

**EL DORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: December 28, 2006

Item No.: 7.b.

Staff: Daniel Hamilton

REZONE/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT/PARCEL MAP

FILE NUMBER: Z05-0016/PD05-0014/ P05-0016

APPLICANT: William Ormond

ENGINEER: Jeffery Crovitz, MGE Engineering, Inc.

REQUEST: Zone change from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to RE-10 with a Planned Development Combining Zone, an application for a planned development, and tentative parcel map (Exhibit E) to create four residential lots ranging in size from 4.03 to 11.47 acres, with a commonly held open space area of 12.59 acres. A design waiver has been requested to reduce the road width improvement requirement for the access road to Lots 2, 3, and 4 from 24 to 20 feet.

LOCATION: On the east side of Cherry Acres Road, approximately one mile south of the intersection with State Route 193, in the Cool area. (Exhibit A)

APN: 071-450-03 (Exhibit B)

ACREAGE: 40.1 acres

GENERAL PLAN: Rural Residential (RR) (Exhibit C)

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Recommend Conditional Approval

BACKGROUND: P05-0016/Z05-0016/PD05-0014 was submitted on December 2, 2005, and circulated for review on February 9, 2006. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting was held on March 27, 2006. As a result of agency comments and General Plan issues discussed at the TAC meeting, additional map revisions were required and received by staff on multiple occasions. After formalization on issues related to the PD overlay zone and the corresponding open space requirements, maps were resubmitted for the final time on September 11, 2006.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Project Description: Zone change request to change zoning from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to add a Planned Development Combining Zone, application for a Planned Development, and tentative parcel map to create four residential lots ranging in size from 4.03 to 11.47 acres, with a commonly owned open space lot of 12.59 acres. No design waivers have been requested as part of the project.

Site Description: The project site is located in Cool, southeast of the intersection of State Route 49 and State Route 193. The site is located between elevations of 1,250 and 1,460 feet, with a mixture of native and non-native grasses, brush, oaks, and scattered pines. The eastern slopes of the site are heavily wooded within the naturally occurring seasonal drainages, and progress from tree canopy to brush as the land rises in elevation. Western slopes on site contain scattered oak trees and grasses. The ridges on the property are primarily grassland and low-lying shrubs. Cherry Acres Road runs adjacent to and west of the site, where two existing residences, a barn, and multiple outbuildings are present. Both of the existing residences are located on one of the proposed lots, while the barn and horse arena are located within the common open space area.

Adjacent Land Uses:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	RE-10	RR	Rural residential
North	RE-10	RR	Rural residential
South	RE-10	RR	Rural residential
East	RE-10	RR	Rural residential
West	RE-10	RR	Rural residential

General Plan: The General Plan designates the subject site as Rural Residential (RR), which permits a density range of one unit per 10 acres to one unit per 40 acres. The Planned Development Combining Zone allows for the lots to be clustered to promote conservation of existing resources, as long as the overall density of the project does not exceed the density allowed in the base district. The project proposes four residential lots on a 40.1 acre site, resulting in an average density of one unit per 10 acres. This is consistent with the General Plan. The following additional General Plan policies apply to this project:

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

Discussion: As indicated in Table 2-4, General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning District Consistency Matrix, the proposed RE-10 (RR) Zone District is consistent with the RR land use designation.

Policy 2.2.3.1: The Planned Development (-PD) Combining Zone District, to be implemented through the zoning ordinance, shall allow residential, commercial, and industrial land uses consistent with the density specified by the underlying zoning district with which it is combined. Primary emphasis shall be placed on furthering uses and/or design that provide a public or common benefit, both on- and off-site, by clustering intensive land uses to minimize impact on various natural resources, avoid cultural resources where feasible, minimize public health concerns, minimize aesthetic concerns, and promote the public health, safety, and welfare. A goal statement shall accompany each application specifically stating how the proposed project meets these criteria.

A. The major components of a Planned Development in residential projects shall include the following:

- 1. Commonly owned or publicly dedicated open space lands of at least 30 percent of the total site. Within a community area, the commonly owned open space can be developed for recreational purposes such as parks, ball fields, or picnic areas. Commonly owned open space does not include space occupied by infrastructure (e.g., roads, sewer, and water treatment plants).*
- 2. Clustered housing units or lots designed to conform to the natural topography.*

Discussion: The project includes an application to apply the –PD Combining Zone District to the parcel and includes a development plan to implement the PD portion of the designation. The parcel map includes the designation of a 12.49-acre lot for common usage by the residents of the site, to be commonly owned by residents of the development. The 12.49 acres is 31 percent of the total site. The usage of the open space includes recreational structures, including a horse barn and related supporting facilities. The remaining lots on the site are configured to conform to the natural topography of the site.

Policy 2.2.3.2: The calculation of development density for purposes of Planned Developments shall be based on the maximum density permitted by the underlying zone district(s). No density shall be attributed to bodies of water, such as lakes, rivers, and perennial streams, excluding wetlands.

Discussion: The maximum density allowed under the base zoning district (RE-10) is one unit per 10 acres. The project proposes four residential parcels on the 40.1 acre site, resulting in an overall density of one unit per 10.03 acres.

Policy 2.3.2.1: Disturbance of slopes thirty (30) percent or greater shall be discouraged to minimize the visual impacts of grading and vegetation removal.

Discussion: The project site contains slopes in excess of 30 percent in multiple areas. These slopes are shown on Exhibit H. All slopes greater than 30 percent are shown outside of proposed building envelopes and driveway locations. No grading or vegetation removal is proposed on slopes exceeding 30 percent.

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

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

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

Discussion: The Georgetown Divide Public Utility District (PUD) will provide water to the subject site, and individual on-site sewage disposal systems will serve each of the proposed lots, subject to El Dorado County Environmental Management Department review and approval. According to the *Verification of Water Service* provided by the Georgetown Divide PUD, the PUD can serve the project site, and each individual lot will be required to have a separate metered service. The PUD currently provides water service to the existing residential dwelling on the site.

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

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

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

Discussion: The El Dorado County Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and stated that the proposed access and on-site roadways are adequate for the development. The District has indicated that a minimum fire flow of 1,000 gallons per minute, at a pressure of 20 pounds per square inch for two hours, shall be necessary to ensure adequate fire suppression.

Policy 7.4.4.4: For all new development projects (not including agricultural cultivation and actions pursuant to an approved Fire Safe Plan necessary to protect existing structures, both of which are exempt from this policy) that would result in soil disturbance on parcels that (1) are over an acre and have at least 1 percent total canopy cover or (2) are less than an acre and have at least 10 percent total canopy cover by woodlands habitats as defined in this General Plan and determined from base line aerial photography or by site survey performed by a qualified biologist or licensed arborist, the County shall require one of two mitigation options: (1) the project applicant shall adhere to the tree canopy retention and replacement standards described below; or (2) the project applicant shall contribute to the County's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) conservation fund described in Policy 7.4.2.8.

Option A

The County shall apply the following tree canopy retention standards:

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

Discussion: The applicant submitted a tree canopy analysis which determined that existing tree canopy at the site is between 20 and 39 percent. This policy requires preservation of 85 percent of the existing canopy coverage. A signed statement by the project applicant, as well as information contained in the *Tree Canopy and Oak Tree Preservation Plan Narrative*, state that the construction of driveways and homes will not result in the loss of any existing canopy or trees. Home sites and proposed locations for septic systems show that the development will not necessitate the removal of on site trees.

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

Zoning: The subject site is requested to add a –PD Planned Development Combining Zone to the existing RE-10 zoning. The net density of the proposed project is one unit per 10.03 acres, consistent with the base zoning district. The dedication of a commonly owned open space lot, representing 31 percent of the total site, ensures consistency with the planned development zone requirements.

Design Waivers Discussion: The following design waiver is required for the completion of the project:

- Reduce the road width improvement requirement from 24 feet per Standard Plan 101B to 20 feet.

Other Issues:

Access/Circulation: The Department of Transportation reviewed the proposed subdivision map and determined that the applicant shall construct Cherry Acres Road to Standard Plan 101B and construct driveways on the site to acceptable County standards. Construction of a new roadway from Cherry Acres Road to the three southernmost new parcels will be constructed to fire safe standards. A design waiver to reduce the roadway width to the minimum fire safe standards is included in the proposed project.

Air Quality: The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District reviewed the submitted air quality analysis and determined that the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality.

Construction Storm Water: The California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region reviewed the project and did not provide comments.

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

Drainage and Grading: Drainage on the site is expected to remain similar to existing conditions, with minor modifications from the development of impervious surfaces, grading, and roadway improvements. Grading calculations provided by the applicant indicate that the improvements called for in the tentative map will require 292 cubic yards of imported fill. Additional cutting and filling will be balanced on site. The Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District reviewed the project and commented that site-specific erosion and sediment control measures should be included in the project construction plans.

Water: The project site is currently served by the Georgetown Divide PUD, which will continue to serve the site. A letter from the Georgetown Divide PUD indicates that the District will be able to continue service provision in the future to expanded lots, with the installation of additional lines and individual meters for home sites.

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

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

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

Wastewater: As proposed, the Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division, is responsible for review of the proposed septic systems and leach fields proposed as part of this project. The Department has made no comments relative to the proposed system design and layout. Two septic systems (in addition to the two systems currently on the site) are proposed, on Lots 2 and 4. These systems are similar in design and scale to the two systems in place on the site, approved by the County and installed in 1999.

Wetlands: There are no known wetlands on the site. Existing mapping and topography indicate a low likelihood for the occurrence of wetlands.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has prepared an Initial Study (Environmental Checklist with Discussion attached as Exhibit K) 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 limited environmental issues, including geology and hydrology. 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

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff;
2. Adopt the mitigation monitoring program in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15074(d) incorporated as conditions of approval in Attachment 1;
3. Approve Z05-0016, PD05-00014, and P05-0016, as the required findings can be made as noted in Attachment 2, based on the analysis in the staff report and the modification of the project to include the conditions itemized in Attachment 1; and
4. Approve the following design waiver since appropriate findings have been made as noted in Attachment 2:
 - a. Request to construct a 20-foot roadway for the access road to Lots 2, 3, and 4 in-lieu of the 24-foot wide roadway required under Standard Plan 101B.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

Attachments to Staff Report:

Attachment 1 Conditions of Approval

Attachment 2 Findings

Exhibit A Vicinity Map

Exhibit B Assessor's Parcel Map

Exhibit C General Plan Land Use Map

Exhibit D Zoning Map

Exhibit E Tentative Subdivision Map

Exhibit G Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan

Exhibit H Slope Exhibit

Exhibit I Septic Disposal Areas

Exhibit J Soils Map

Exhibit K Environmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts

ATTACHMENT 1

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

FILE NUMBER Z05-0016, PD05-0014 and P05-0016

1. This zone change, planned development, and tentative parcel map approval is based upon and limited to compliance with the project description, dated December 28, 2006, 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:

The "Project" is for a zone change (Z05-0016) from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to Estate Residential Ten-acre with a Planned Development Combining Zone (PD). In addition, a Tentative Parcel Map P05-0016 has been requested to subdivide the property into four residential lots ranging in size from 4.03 to 11.47 acres, with a 12.59-acre lot for commonly held open space. Planned Development PD05-0014 is a request to create a planned development on the site, with clustered lots designed to reflect topography and allow for dedication and preservation of open space. A design waiver request was submitted to allow the following: (1) Construct a 20-foot roadway in-lieu of the 24-foot wide roadway required under Standard Plan 101B.

MITIGATION MEASURES

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

2. The applicant shall utilize vegetated areas and catch basins to ensure that no additional storm water volumes are added to the existing storm drainage system, based on pre-construction water levels.

MONITORING: The on-site drainage study shall be reviewed by the Department of Transportation prior to issuance of a grading permit to ensure that pre-construction storm water volumes are maintained.

Department of Transportation

3. The applicant shall submit a site improvement/grading plan prepared by a professional civil engineer to the Department for review and approval. The plan shall be in conformance with the County of El Dorado *Design and Improvement Standards Manual*, the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, the *Drainage Manual*, the *Off-Street Parking and Loading*

Ordinance, and the State of California Handicapped Accessibility Standards. The improvements shall be substantially completed, to the approval of the Department of Transportation, prior to filing the parcel map.

4. The developer shall enter into an Improvement Agreement with the County, for the roadway improvements to Cherry Acres Road, and provide security to guarantee performance of the Improvement Agreement. The roadway improvements to Cherry Acres Road shall be substantially complete, as determined by the Department of Transportation, prior to filing the parcel map.
5. The developer shall construct half width improvements on Cherry Acres Road, along the project frontage, to the General Plan requirements for a Two Lane Regional Road standards (i.e. 50-foot right of way and 24-foot roadway) and Standard Plan 101C, including signage (i.e. stop signs, street name signs, etc.). The roadway improvements to Cherry Acres Road shall be substantially complete, as determined by the Department of Transportation, prior to filing the parcel map.
6. The developer shall construct the portion of Cherry Acres Road that is not County maintained, to minimum Fire Safe Standards from the project to the County maintained portion of Cherry Acres Road, prior to filing the map.
7. The developer shall construct onsite roads to minimum fire safe standards, consistent with the requirements of the El Dorado County and the Fire District, including signage (i.e. stop signs, street name signs, “not a County maintained road”, etc.) prior to filing the parcel map.
8. The developer shall irrevocably offer to dedicate, the right of way as easement with a public utilities easement (to be rejected) on the parcel map for all on-site roadways.
9. Applicant shall join and/or form an entity, satisfactory to the County, to maintain all roads not maintained by the County, both on-site and for those roads (Cherry Acres Road) that are required for access to County or State maintained roads. If a Zone of Benefit, Home Owner Association or informal road maintenance association cannot be formed to maintain non-County maintained roads, the applicant should be aware that Civil Code 845 requires that the owner of any easement in the nature of a private right-of-way, or of any land to which any such easement is attached, shall maintain it in repair, and in the absence of an agreement, the cost shall be shared proportionately to the use made of the easement by each owner.
10. Applicant shall pay the traffic impact fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued. Until such time as updated traffic impact fees are adopted pursuant to the General Plan, any subdivisions will be required to either (1) execute an agreement agreeing to pay the higher fees, even after building permits have been issued or (2) have a notice of restriction placed on the final map prohibiting the issuance of building permits until the updated traffic impact fees are adopted.

11. If blasting activities are to occur in conjunction with grading or improvements, applicant shall ensure that such blasting activities are conducted in compliance with state and local regulations.
12. If burning activities are to occur during the construction of the project improvements, applicant shall obtain the necessary burning permits from the California Department of Forestry and air pollution permits from the County prior to said burning activities.
13. The location of fire hydrants and systems for fire flows are to meet the requirements of the responsible Fire Protection District.
14. The emergency vehicle circulation requirements for roads and driveways, and the location of hydrants, shall be shown on the improvement plans, which shall be subject to the approval of the responsible Fire Protection District. The Department of Transportation will require plans to meet Fire Safe Standards, but only the responsible Fire Protection District may waive or relax those Fire Safe Standards.
15. If human remains are discovered at any time during the grading or improvement phase, the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted per Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.89 of the Public Resources Code. If archaeological artifacts are discovered, the developer shall retain an archaeologist to make recommendations for the treatment of the artifacts. Treatment of Native American remains or archaeological artifacts shall be the responsibility of the developer and shall be subject to the review and approval of the County Deputy Director of Planning Services or designee.
16. The applicant shall provide a soils report at time of improvement plan or grading permit application addressing, at a minimum, grading practices, compaction, slope stability of existing and proposed cuts and fills, erosion potential, ground water, pavement section based on TI and R values, and recommended design criteria for any retaining walls.
17. Any import or export to be borrowed or deposited within El Dorado County shall require an additional grading permit for that offsite grading.
18. The applicant shall provide a drainage report at time of improvement plans or grading permit application, consistent with the Drainage Manual and the Storm Water Management Plan, which addresses storm water runoff increase, impacts to downstream facilities and properties, and identification of appropriate storm water quality management practices to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation.
19. Upon completion of the improvements required, and prior to acceptance of the improvements by the County, the developer will provide a CD to the Department of Transportation with the approved drainage and geotechnical reports in PDF format and the approved record drawings in TIF format.

20. Improvement plan centerline stationing shall conform to as-built plans. If there is any question about the stationing, the Department of Transportation will be the sole authority in setting the stationing.

El Dorado County Fire Protection District

21. The applicant shall submit review fee of \$120.00
22. The required fire flow for this project is 1,000 gallons per minute at 20 psi for two hours.
23. An additional hydrant on Cherry Acres Road at the property line between Lot 2 and 4 will be required for this map.
24. The applicant shall provide documentation from GDPUD and the Fire District to show that the system will meet required fire flow for this project.
25. The private roadway access for Lots 2-4 is required to be 20' wide and, if paved, can be a maximum 20 percent grade.
26. Common Driveway #2 is only required to be 12 feet wide.
27. Where the private road and common driveway #2 meet, the inside turning radius must be increased to 25 feet or provide a 50 foot inside radius cul-de-sac.
28. A Fire Safe Plan is required prior to construction.
29. Any gates constructed on site will require fire district approval.

Planning Services

30. Prior to occupancy/issuance of a building permit 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/issuance of a building permit for verification of compliance with applicable conditions of approval.
31. The subdivision is subject to parkland dedication in-lieu fees based on values supplied by the Assessor's Office and calculated in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of the County Code. The fees shall be paid at the time of filing the final map.
32. The subdivider shall be subject to a \$150.⁰⁰ appraisal fee payable to the El Dorado County Assessor for the determination of parkland dedication in-lieu fees.

Georgetown Divide Recreation District

33. Applicant shall pay all fees to the District required by County Ordinance.
34. A fifteen foot dedicated easement shall be required to comply with the El Dorado County and the Georgetown Divide Recreation District Trails Master Plan. The easement shall run adjacent to Cherry Acres Road. In absence of this easement, the applicant could provide evidence that the public easements for equestrian and other trails are already dedicated on the area to provide point-to-point access sought by this easement dedication.

Surveyor's Office

35. All survey monuments must be set prior to filing of the parcel map.
36. The roads serving the development shall be names by filing a completed Road Name Petition with the County Surveyors Office prior to filing the parcel map.
37. Prior to filing the parcel map, a letter to the County Surveyor will be required from all agencies that have conditions placed on the map. The letter will state that all conditions placed on the map by that agency have been met.

Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District

38. The applicant shall submit a detailed, site-specific soils report, prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist, identifying existing soil and groundwater conditions in the project area and, if necessary, identifying potential mitigation measures.
39. In order to comply with the District's Erosion Control Requirements and Specifications, the applicant will need to implement erosion control measures, including runoff control measures and soil stabilization measures, and sediment control measures, including straw rolls, sediment fence, and sediment basins, as necessary. The applicant is encouraged to contact the District to identify suitable measure to include in the final construction documents.
40. The applicant shall mimic existing drainage patters to the extent practicable, accounting for runoff flowing onto the site from adjacent development, and ensure that the post-construction storm-water volumes and peak discharges from the site approximate existing conditions. The applicant should maximize vegetated area to reduce runoff volume and peak flow and use basins as a secondary practice. A description of the proposed storm water management system design shall be included with applications for building permits.

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District

41. If the project includes the disturbance of 20 cubic yards or more of earth, the applicant shall comply with AQMD Rule 223-2 Fugitive Dust Asbestos Hazard Mitigation, which includes an asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan submittal, fugitive dust prevention, speed limits, warning signs, trackout prevention, excavated soil management and post-construction mitigation. This must be submitted to the AQMD along with the \$315 application fee plus \$20/disturbed acre, prior to issuance of a permit.

ATTACHMENT 2 FINDINGS

FILE NUMBER Z05-0016/PD05-0014/P05-0016

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

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1.0 CEQA FINDING

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration together with the comments received and considered during the public review process. The Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and is adequate for this proposal. A de minimis finding on the project's effect on fish and wildlife resources can be found.
- 1.2 The County finds that through feasible conditions and mitigation placed upon the project, impacts on the environment have been eliminated or substantially mitigated.
- 1.3 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services Department - Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.
- 1.4 Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires the County to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The approved project description and conditions of approval, with their corresponding permit monitoring requirements, are hereby adopted as the monitoring program for this project. The monitoring program is designed to ensure compliance during project implementation.

2.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS

2.1 Zone Change Z05-0016 and Planned Development Permit PD05-0014 Findings

Zone Change Z05-0016 is a request to change the subject site zoning from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to Estate Residential Ten-acre with a Planned Development Combining Zone (PD). Tentative Parcel Map P05-0016 consists of an application to create 4 residential lots ranging in size from 4.03 to 11.47 acres, with a 12.59-acre lot for commonly held open space. Planned Development PD05-0014 is a request to create a Planned Development on the site, with clustered lots designed to reflect topography and allow for dedication and preservation of open space. A design waiver request was submitted to allow the following:

(1) Construct a 20-foot roadway in-lieu of the 24-wide roadway required under Standard Plan 101B.

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

2.1.1 The PD zone request is consistent with the General Plan.

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

2.1.2 The proposed development is so designed to provide a desirable environment within its own boundaries.

The project is for residential purposes. The subject site is surrounded by residential development and will fit within the context of the existing residential uses. The project includes 30 percent open space as required by General Plan Policy 2.2.3.1.

2.1.3 Any exceptions to the standard requirements of the zone regulations are justified by the design or existing topography.

The project does require a design waiver to reduce the road width improvement from 24 feet per Standard Plan 101B to 20 feet. Strict application of the County Road Improvement Standards would result in an increased amount of project grading on steep slopes; therefore, with the constraints of the existing topography and vegetation, the Design Waiver can be supported.

2.1.4 The site is physically suited for the proposed uses.

The project site is developed with a single family home. The planned development and subdivision will allow for the development of three additional single family homes to be developed within the planned development. The project includes 30 Percent open space, which includes a horse barn and related facilities.

2.1.5 Adequate services are available for the proposed uses, including, but not limited to, water supply, sewage disposal, roads and utilities.

The Georgetown Divide Public Utility District will provide water to the subject site, and on-site septic systems will be provided for each residential unit. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation has recommended approval of the Project with road improvements made as a requirement of project approval.

2.1.6 The proposed uses do not significantly detract from the natural land and scenic values of the site.

The project is not within a scenic corridor and is surrounded by residential development.

2.2 Tentative Parcel Map P05-0016 Findings

Tentative Parcel Map P05-0016 consists of an application to create 4 residential lots ranging in size from 4.03 to 11.47 acres, with a 12.59-acre lot for commonly held open space.

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

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

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

As proposed and with the approval of the requested design waivers, the tentative parcel map conforms with the development standards within the Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) and Planned Development Combining Zone District and the Major Land Division Ordinance.

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

As shown on the tentative parcel map, adequate building areas for each lot are available considering the required septic replacement area, slope constraints, tree canopy retention, zoning setbacks, and fire safe standards. As such, the site is physically suitable for the proposed type and density of development.

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

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

3.0 Design Waiver Findings

A Design Waiver has been requested to allow for the construction of a 20 foot roadway in-lieu of the 24 wide roadway required under Standard Plan 101B.

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

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

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

Strict application of the design and improvement requirements would require a wider roadway resulting in an increased amount of project grading and potential slopes on roadways above fire district standards. The Department of Transportation and El Dorado County Fire Protection District have reviewed the design waiver request and have no objections.

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

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

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

The waiver would not result the nullification of the objectives of Article II of Chapter 16 of the County Code, nor any other ordinance applicable to this division.



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Zone Change Z05-0016, Planned Development PD05-0014, Parcel Map P05-0016

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

Contact Person: Daniel Hamilton

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: William and Karen Ormond, 3989 Cherry Acres Road, Cool, CA

Project Applicant's Name and Address: William and Karen Ormond, 3989 Cherry Acres Road, Cool, CA

Project Agent's Name and Address: Jeff Crovitz, 419 Main Street, Suite 300, Placerville, CA

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:

Project Location: 3989 Cherry Acres Road, Cool, CA

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 071-450-03

Zoning: RE-10

Section: 29 **T:** 12N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: RR

Description of Project: The proposed project is a Zone Change, Planned Development and Parcel Map for a 40.10 acre site within the Cool area. The 40.10 acre site is to be subdivided into four (4) single family residential parcels and one open space lot. The open space lot is to contain grasslands and commonly held vegetated areas, for passive recreational use, and would be privately maintained by the homeowners. There are no waterways on site, although the slopes of the site do result in drainage channels forming in rainy months.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RE-10	RR	Rural residential
North:	RE-10	RR	Rural residential
East:	RE-10	RR	Rural residential
South:	RE-10	RR	Rural residential
West:	RE-10	RR	Rural residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The site is characterized by moderately to heavily sloping lands, vegetated by mixed trees and shrubs and a single-family residence. The 40-acre site is located in the Cool area of northern El Dorado County, southeast of the intersection of Highways 49 and 193. Mixed grasslands cover portions of the site, including both native and non-native grasses and vegetation.

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

El Dorado County Development Services Department, Building Services: Building Permit

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	x	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: November 17, 2006

Printed Name: Gina Hunter, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

a) through d) The project site is not visible from a scenic vista or state scenic highway. The proposed project would create divide the parcel into four single-family residential lots and one common open space lot along Cherry Acres Road. With existing development on one lot, it is likely that the project would result in the construction of three additional single-family residences on the newly created lots. The home locations, shown on the Development Plan exhibit, shows the building pads and locations of other improvements. The development of these homes and supporting infrastructure would represent a slight change to the existing visual environment, introducing new sources of light within and around the home sites. The removal of vegetation for home sites would represent a slight change to existing visual conditions.

The creation of the lots, the construction of individual homes and related lighting would represent a small change in the existing visual environment, and would not constitute a significant impact on the environment.

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

Discussion:

The site is currently zoned as RE-10, which is a residential designation. The site is not actively used in agriculture. Soils on the site consist of Auburn very rocky silt loam (30-50 percent slopes), Boomer very rocky loam, and Delpiedra very rocky loam. None of these soils are classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland. The proposed subdivision of property would not result in the creation of

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

any changes which could facilitate or otherwise result in the conversion of nearby farmland to non-agricultural uses. There would be no impact.

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

Discussion:

The project would result in the creation of lots allowing the construction of three new single-family homes. Additional construction would be done to provide supporting infrastructure, including extension of utility lines, expansion of roads, construction of driveways, and related improvements.

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) through e) The project involves the subdivision of the property into four residential lots and one common open space lot, allowing the development of three additional homes on the site. Additional improvements such as roadway improvement and grading would require the use of construction vehicles. Construction and operational emissions from potential home development on the site could produce minor amounts of air pollutants, including PM₁₀, CO, SO₂, and NO_x, although not at levels near the thresholds listed above.

The approval and construction of the project would not affect the implementation of any regional air quality attainment plan or program, nor would the project represent a significant contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation. The cumulative contribution to air quality pollutant levels is less than significant. The project would not

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

expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, nor result in the creation of objectionable odors for residents in the area.

The project site is located within an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA). The El Dorado Air Quality Management District requires preparation and approval of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan to address such impacts. Refer to the Geology and Soils section of this Initial Study for addressing of this impact. The impacts to air quality would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

a) through f) The project site is 40.1 acres of rural residential land located southeast of the intersection of Highway 49 and Highway 193. Elevations on the site range from 1250 to 1460 feet above sea level, with a mixture of native grasses, brush, oak, and scattered pine trees. The eastern slopes of the parcel are heavily wooded within the naturally occurring seasonal drainages, and progresses from tree canopy to brush as the land rises toward the knolls. The western slopes are characterized by scattered oaks and native grasses. Ridges and flatlands between hills are mostly grassland and scattered brush. There is an existing drainage ditch located on the east side of Cherry Acres Road, along the frontage of the property.

The present zoning on the site is RE-10, which would allow for the creation of an equal number of lots to that proposed in this application. The rezoning portion of the application is intended to allow for variation in lot sizes, and to allow for the dedication of open space as part of the northernmost parcel. Site disturbance associated with the project includes construction and improvement of driveways to home sites, construction of homes and building pads, and designation of septic system leach fields for on-site septic systems.

The potential for impact to biological resources is limited. No trees are proposed for removal as part of the project. The placement of buildings and driveways shown on the proposed Parcel Map show no removal of trees, and the applicant has provided a declaration supporting the assertion that no trees would be removed as part of construction of the project. Any removal or disturbance of trees associated with the project would require consistency with General Plan Policies 7.4.4.4, 7.4.2.8, and 7.4.5.1, requiring on-site replacement of any oak trees removed or harmed at a 1:1 woodland replacement ratio, with maintenance for a minimum of 15 years, in accordance with the Interim Interpretive Guidelines for El Dorado County implementing General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4..

The project proposes an additional crossing of the drainage ditch south of the existing driveway into the property. Paving of the driveways and introduction of impervious surfaces at home sites has the potential to slightly increase the runoff from the property to the drainage ditch, particularly during construction periods. Existing State and Federal regulations require a determination of the jurisdiction of this waterway, and require consultation with and approval by the appropriate State or Federal regulatory agency prior to creating any disturbance or impact to the waterway.

The placement of homes and driveways on the site corresponds to the low slopes on the site, and avoids the sensitive habitat areas (denser tree locations, steep slopes) to the greatest extent feasible. Existing local, State, and Federal regulations are sufficient to ensure that impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			X
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X

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

Discussion:

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) through d) Impacts to cultural resources occur when prehistoric, historic, or socially significant remains and remnants of past importance are discovered during construction of improvements on the site. Existing law requires an immediate ceasing and desisting of construction activities if human or archeological remains are encountered, and consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission or appropriate cultural resource specialist is required to effectively mitigate for the resource encountered. Given existing regulatory requirements, the impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

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

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

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.

Impacts to geological resources occur when existing site conditions are geologically unstable or at risk of geologic activity from natural phenomena or catastrophe.

- a) 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 the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope, ranging to more than 40 percent on portions of the site. All proposed building pads, roadways, and driveways are located in areas with slopes of less than 30 percent. All portions of the site with slopes greater than 30 percent are shown as undisturbed, except as required to provide for leaching areas for proposed septic systems. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides would be less than significant.
- b) All grading activities shall comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- c) The site is located on a heavily-sloping site in northern El Dorado County. The potential for earthquake or groundshaking activity is low in the region due to the lack of faults or geologically active sites in the area. The potential for impacts related to the stability of the soils or lands is low because of this lack of geologic activity. Therefore, impacts resulting from potentially unstable soils would be less than significant.
- d) The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has mapped soils on the site as Auburn very rocky silt loam, 30 to 50 percent slopes (AxD) (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). A small portion of the site located in the southwest corner is classified as Delpiedra very rocky loam. No improvements or site alterations are shown on areas of the map with the Delpiedra soils. Review of the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area* indicates that properties in which Auburn very rocky silt loam soil is found have a low shrink-swell potential. The Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District has indicated that, in order to comply with the District’s Erosion Control Requirements and Specifications, the project would be required to provide a detailed, site-specific soils report, prepared by a registered Civil Engineer and/or Certified Engineering Geologist, to identify soil and groundwater conditions in the project area and identify mitigation measures as needed. Additionally, the applicant shall

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

incorporate erosion control measures, including runoff control measures and soil stabilization measures, and sediment control measures sufficient to meet the requirements of the Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District Erosion Control Requirements and Specifications. The resulting impacts that would be less than significant.

- e) The project proposes individual septic of treat wastewater generated on the site. The Auburn very rocky silty loam soils identified on the project site are suitable for placement of septic systems, and the site already supports one such system at present. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;

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

- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

a) through h) The site is not located on a known hazardous materials property, as identified on State and Federal databases. The site has been in use as rural lands and rural residential property for its known history. There are no school sites within one-quarter mile of the site, nor are there public or private airports or air strips within two miles of the site.

Hazardous materials would be used in the construction of the homes and improvements associated with the project. Fuels for vehicles, landscaping chemicals and herbicides, and similar small-scale hazardous chemicals are typically used in some construction and roadway construction. The safe use and storage of these materials is required by federal law, and safety information for all such products is included on packaging materials and labels. The routine use of these materials by construction personnel and homeowners does not result in significant adverse health impacts in typical circumstances.

The site is located within a relatively rural area, with grasslands and vegetation capable of supporting or spreading a wildland fire. The County General Plan has assigned a Fire Hazard Rating of High to the site, indicating a high risk of damage from wildland fire. The Fire Protection District has required the creation of a Wildfire Fire Safe Plan to ensure that building design and vegetation plans minimize fire risks for new homes on the site. This existing regulation will be sufficient to ensure that the impacts are fully mitigated. No additional mitigation shall be required, as existing fire protection services and building code requirements are sufficient to ensure the risks associated with fire damage to persons and structures are less than significant.

The site is located within an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos. Asbestos is a carcinogen which can cause significant adverse health impacts on humans and animals if inhaled in large quantities or over long periods of time. The Air Quality Management District has identified the site as within the Asbestos Review Area, thus requiring compliance with AQMD Rule 223-1 and potentially 223-2, depending on the total amount of grading to occur on site. Adherence to the applicable regulations of the AQMD will ensure that the impacts are less than significant.

Overall impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are considered less than significant, with the included mitigation.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		X	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		X	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

Discussion:

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

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

a) through j) The project would add housing to the site and would add impervious surfaces which would affect drainage and groundwater recharge. Grading for home sites would also affect drainage patterns. The project is expected to result in the creation of three new homes and related improvements, including roadway and driveway construction to the home sites. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (Flood Zone C, FIRM Panel 060040 0450 B), is not within the inundation area of a dam or levee, or near a body of water large enough to generate a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Impacts to the project site and nearby waterways would be limited to changes in grading and the creation of impervious surfaces associated with new homes and driveways. Pollutant discharge to waterways could potentially increase during

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

construction as the result of site access by construction equipment and vehicles. The western and southern portions of the project site currently drain to the west, generally into a drainage ditch located along Cherry Acres Road. The eastern portion of the site drains east into lower elevation areas on adjacent properties. Based on recommendations of the Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District, the following mitigation measure is included to ensure that the impacts to storm water runoff are less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURE HYDRO-1

The applicant shall utilize vegetated areas and catch basins to ensure that no additional stormwater volumes are added to the existing storm drainage system, based on pre-construction water levels.

Runoff would not be expected to increase significantly as a result of the project, with incorporation of the above-noted mitigation measure. The addition of impervious surfaces for building foundations and accessory structures would not limit groundwater recharge in a meaningful way, and would not serve to degrade the quality of water running off the site. Pollutants from vehicles, including oil, dirt, and automotive fluids, could pool or collect at driveways and eventually reach the drainage ditch through rainwater runoff. This impact is common among residential development and does not significantly impact overall stormwater quality. The overall impacts resulting from the project would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a) through c) The project would not result in the conversion of any agricultural land or otherwise divide a community. The site and its surroundings are rural residential in nature and the character of the land uses would not be significantly altered by the project. The project includes a rezone to add a Planned Development overlay zone, to allow for the lotting pattern proposed in the development application, including the dedication of a common open space lot along the western

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

edge of the parcel. No portion of the project or the improvements associated with the project would limit the implementation or effectiveness of the Habitat Conservation Plans in the County or other regulatory document adopted to mitigate environmental impacts. The impacts to land use would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

a) and b) The project site is not located within the overlay zone designated in the Zoning Ordinance for areas with known mineral resources. The project would not limit the ability of property owners to extract mineral resources should such resources become known in the future. There would be no impact.

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

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) Noise would be generated on the site from construction associated with the new homes and improvements to the roadways and driveways. This noise generation would be required to comply with the County’s noise ordinance, limiting the amount and duration of noises produced in residential areas. Construction times are limited to daytime hours, and the noise generation would be intermittent and temporary in nature. The impacts would be less than significant.
 - b) Ground borne vibrations are associated with heavy vehicles (i.e. railroad) and with heavy equipment operations. Vehicle traffic generated by the Project would be typical of traffic generated by the adjacent residential uses; passenger cars and trucks, which are not a source of significant vibration. The impacts would be less than significant.
 - c) The noise generated during construction would be temporary in nature. Subdivision of the land and construction and operation of the three additional homes would result in periodic noise generation from the use of vehicles, noises generated on home sites, and landscape maintenance. The overall effect on the ambient noise level would be less than significant.
 - d) As noted above, the construction aspects of the project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels. The increase associated with this construction would be relative to the type of equipment used in residential construction which does not result in significant noise generation. Given the low ambient noise level in the area of the project site, and the limited nature of the construction anticipated, the impacts would be less than significant.
 - e) The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport or airstrip. There would be no impact.
 - f) The project site is not located within two miles of an airstrip. There would be no impact.

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

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), b), and c) The project would not result in the loss of existing housing or the displacement of residents. The project would result in the addition of three homes to the area, along with a common open space lot. This number of new homes is not considered substantial and would not result in the indirect addition of any additional growth. There would be no environmental impacts related to population or housing.

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

Discussion:

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

- Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department’s/District’s goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;
- Substantially increase or expand the demand for public law enforcement protection without increasing staffing and equipment to maintain the Sheriff’s Department goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents;
- Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services;
- Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources;
- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.

a) Public services are provided to the site by various County and special district departments. The project would add housing to the site, but would not result in the change of any service providers. Fire services are provided by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District, which currently provides service to the site and its surroundings. The creation

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

of additional homes on the site would result in an increased demand for services, and would be subject to the payment of fees to offset the increase in service demand associated with the growth. As the District currently serves the site and driveway improvements would meet the minimum safety codes required by the County and the Fire Safe Code, no additional impacts would result.

b) The El Dorado County Sheriff's Department would provide police services to the site, as they do presently. The creation of additional homes on the site would result in an increased demand for services, and would be subject to the payment of fees to offset the increase in service demand associated with the growth. As the Department currently serves the site and driveway improvements would be sufficient to allow for access by public safety vehicles, no additional impacts would result.

c) School services would be provided by the Black Oak Mine Unified School District. The occupancy of homes may add school-age children to the District, adding demands to school facilities. The District assesses fees, as permitted by State law, to offset the potential impacts associated with population growth. Fees are assessed as part of the County's building permit process. This fee is sufficient to offset the environmental impacts to the school district.

d) Parks services would be provided by the County and special districts which maintain facilities in the County. The property is within the boundaries of the Georgetown Divide Recreation District, which has requested a 15-foot easement along Cherry Acres Road to ensure public access to open space set forth on the Parcel Map. This easement is sufficient to ensure access to the public areas dedicated on the map application, and is sufficient to address impacts related to the generation of parks demand by residents of the project.

e) No other government services would be adversely affected by the project. Overall impacts to public services would be less than significant.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

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

a), b) The project is dedicating open space for public use as part of the Planned Development application. The three new homes would likely result in the addition of 10-12 persons to the regional population, which would necessitate the

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

need for the dedication of less than one-tenth of an acre of parkland. The project has proposed approximately 12.6 acres of land for public use, more than meeting its stated need for recreational land. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
 - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
 - Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of five or more units.
- a) The project would add three residential homes to the site, all of which would receive access from Cherry Acres Road. Cherry Acres Road serves residential traffic only, and is a free-flowing residential street. Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, the three new homes are expected to generate an additional 31 daily traffic trips onto Cherry Acres Road, with no more than eight of these trips within any given hour. This slight increase is insufficient to result in a significant impact to volume to capacity ratios or levels of service along any roadway. The impact would be less than significant.

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

- b) See discussion under (a) above. The generation of 31 additional trips is not sufficient to exceed any level of service standard on area roadways. The impact would be less than significant.
- c) The project includes subdivision of rural residential property, and the construction of three new homes. The project would not impact air traffic patterns. There would be no impact.
- d) The project would add new homes to the site, with access coming from the existing driveway on the north end of the site, and a new driveway on the south end of the site. The project would not create any design features which limit visibility or impair safety mechanisms, nor place incompatible uses adjacent to one another. The impact would be less than significant.
- e) The project would not increase on-site circulation options, and would not adversely affect any roadway or route used or potentially usable for emergency access to or through the property. The impact would be less than significant.
- f) The project would add three new single-family residential homes. Parking for these uses would be provided on site, likely in the creation of garage parking for residents of the homes. The impact would be less than significant.
- g) The project proposes no design characteristics, uses, or features that conflict with any plans, policies, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The impact would be less than significant.

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

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) The project proposes the subdivision of the site into four residential parcels, with the three new lots proposed to have individual septic systems serving each home. The septic systems fall under the authority of the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Health, and under the regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Septic systems designed and installed on site must meet State and county standards, and thus would not result in the exceedance of any standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The impact would be less than significant.
- b) See discussion (a) above. The project would require the installation and operation of three individual septic systems on site. Water service would be provided by the Georgetown Divide Public Utilities District (PUD), and would require only onsite extension of water lines already in place. No offsite or regional improvements to water and wastewater systems would be required. The impact would be less than significant.
- c) The project would include the addition of impervious surfaces which may limit groundwater recharge or absorption of water into the land during periods of rainfall. Outside of driveway and building pad locations, no grading is proposed on the site. The limited area of site disturbance and the addition of driveways and building pads are insufficient to significantly alter drainage patterns from or through the site. The impact would be less than significant.
- d) Water service to the site is to be provided by the PUD. Sufficient supplies and distribution facilities are in place within the water system of the Georgetown Divide PUD to ensure adequate water supply to the site. The impact would be less than significant.
- e) Wastewater service is to be provided by on-site septic systems. There would be no impact.
- f) The project would create a minimum additional amount of solid waste for disposal, and the site is already served by solid waste pickup and disposal at area landfills. The impact would be less than significant.
- g) The project would generate waste similar to other single-family residential uses. No local, state, or federal statutes related to the generation, treatment, or disposal of solid waste would be violated by the project. The impact would be less than significant.

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?			X
b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X
c. Have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X

Discussion:

- a) As discussed in Cultural Resources, the proposed project would have no significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources as mitigated. There would be no effects on fish habitat or on special-status plant or animal species.
- b) Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, mitigation measures previously incorporated, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in this Initial Study, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant.
- c) Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, mitigation measures previously incorporated, and site-specific environmental conditions, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9
Appendix A
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

El Dorado County General Plan – A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief (Adopted July 19, 2004)

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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