearly campers using the facilities as it will provide additional lodging space. Very little increase in traffic is anticipated with the proposed lodge as the estimated 30 campers will be transported to the facility in approximately two vehicles. Thus, traffic impacts are found to be less than significant. The Department of Transportation reviewed the project and related traffic issues and had no significant comments or concerns.

Landscaping

No landscaping is required for the proposed use. No tree removal is proposed as a result of lodge construction.

Land Use Compatibility

General Plan Policy 2.2.5.11 recognizes that forested areas have a need for certain commercial support uses which should be allowed in a manner which is consistent with the forest use and outdoor recreation areas. Uses which are consistent here may include the processing of forest products and natural resources, overnight individual and group outdoor accommodations, outdoor recreation activities, including ski resorts, hunting and fishing clubs, equestrian facilities, and interpretive centers and conference/convention centers. These special support uses shall only be allowed to be established with the approval of a special use permit. General Plan Policy 2.2.5.21 requires that development projects be located and designed in a manner that avoids incompatibility with adjoining land uses. As proposed, the 2,000 square foot lodge within the Girl Scout Camp is consistent with the used described above and is compatible with surrounding land uses.

Lighting

No exterior lighting is proposed as part of the project. Any outdoor lighting that may be installed shall conform to Chapter 17.14.170 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Parking

The submitted site plan 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. However, parking requirements for the proposed use are not specifically addressed within the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has proposed to construct several new parking areas throughout the Girl Scout Camp, one of which is to be located near the proposed lodge. Based on the availability of existing parking areas and several proposed parking areas, adequate parking is available for the proposed use.

Signage

No signage is proposed as part of the project

GENERAL PLAN

The project has been reviewed in accordance with the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan policies, and it has been determined that the project is consistent with the General Plan. Findings of consistency with the General Plan are provided in Attachment 2.

ZONING

The proposed use is permitted by special use permit in the Residential Agricultural Eighty-acre (RA-80) Zone District, pursuant to Section 17.30.190 (A). In order to approve the use, the approving authority must find that the use is consistent with the General Plan and would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare nor injurious to the neighborhood. Based on comments received from public agencies, as well as the analysis discussed above, staff finds that the project would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare and would not be injurious to the neighborhood. After obtaining a special use permit, this use is consistent with the provisions of the RA-80 Zone District. As proposed and conditioned, the project meets all applicable development

standards within Section 17.30.200 of the Zoning Ordinance, including the minimum 30-foot building setback. Based upon staff research, a special 200-foot agricultural setback is not applicable to the subject site for the proposed use.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has prepared an Initial Study (Environmental Checklist with Discussion attached as Exhibit J) 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 cultural resources. 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 take the following actions:

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), as incorporated in the conditions of approval and mitigation measures in Attachment 1; and
3. Approve Special Use Permit S04-0045, subject to the conditions in Attachment 1, based on the findings in Attachment 2.

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 Page
Exhibit E	Site Plan
Exhibit F	Preliminary Lodge Elevations
Exhibit G	Floor Plan
Exhibit H	Tree Canopy Map
Exhibit I	Applicant's Project Description
Exhibit J	Environmental Checklist & Discussion of Impacts

ATTACHMENT 1

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

FILE NUMBER S04-0045

1. This special use permit approval is based upon and limited to compliance with the project description and conditions of approval set forth below. Any deviations from the project description, exhibits or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the County for conformity with this approval. Deviations may require approved changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above-described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.

The project description is as follows: A special use permit to construct a 2,000 square foot lodge to accommodate up to 30 campers with kitchen facilities and restrooms to be served by a separate well and on-site septic disposal system. Several new parking areas are also to be constructed throughout the Girl Scout Camp.

MITIGATION MEASURE FROM PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

2. In order to avoid further disturbance of historical resources at the subject site during project construction, orange mesh fencing or a similar suitable alternative shall be installed to enclose the historical resources identified as sites “I” and “J” in “Archaeological Recording of Historical Resources on the Camp Fleming THP 4-99-09/ELD-4,” prior to the issuance of a grading and/or building permit.

Monitoring: When submitting plans for a grading permit, the applicant shall note the sensitive areas to be enclosed at the subject site. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide documentation to Planning Services staff to verify satisfactory implementation of this mitigation measure.

3. 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. Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

Monitoring: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, Planning Services staff shall review the submitted plans to ensure that notes have been included regarding the mitigation measure discussed above.

PROJECT SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

Planning Services

4. All site improvements shall conform to Exhibits E, F, and G which are in the project file in Planning Services.
5. The applicant is responsible for constructing new parking areas throughout the Girl Scout Camp, as shown on the submitted site plan. All campground parking facilities shall be graded and surfaced with two inches of aggregate base prior to final occupancy.
6. Any proposed 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 as determined by Planning Services prior to final occupancy of the facility.
7. Prior to occupancy or commencement of any use authorized by this permit, the applicant shall provide a written description, together with appropriate documentation, showing conformance of the project with each condition imposed as part of the project approval. The applicant shall also schedule an inspection by Planning Services prior to occupancy for verification of compliance with applicable conditions of approval.

Pioneer Fire Protection District

8. Prior to issuance of a building permit, all plans shall be reviewed by the Pioneer Fire Protection District to verify compliance with the uniform fire code and other fire safe related issues, as determined by the Pioneer Fire Protection District.

California Department of Health Services/El Dorado County Environmental Management Department

9. Prior to final occupancy, an application to amend the water system permit must be reviewed and approved by the California Department of Health Services and El Dorado County Environmental Management Department.

ATTACHMENT 2 **FINDINGS**

FILE NUMBER S04-0045

1.0 CEQA FINDINGS

- 1.1 The Planning Commission 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 Planning Commission 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 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 Planning Commission 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 GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS

- 2.1 As proposed, the project is consistent with the Natural Resource (NR) land use designation of the subject site as defined within General Plan Policy 2.2.1.2 because the NR land use designation specifically includes recreation as a compatible use.
- 2.2 The proposal is consistent with General Plan Policies 2.2.5.11, 2.2.5.21, 6.2.3.2, 7.1.2.1, and 7.4.4.4 concerning land use compatibility, fire safe access, grading on slopes in excess of 30 percent and tree canopy retention standards. Because of the project's provision of adequate access, site design, and efforts to fit within the context of the surroundings land uses, it is consistent with the General Plan policies identified above.

3.0 ZONING FINDINGS

- 3.1 The subject site is zoned Residential Agricultural – Eighty-acre (RA-80) which permits the proposed use with an approved special use permit under Section 17.30.190 (A).
- 3.2 As proposed, the project meets all applicable development standards contained within Section 17.30.200 of the *El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance*.

4.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS

- 4.1 The issuance of a Special Use Permit for the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan as detailed in the General Plan findings above.
- 4.2 The proposed use is not considered detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, or injurious to the neighborhood based on the analysis within the staff report. The proposed project is found to have less than significant public health, safety, and welfare impacts regarding emergency access, traffic, parking and aesthetic issues. No agency objections were expressed during the project review process.
- 4.3 The proposed use is specifically permitted by special use permit pursuant to Section 17.30.190 (A).



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Special Use Permit S04-0045/Camp Fleming Girl Scout Camp

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: Tierra Del Oro Girl Scout Council, 3005 Gold Canal Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Aspen Street Architects, P.O. Box 370, Angels Camp, CA 95222

Project Location: The subject parcels are located north of Happy Valley Road, approximately four miles east of the intersection with Mount Aukum Road, in the Somerset area.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 093-021-09	Parcel Size: 403.2 acres
093-021-10	Parcel Size: 40.0 acres

Zoning: Residential Agricultural-80 (RA-80) **Section:** 1 **T:** 9N **R:** 12E

General Plan Designation: Natural Resources (NR)

Description of Project: A special use permit request to construct a 2,000 square foot lodge with kitchen facilities and restrooms to be served by a separate well and on-site septic disposal system. The subject site has been operated as the Camp Fleming Girl Scout Camp by the Tierra Del Oro Girl Scout Council since 1956 and includes many existing structures. However, this environmental document is only to review the proposed lodge.

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:	RA-160	NR-NJ	National Forest Land
East:	RA-80/RA-40	NR	Undeveloped/Single-Family Residence/National Forest
South:	RE-10/RA-40	RR-PL/NR	Undeveloped/Single-Family Residence
West:	RA-40/RA-20	NR	Undeveloped/Single-Family Residence

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site lies at an average elevation between 2,450 and 2,925 feet above mean sea level. Topography on the site is moderate with rolling hills with slopes ranging from 10 to 35 percent. The site is bisected by Butte Creek, as well as several small drainages flowing into Butte Creek. Vegetation on the parcels consists of oak woodland with mixed scrub and grasses, as well as riparian vegetation along Butte Creek and the drainages. There are many rock outcroppings scattered throughout the site. Existing site improvements include: a 6,793 square foot two-story lodge with a commercial kitchen, restrooms, conference room, dining room, infirmary, and dormitory with shower and restrooms; 912 square foot maintenance/garage building; 616 square foot wood storage shed; 880 square foot restroom/shower building with 6 shower stalls and 8 toilet stalls; 640 square foot troop shelter; 285 square foot nature display; 6 portable restrooms adjacent to campsites; 12 outdoor tent camp sites; 1,200 square foot manufactured home/caretaker's residence; 3, 2,000 gallon water storage tanks and well and pump house; and tree house/platform. Access to the site is from Happy Valley Road which is an 18 to 20 foot wide paved County maintained road. There is a network of dirt roads and paths crossing the property providing access to camping areas.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado County Building Services: Building Permit; Environmental Management Department: Septic Permit/Well Permit/Approval of Kitchen Facility

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		Air Quality
	Biological Resources	X	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 3, 2006

Printed Name: Jason R. Hade For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: October 3, 2006

Printed Name: Peter N. Maurer 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 substantially 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 within a corridor defined as a State scenic highway adjacent to the project site.
- c) The proposed project will not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The surrounding area has been developed with a range of agricultural and residential uses on large parcels. The project will not introduce development that is out of character with the surrounding development.
- d) No new lighting is proposed as part of the project.

FINDING: It has been determined that there will be no 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.

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?			✓

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

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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 no areas of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance will be affected by the project. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use map for the project 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 (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- b) The proposed project will not conflict with 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.

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?		✓	

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
 - b) El Dorado County is classified as being in “severe non-attainment” status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone. 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 Quality Management District administers point source air pollution control. The proposed project will involve only minor construction work, such as grading. Therefore, the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District has determined the project would have an insignificant impact on the air quality. All potential project air quality impacts may be fully mitigated by compliance with standard Air Quality Management District regulations.
 - c) Regarding cumulative air quality impacts, the proposed project does not require a change in existing land use designation or exceed the project alone significance criteria. CO, NO₂, PM₁₀, and SO₂ emissions cumulative impacts are considered to be less than significant. The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District has determined that the seasonal use of the site as a Girl Scout Camp would have a less than significant impact to air quality from operations. Operational air quality impacts include vehicle trips (buses and private vehicles) to and from the site and open fires from groups camping at the site.
 - d) There are no sensitive receptors adjacent to the project site. The proposed site and use will not substantially impact any sensitive receptors in the area.
 - e) The Residential Agricultural –80 (RA-80) 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 further 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 project would include only minor construction work and grading resulting in an insignificant impact on the air quality. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			✓
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) Review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) *Quad Viewer* (http://imaps.dfg.ca.gov/CNDDDB_Quads) for the *Sly Park Quadrangle* indicates the presence of the following threatened, endangered, or Species of Special Concern located in the vicinity of the project:

- California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*); and
- Foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylei*).

Butte Creek, which flows through the project site, is not located in the Weber Creek-Consumnes Unit that is designated as critical habitat for the California red-legged frog by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. However, Butte Creek may be deemed potential habitat, specifically in areas with slow moving water and deep pools.

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

The project does not include any development or disturbance adjacent to Butte Creek. As such, no impact will occur to any potential habitat on the site for either of the two threatened species identified above.

b & c)

The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Map for the project area (Sly Park, CA Quadrangle, 1995) was reviewed to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project site. This review indicates that there are riparian habitat areas adjacent to Butte Creek (R3UBH-Riverine upper perennial unconsolidated bottom-permanently flooded) and one of the intermittent drainages (R4SBC-Riverine intermittent streambed-seasonally flooded) flowing into Butte Creek. General Plan Policy 7.3.3.2 establishes that all feasible project modifications shall be considered to avoid wetland disturbance. In this case, the project proposal does not include any plans for development or disturbance adjacent to Butte Creek. As such, it was determined that the project will have a less than significant impact to wetlands and riparian areas identified on the subject site.

- 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) The predominant vegetation on the subject parcel consists of Oak woodland with a mix of under story brush and grasses. Information submitted by the applicant indicates there is 60 percent oak tree canopy present on the parcel. However, the project proposal does not include the need for the removal of oak trees. As such, no requirements to retain the canopy are necessary as no tree removal will occur as part of the project. The property owners have indicated a desire to maintain the site in its natural condition with no future plans for large scale removal of oak trees for any future development.
- f) The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to the draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?		✓		
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?		✓		

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & b)

The applicant submitted a copy of an archaeological report, “Archaeological Recording of Historical Resources on the Camp Fleming THP 4-99-09/ELD-4,” prepared in August 1999 for the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection as part of a Timber Harvest Plan. According to the report, two historical sites are located near the proposed lodge. These sites are identified as “I” and “J” within the archeological survey. RPF Kral filed impact assessment and protection measures for the CFTHP which were approved by CDF archaeologist L. Sandelin. The CSUS/IAR team observed adverse impacts on sites I, J, and M resulting from subsequent THP operations. Portions of sites I and J are covered with slash; a road in use during timber harvest operations passes directly over milling feature 1 on site I. Although construction of the proposed lodge is not expected to significantly impact the historical resources discussed above, the following mitigation measure is required to reduce potential cultural resource impacts to a less than significant level:

(a/b.1) In order to avoid further disturbance of historical resources at the subject site during project construction, orange mesh fencing or a similar suitable alternative shall be installed to enclose the historical resources identified as sites “I” and “J” in “Archaeological Recording of Historical Resources on the Camp Fleming THP 4-99-09/ELD-4,” prior to the commencement of project grading and construction.

- 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) Earth disturbance and grading on the project site may potentially result in the disturbance of human remains interred outside a formal cemetery. As such, the following mitigation measure is required to reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level:

(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. Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

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.

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

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.			✓
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?			✓
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) The project is located east of both branches of the Bear Mountain Fault and is east of the Melones Fault and Mormon Island Fault Zone. These fault zones are considered potentially active (*Generalized Geologic Map of El Dorado County*, 2001, California Geologic Survey). These faults are part of the larger Foothill Fault Suture Zone extending from Mariposa northwards towards Chico and paralleling the Mother Lode. The last known event associated with this fault system was a Richter scale magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Oroville on August 1, 1975 (DMG, 1992). According to the

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

California Division of Mines and Geology (Jennings, 1992), the nearest known active fault is the Dunnigan Hills Fault located approximately 40 miles to the northwest. Additionally, the *Fault Evaluation Program of the California Division of Mines and Geology (DMG)* was developed to identify active faults that may be hazardous in terms of surface fault rupture and impact to un-reinforced structures. This program was designed to carry out the objectives of the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act of 1972. Only those earthquake faults considered having a relatively high potential for future earthquake activity, and which have well defined surface fault traces were considered for mapping.

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 structures in the project area would be offset by compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.

- b) Minimal grading is required for the development of the proposed lodge at the site. A grading permit may not required and as such no erosion control measures will be required.
- c) According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado County Area*, the properties contain the Holland coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes (HgD), Holland very rocky coarse sandy loam, 15 to 50 percent slopes (HkE), Musick sandy loam, nine to 15 percent slopes (MrC), and the Chaix very rocky coarse sandy loam, nine to 50 percent slopes (CcE). Topography on the site is moderate with slopes ranging from 15 to 50 percent. The Holland very rocky coarse sandy loam, 15 to 50 percent slopes (HkE) soil is characterized as having medium to rapid surface runoff with a high erosion hazard. The Holland coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes (HgD) soil is characterized as having medium to rapid surface runoff, with a high erosion hazard. The Musick sandy loam, nine to 15 percent slopes (MrC) is characterized as having medium surface runoff with a moderate to high erosion hazard. The Chaix very rocky coarse sandy loam (CcE) consists of medium to rapid surface runoff with a high erosion hazard. None of these soil types are categorized as an unstable soil.
- d) Soil series with low to moderate shrink-well potential provide sites adequate for placing structures. Review of the *Soil Survey of El Dorado County Area* indicates that the Holland coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes (HgD), Holland very rocky coarse sandy loam, 15 to 50 percent slopes (HkE), Musick sandy loam, nine to 15 percent slopes (MrC), and the Chaix very rocky coarse sandy loam, nine to 50 percent slopes (CcE) all have a low shrink-well potential. Based upon this review, the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.
- e) The project requires the construction of an on-site septic disposal system to serve the lodge. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, septic system plans shall be submitted to El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, Environmental Health Division for review and approval. Obtaining a building permit will fully mitigate any potential septic system expansion impacts to a less than significant level.

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?		✓

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

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

- 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 proposed project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous/combustible materials. Therefore, the risk of accidental explosion and/or release of hazardous substance are remote.
 - b) The project, as proposed, involves no storage of hazardous materials on-site. Based on the information discussed above, the risk of release of hazardous materials or emissions to the public is remote.
 - 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.

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

- 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.
- h) The State Fire Marshall and Pioneer Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and indicated 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: For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance will not be exceeded by the proposed project.

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?			✓

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) No erosion control or wastewater discharge plan is required for the grading associated with the development of the proposed lodge at the subject site.
- b) The proposed lodge will be served by an on-site well. Development of an on-site well will require permits from the Environmental Management Department to establish the ability of the well to serve the proposed structure.
- c) 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)
 In this case, the project will include minimal grading for the proposed lodge. Compliance with the *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* will reduce erosion and sediment discharge off the site to a less than significant level.
- f) The project will not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site.
- g & h)
 The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0800B, October 18, 1983) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain.
- i) The subject property within the Somerset area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters.
- j) The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. Potential for a mudflow is also considered to be less than significant.

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

FINDING: As discussed above, the proposed project involves only minor grading for the proposed lodge. Existing drainage patterns will be unaffected. No other additional 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 therefore no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Physically divide an established community?			✓
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) The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.
- c) The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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?			✓

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

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:

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?				✓

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & c)

The project will not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. This conclusion is based upon the remoteness of the subject site in relation to the surrounding agricultural development and residences. By nature of the use, minimal noise is expected.

The project is not located in an area exposed to existing noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. As such, an acoustical analysis was not required as part of the project application submittal. The project will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 of the General Plan.

b & d)

Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of project operation. As no significant grading activities are proposed, persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to significant short-term ground borne noise and vibration as a result of grading and excavation.

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

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

FINDING: As mentioned above, no significant grading activities are proposed as part of the project. For the “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will occur from the proposed development.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			✓
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?			✓

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

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 no growth-inducing impact as the project does not include any proposal to extend, or expand infrastructure or roads, and does not include any school or large scale employment opportunities that lead to indirect growth. No new residential development is proposed as part of the project.
- b. No substantial numbers of existing housing stock will be displaced by the proposed project.
- c) No substantial numbers of people will be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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

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

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;

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

- 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 Pioneer 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 Pioneer Fire Protection District will verify fire safe standard compliance prior to building permit issuance.
- 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 the proposed lodge will not significantly impact current response times to the project area.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Pioneer Union School District. Impacts to the affected school district from the proposed lodge will be less than significant.
- 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. Provisions to provide parkland or the payment of an in-lieu fee are not included as the project is not a subdivision. The project will not increase the demand for parkland.
- e) No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the project.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. There is no potential for a significant impact due to the development of the lodge, either directly or indirectly. No significant public service impacts are expected. 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?		✓	
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.

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

- a) Because of the proposed small size and scope of the facility, the project will not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- b) The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing recreation facilities. As proposed, the 2,000 square foot lodge will offer additional recreational opportunities and amenities at the existing Girl Scout Camp.

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		✓	
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?		✓	
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)

Access to the project site is from Happy Valley Road which is an 18 to 20 foot wide paved County maintained road. The proposed lodge is intended to serve up to 30 campers. It is estimated that a group of this size will utilize two vehicles to reach the site. The proposed lodge may be used year-round and camp usage records indicate the existing lodge is used

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

three to four weekends per month on average. Total camp users for one year utilizing all camp facilities are estimated to be 3,125 persons. The addition of the proposed lodge is expected to slightly increase the number of yearly campers using the facilities as it will provide additional lodging space. Very little increase in traffic is anticipated with the proposed lodge as the estimated 30 campers will be transported to the facility in approximately two vehicles. Thus, traffic impacts are found 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) The proposed project does not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that will substantially increase hazards. No traffic hazards will result from the project design.
- e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access to the proposed lodge.
- f) The submitted site plan 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. However, parking requirements for the proposed use are not specifically addressed within the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has proposed to construct several new parking areas throughout the Girl Scout Camp, one of which is to be located near the proposed lodge. Based on the availability of existing parking areas and several proposed parking areas, adequate parking is available for the proposed use.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & b)

The project does not require the connection to public wastewater collection facilities as the project will be served by a septic system. No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required as a result of the project.

- c) No on-site stormwater drainage facilities are required for the proposed lodge.
- d) Potable water for the project is provided by an existing on-site well and three 2,000 gallon water storage tanks. The proposed lodge will be served by a separate new on-site well.
- e) In this case, septic disposal for the proposed lodge at the subject site will be provided by a proposed on-site septic disposal system. The existing lodge and restroom and shower facility are served by an approved existing on-site septic disposal system.
- 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. Adequate solid waste collection space and disposal is currently available at the subject site to accommodate the projected needs of the proposed use.

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.

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

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 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 measures have been incorporated into the project to address cultural resources protection issues.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

2004 El Dorado County General Plan

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

PROJECT SPECIFIC REPORTS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Archeological Recording of Historical Resources on the Camp Fleming THP 4-99-09/ELD-4. L.K. Napton, PH.D. and E. A. Greathouse, M.A. California State University, Stanislaus Institute for Archaeological Research. August 1999.

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING			
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Agency	Time Frame
<i>Cultural Resources</i>	<i>In order to avoid further disturbance of historical resources at the subject site during project construction, orange mesh fencing or a similar suitable alternative shall be installed to enclose the historical resources identified as sites "I" and "J" in "Archaeological Recording of Historical Resources on the Camp Fleming THP 4-99-09/ELD-4," prior to the commencement of project grading and construction.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Grading Permit Issuance</i>
<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. Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit.</i>	<i>Planning Services</i>	<i>Prior to Grading Permit Issuance</i>

Mitigation Measure Agreement for S04-0045 Camp Fleming Girl Scout Camp

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

