



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: S05-0031/El Dorado Hills Kingdom Hall

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

Contact Person: Aaron Mount, Associate Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: El Dorado Hills, CA Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Inc. P.O. Box 5265 El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Carlton Engineering 3883 Ponderosa Road Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Agent's Name and Address: Carlton Engineering 3883 Ponderosa Road Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Carlton Engineering 3883 Ponderosa Road Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Location: East side of Hillsdale Circle north of the intersection with Glenhaven Court in the El Dorado Hills area.

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 117-085-07 (2.5 acres)

Zoning: Research and Development (R&D)

Section: 23 **T:** 9N **R:** 8E

General Plan Designation: Research and Development (R&D)

Description of Project: Special Use Permit for a 9,190 square foot church within an existing business park

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:	R&D	R&D	Undeveloped
North:	R&D	R&D	Undeveloped
East:	R&D	R&D	Undeveloped
South:	R&D	R&D	Commercial Structure/Undeveloped (Bldg permits issued)
West:	R&D	R&D	Commercial Structures

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The subject parcel is at an elevation of approximately 500 feet above mean sea level. Vegetation is dominated by annual grasses with no shrubs or trees present. Soil is Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent loam. The subject parcel is unimproved but is within an existing research and development business park. All access roads within the business park have been constructed. All associated infrastructure (water and sewer lines, electrical and phone lines, etc.) are present within the business park.

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

El Dorado County Building Services
El Dorado County Department of Transportation

El Dorado Irrigation District
El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Aaron Mount For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a) **No impact.** No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway will be substantially affected by this project.
- b) **No impact.** The proposed project will have no impact on existing scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources within a corridor defined as a State scenic highway adjacent to the project site.
- c) **No impact.** The proposed project will not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings as the architecture is consistent with R&D zone district requirements and the surrounding buildings within the business park. The proposed church was reviewed and approved by the El Dorado Hills Business Park Architectural Design Review Committee to ensure consistency with the R&D Zoning Ordinance and surrounding development. The surrounding area has been substantially developed with a mix of commercial and residential uses.
- d) **Less than significant impact.** Some limited light and glare may result from the additional that is proposed as part of this project. These increases are expected to be normal, however, for the Research and Development (R&D) zone district and are not expected to have an impact or adversely affect day or nighttime views adjacent to the project site.

FINDING: It has been determined that there will be no impacts to aesthetic or visual resources. Identified thresholds of significance for the “Aesthetics” category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

- a) **No impact.** Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that no areas of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance will be affected by the project. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use map for the project and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- b) **No impact.** The proposed project will not conflict with existing agricultural zoning in the project vicinity, and will not adversely impact any properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) **No impact.** No existing agricultural land will be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

FINDING: It has been determined that the project will not result in any impacts to agricultural lands, or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is developed with a mix of commercial and residential uses. For this “Agriculture” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			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:

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-c) **Less than significant impact.** El Dorado County has adopted the Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan. Implementation measures from this plan are required to be implemented at the project level. In addition, a project is required to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as required under the Federal Clean Air Act as well as the State of California Ambient Air Quality Standards, which are equal to or more stringent than the National Standards as discussed below. Activities related to the processing of this SUP in order to construct 9,190 square foot church will create a less than significant impact on air quality. Typical conditions for project approval are included in the project permit that will require implementation of grading and construction measures to reduce the likelihood of defined particulate matter to a level of less than significant. The project and conditions of approval will conform to the County's air quality standards and plan.

An "Air Quality Assessment for Kingdom Hall of El Dorado Hills El Dorado County, California" was prepared by Carlton Engineering dated May 2006.

Carlton ran an URBEMIS model and produced the following results:

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

Project construction emissions:

ROG (lb/day)	Nox (lb/day)	PM10 Total (lb/day)	PM10 Exhaust (lb/day)	PM10 Dust (lb/day)
23.30	34.94	3.72	1.21	2.51

The constructive reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrous oxide (Nox) rates for each phase are below the APCD emission thresholds of significance of 82 pounds per day each of ROG and Nox.

The project operational (vehicle) and area source emissions are:

Summer		
Phase	ROG (lb/day)	NOx (lb/day)
Area	0.26	0.09
Operational	0.66	1.16
Sum:	0.92	1.25

Winter		
Phase	ROG (lb/day)	NOx (lb/day)
Area	0.14	0.09
Operational	0.81	1.38
Sum:	0.95	1.47

Both summer and winter ROG and NOx sum of the operational and area emissions rates are below the thresholds of significance of 82 pounds per day.

- d) **Less than significant impact.** Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, day-care centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. General Plan Policy 6.7.6.1 requires that the County "Ensure that new facilities in which sensitive receptors are located (e.g., schools, child care centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, and hospitals) are sited away from significant sources of air pollution." The R&D zone district requires that churches applying for a special use permit provide a site plan indicating the adjacent uses and the distances from the uses to determine whether sensitive receptors will be exposed to hazardous conditions. The site plan did not identify any adjacent industrial uses that produce or use hazardous or toxic chemicals.
- e) **No impact.** The proposed church development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide. The proposed church project will not result in significant impacts resulting from odors.

FINDING: A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the proposed project would not impact air quality. For this "Air Quality" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a) **No impact.** Review of the Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Data Base and maps indicate that no rare, threatened, or endangered fish, animal, or insect species exist on or adjacent to the project site. The project will not impact any riparian habitat and may impact species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

b & c)

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

No impact. The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Maps were reviewed to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project site. This review indicates that there are no wetlands or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project.

- d) **No impact.** Review of the Department of Fish and Games Migratory Deer Herd Maps and General Plan DEIR Exhibit V-8-4 indicate the absence of mapped deer or wildlife migration corridors on the project site. The project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.
- e) **No impact.** Objective 7.4.4 of the General Plan requires that the County “Protect and conserve forest and woodland resources for their wildlife habitat, recreation, water production, domestic livestock grazing, production of sustainable flow of wood products, and aesthetic values.” The predominant vegetation on the subject parcel consists of shrubs and grasses. The site does not contain any tees.
- f) **No Impact.** The proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of a proposed or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Rare Plant Mitigation Fee for commercial development is collected at the time of Building Permit issuance.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property or historic or cultural significant to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study;

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

- Affect a landmark of cultural/historical importance;
- Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.

(a & b)

Less than significant impact. The applicant supplied a Record Search completed by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) dated December 6, 2005. This Record Search indicated a low to moderate possibility of identifying Native American and historic-period cultural resources in the project area. Further archival and/or field survey by a cultural resource professional was recommended, however the project parcel is within an existing business park. The business park contains all necessary infrastructure, the project parcel is developed on two sides, and the project site was graded to construct the existing road system.

(c) **No impact.** A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil locales.

(d) **Less than significant impact.** In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the steps outlined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines shall be implemented immediately. This is a standard grading requirement which applies to all discretionary projects.

FINDING: No impacts to cultural resources are expected with the development of a church either directly or indirectly. For this “Cultural Resource” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X	
iv) Landslides?		X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?		X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or			X

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			

Discussion:

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

a)
(i, ii, & iii)

Less than significant impact. The project is located seven miles west of the Bear Mountain Fault Zone. This fault zone is considered potentially active (Carson Creek Specific Plan EIR, May 1996). This fault is part of the larger Foothill Fault Suture Zone extending from Mariposa northward towards Chico and paralleling the Mother Lode.

The last known event associated with this fault system was a Richter Scale magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Oroville on August 1, 1975 (DMG 1992). According to the California Division of Mines and Geology (Jennings, 1992), the nearest known active fault is the Dunnigan Hills Fault located approximately 40 miles to the northwest. Additionally, the *Fault Evaluation Program of the California Division of Mines and Geology* (DMG) was developed to identify active faults that may be hazardous in terms of surface fault rupture and impact to un-reinforced structures. This program was designed to carry out the objectives of the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act of 1972. Only those earthquake faults considered to have a relatively high potential for future earthquake activity, and which have well defined surface fault traces were considered for mapping. As shown in the Division of Mines and Geology’s publication *Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California*, there are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones mapped in El Dorado County. This mapping and study does not conclusively preclude the fact that active or potentially active faults exist in El Dorado County. What this study does is identify that none of the known faults within El Dorado County were identified as fitting the criterion for establishment of a Special Studies Zone. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating buildings in the project area will be offset by compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards.

(iv) **Less than significant impact.** The *Generalized Map Showing Relative Amounts of Landslides* in California places El Dorado County entirely within the low severity zone for landslide activity (CDMG 1973 - General Plan EIR). Generally, landslide activity is restricted to areas of very steep slopes (in excess of 40 percent) and where planes of weakness in the

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

soil or bedrock are evident and have been disturbed by development activities such as grading and construction. The project site is not located in an area with significant topographic variations in slope. The potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.

- b) **Less than significant impact.** All grading activities exceeding 50 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and insure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. Compliance with the *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* will reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- c) **Less than significant impact.** The Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes (AxD) soil type is not considered an unstable soil. Topography on the site is generally gentle. In areas of steep slope or unstable soils, the project applicant is required to provide a Geotechnical Report prepared by a registered engineer or engineering geologist at the time of Building Permit submittal. Compliance with the *County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* should limit any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
- d) **Less than significant impact.** Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes numerical expansion indices for soil types ranging from very low to very high. Any soil identified in the foundation investigation to have an expansion index greater than 90 (medium) will require specific engineering analysis as required within the Uniform Building Code. This foundation investigation / soil report is typically provided at the time of application for a building permit. The *Soil Survey of El Dorado County* contains Table 6 (Pages 56-63) which tabulates the estimated properties of all the different soil series found in the County, including the shrink-swell potential. Shrink-swell potential is dependent upon the amount of clay within the soil series. Soils series with low to moderate shrink-swell potential provide sites adequate for placing structures. Review of the *Soil Survey of El Dorado County* indicates that the Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes (AxD), has low shrink-swell potential. Based on this review, the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.
- e) **No impact.** No impacts to soils will occur from septic systems because the project proposes to connect to public sewer.

FINDING: No significant impacts will result from geological or seismological anomalies on the project site. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that will result in significant impacts. For the "Geology and Soils" category, established thresholds will not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:			
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			X

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X	
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		X	

Discussion:

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

a&b) **No impact.** The project will not result in a reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. No significant amounts of hazardous materials will be utilized for the project.

c) **No impact.** The project site is in the vicinity of a private school, however the proposed church falls within the category of a sensitive receptor. No hazardous emissions will be created as part of the project, and no hazardous materials are proposed to be handled or transported to and from the site.

d) **No impact.** The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there will be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.

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

- e) **No impact.** The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. The project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There are no impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations and the over flight of aircraft in the vicinity of the project.
- f) **No impact.** The project site is not located within two (2) miles of a privately operated airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights in the vicinity of the project site.
- g) **Less than significant impact.** The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the project area. This is based upon the location of the nearest fire station, availability of multiple access points to the project site, availability of water for fire suppression, and provisions within the County emergency response plan. The County emergency response plan is located with the County Office of Emergency Services located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.
- h) **Less than significant impact.** The El Dorado Hills Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and stated that the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area. The property is located in an area with existing water service providing adequate flow for fire suppression purposes.

FINDING: The proposed project will not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance will not be exceeded by the proposed project.

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

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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) **Less than significant impact.** An Erosion Control Plan will be required. The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit storm water runoff and discharge from a site. The Erosion Control Plan will be submitted with the grading and improvement plans for the project. Specific water quality objectives have been established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and any project not meeting those objectives are required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. Compliance with the Erosion Control Plan will limit water runoff and discharge from the site which would violate Water Quality Standards or discharge requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. In addition, the project will be subject to obtaining a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System NPDES Permit). This requirement became effective October 1, 1992, and requires general stormwater discharge permits by the State for any construction activities on a project site disturbing five or more acres of area. Permit applicants are required to prepare and retain on the construction site, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that describes the site, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste control, implementation of local plans required by the Resource Conservation District, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control, and non-stormwater management controls.
- b) **Less than significant impact.** The geology of the Western Slope portion of El Dorado County is principally hard crystalline igneous or metamorphic rock overlain with a thin mantle of sediment or soil. Groundwater in this region is found in fractures, joints, cracks, and fault zones within the bedrock mass. These discrete fracture areas are typically vertical in orientation rather than horizontal as in sedimentary or alluvial aquifers. Recharge is predominantly through rainfall infiltrating into the fractures. Movement of this groundwater is very limited due to the lack of porosity in the bedrock. Wells are typically drilled to depths ranging from 80 to 300 feet in depth. There is no evidence that the project

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

will substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. No on-site wells are proposed.

- c) **Less than significant impact.** There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbance activities associated with the project will substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance contains specific requirements which limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 and Section 15.14.590). The standards within the Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance will apply to this project.

d & e)

Less than significant impact. *The Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* establishes that "No person shall do or permit to be done any grading which may obstruct, impede or interfere with the natural flow of storm waters, whether such waters are unconfined upon the surface of the land or confined within any land depressions or natural drainage ways, unimproved channels or watercourses, or improved ditches, channels or conduits, in such a manner as to cause flooding where it would not otherwise occur, aggravate any existing flooding condition or cause accelerated erosion except where said grading is in accordance with all applicable laws, including but not limited to these permit requirements" (Section 15.14.090). Compliance with the standards and requirements contained within the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* will limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site, and limit erosion and siltation to a less than significant level.

- f) **Less than significant impact.** The project will not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site.

g & h)

No impact. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No.060040 0725C, December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

- i) **Less than significant impact.** The California Dam Safety Act requires dam owners to submit inundation maps to the California Office of Emergency Services showing the extent of inundation resulting from a potential dam failure. This Act also requires that local jurisdictions adopt emergency evacuation and control procedures for areas located below dams to limit loss of life, injury, and property. El Dorado County has adopted a Multi-Hazard Functional Plan to be implemented by the County's Office of Emergency Services. This Plan identifies those dams which have the potential to inundate residential areas. The subject property is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee which has the potential to fail and inundate the area with flood waters.

- j) **Less than significant impact.** A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. The potential for a mudflow is considered to be less than significant.

FINDING: For the "Hydrology and Water Quality" section, it has been determined the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and therefore no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Physically divide an established community?			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) **No impact.** The project will not result in the physical division of an established community.
- b) **No impact.** The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.
- c) **No impact.** The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

FINDING: For the “Land Use Planning” section, the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			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:

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

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- (a) **No impact.** The project site is not mapped as a known Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology as shown on the Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn 15-minute Mineral Resource Zone quadrangles or by El Dorado County as depicted on General Plan Exhibit V-7-4. If project is mapped as a known MRZ, provide additional discussion, and mitigation
- (b) **No impact.** The western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15-minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value.

FINDING: No impacts to any known mineral resources will occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. In the “Mineral Resources” section, the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

(a & c)

Less than significant impact. The project will not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. As proposed, the project is not located in an area exposed to existing noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1. The applicant submitted an acoustical analysis as required by the R&D Zone District, as a church is considered a noise sensitive use within the existing business park. The “El Dorado Hills Kingdom Hall Acoustical Analysis Technical Memorandum” concluded that on average the daytime noise levels as measured from the project site were less than 50 dBA. This is well within the noise levels specified in Table 6-2 of the General Plan. The acoustical analysis also concludes that the proposed use will not be a substantial source of noise.

- (b) **Less than significant impact.** Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of project construction or upon completion of the project.
- (d) **Less than significant impact.** Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the project vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. All storage, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas are required to be located as far as practicable from any residential areas.
- (e) **No impact.** All transportation noise sources including airport noise is required to meet the noise thresholds contained in Table 6-1 (Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure for Transportation Noise Sources). All non-transportation noise sources are required to meet the noise thresholds contained in Table 6-2. In addition, County Airports include a Comprehensive Land Use Plan which contains building restrictions due to airport noise. In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a county owned/operated airport facility.
- (f) **No impact.** The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport.

FINDING: As mentioned above, there is no noise associated with the project and no impact on the noise sensitive use. For the “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and with the mitigation measures proposed, no significant adverse environmental effects will occur from the proposed development.

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

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

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
of replacement housing elsewhere?			
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a) **Less than significant impact. Fire Protection:** The El Dorado Hills Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. The established minimum level of service for the fire district in a Community Region is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population. The established minimum level of service for Rural Centers and Rural Regions is a 15- to 45-minute response time which is dictated by distance and road conditions. No factual information was provided by the impacted fire district stating that the minimum level of service would fall below this minimum. This supports the finding that there will be a less than significant impact to fire protection services. Additionally, the responsible Fire District will review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards including, but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking lots, fire sprinklers within buildings, building identification and construction phasing. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured.

b) **Less than significant impact. Police Protection:** The project site will be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. No specific minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for police protection services, but would not prevent the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area.

c-e) **No impact. Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** There are no components of construction and operation the proposed church project that would include any permanent population-related increases that would substantially contribute to increased demand on schools, parks, or other governmental services that could, in turn, result in the need for new or expanded facilities. There would be no impact.

FINDING: As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-b)

No impact. Parks and Recreation. The proposed project does not include any increase in permanent population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. There would be no impact.

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

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

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X

Discussion:

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

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

a-b)

Less than significant impact. The proposed project will operate in the evenings and on weekends. A traffic study was submitted by the applicant titled “El Dorado Kingdom Hall ADH TS So5-0031 Draft Traffic Impact Study” prepared by Prism Engineering. The Traffic study concluded that the project has some minor impact at some of the study intersections for both the existing and future year 2011 scenarios. However, the project does not worsen roadway facilities as defined in the General Plan Policy TC-Xe. All intersections are at LOS C or better conditions, with or without the project. The project is expected to generate approximately 109 trips during the Sunday peak hour. No mitigations are necessary with the development of this project. There will be a less than significant impact.

- c) **No impact.** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.
- d) **No impact.** The project site is readily accessible from Hillsdale Circle. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. There would be no impact.
- e) **No impact.** The project site is accessible from Hillsdale Circle with through access. There would be no disruption of emergency access to and from Windplay Drive. There would be no impact.
- f) **No impact.** The submitted site plan was reviewed to verify compliance with the Zoning Ordinance on-site parking requirements. Section 17.18.060 of the Zoning Ordinance lists the parking requirements by use. A church requires one on-site parking space for each 4 seats within the building. The church proposes to have 392 seats within the proposed building. This would require 98 onsite parking spaces. The applicants have proposed 148 onsite parking spaces, which is more than adequate. The church has distinct and differing hours from the other uses on adjacent sites. There will be no impact.
- g) **No impact.** The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

FINDING: As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected with the church proposal either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- (a) **Less than significant impact.** No significant wastewater discharge or surface run-off will result from the proposed Special Use Permit.
- (b) **Less than significant impact.** No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required as a result of the project.

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

- (c) **Less than significant impact.** On-site storm water drainage facilities will be installed and maintained on the project site in order to control, reduce and/or eliminate run-off. All storm water drainage facilities shall be built to conform to County of El Dorado Drainage Manual standards and will be required to not exceed the existing site discharge levels.
- (d) **Less than significant impact.** In this case, water will be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District. In the Facility Improvement Letter provided by the applicant the El Dorado Irrigation District states that property is currently not served. The El Dorado Irrigation District states there are existing 8-inch water line stubs located in Glenhaven Court and Hillsdale Circle. This water lines have adequate capacity and pressure to serve any additional potable water and fire flow needs but must be extended to the project parcel. EID operates on a first come, first serve policy (Regulation No. 2). In the case where the District’s water supply is depleted, water meters will not be sold. No new or expanded water entitlements are necessary to provide water service to the project.
- (e) **Less than significant impact.** In the Facility Improvement Letter provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District, it states that an 6-inch sewer main is adjacent to the site in Glenhaven Court. A service stub is located along the southern property line in Glenhaven Court and has adequate capacity at this time.
- (f) **Less than significant impact.** In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility / Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) are allowed to be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal site. All other waste materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.
- (g) **Less than significant impact.** County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. For residential development curb-side trash and pick-up of recyclable materials is provided by a local provider contracting to the property owner for the service. For multi-family, commercial, and industrial development some on-site separation of materials is required and areas are required to be set aside for the storage of solid waste in accordance with Ordinance No. 4319.

FINDING: No significant impacts will result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the “Utilities and Service Systems” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects will result from the project.

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

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

Discussion:

- a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the whole record that the project will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any potentially significant impacts can be mitigated through the incorporation of the proposed mitigation measures and existing standards and requirements.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines as “two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Generally the discussion of cumulative impacts need not focus on the impacts created by the adjacent project, but should specify how the proposed project and adjacent project’s impacts create or combine to create a greater impact. It has been determined that the proposed project will not have any impacts which are cumulatively considerable.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document it has been determined that project will not have any environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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

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.)