



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: TM88-1095E Sierra Sunrise

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

Contact Person: Pat Kelly

Phone Number: (530) 358-3621

Property Owner's Name and Address: Pacific States Development Corporation
991 Governor Drive, Suite 103 El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Pacific States Development Corporation
991 Governor Drive, Suite 103, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Agent's Name and Address: CTA Engineering & Surveying, Inc.
3233 Monier Circle, Rancho Cordova CA, 95742

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: CTA Engineering & Surveying, Inc.
3233 Monier Circle, Rancho Cordova CA, 95742

Project Location: The property is located on the east side of Woodleigh Lane, approximately .4 miles south east of the intersection with Bass Lake Road in the Cameron Park area.

Assessor's Parcel No: 116-030-28 and 116-030-30

Zoning: Single-family Residential - Airport Safety District (R1-AA)

Section: 32 **T:** 10N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: High Density Residential (HDR)

Description of Project: The request would grant a one-year time extension for the approved Tentative Subdivision Map (TM88-1095). TM88-1095 would create eighteen (18) parcels ranging in size from 12,000 square feet to 53,000 square feet. The project would be accessed via a cul-de-sac road, identified on the Tentative Subdivision Map as A Street, (Exhibit D), which would be accessed from Woodleigh Lane, a county maintained road. The proposed A Street would extend from the project site north to provide access for the adjacent Tentative Subdivision Map, (TM92-1261) Sierra Sunrise II.

Sierra Sunrise II, TM92-1261 is an eleven (11) parcel tentative subdivision map located immediately to the north and adjacent to TM88-1095, was approved by the Board of Supervisors on August 23, 1993. A time extension for this project has been requested.

The applicant proposes to develop the project site in phases. Phase 1 would be identified as Large Lot 1 on the Tentative Subdivision and would consist of Parcel 1 and Parcels 14 through 18. Phase 2 would be identified as Large Lot 2 on the Tentative Subdivision Map and would consist of Parcels 2 through 13 (Exhibit D).

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: | R1/AA | HDR | Undeveloped |
| North: | R1 | HDR | Undeveloped |
| East: | R1 | HDR | Single-family Residence |
| South: | R1 | HDR | Single-family Residence |
| West: | R1 | HDR | Single-family Residence |

| |
|--|
| <p><u>Briefly Describe the environmental setting:</u> The project site is characterized by sloping terrain ranging from 0 to 21 percent and an elevation varying from 1376 to 1480 above sea level. The project site consists of a ridge top. The adjacent north and east facing slopes are vegetated with a community of dense chaparral including Manzanita being up to six feet in height. No water bodies or streams are apparent.</p> |
| <p>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading permit for off-site/on-site access road Improvements; offer to dedicate road right-of-way. 2. El Dorado County Building Services: Construction permits 3. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District: Require an approved Fugitive Dust Plan for air quality impacts during project construction. |
| |

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.

Printed Name: Pat Kelly For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed residential project. The project would allow the creation of eighteen (18) residential parcels.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

Project Characteristics

The project would create eighteen (18) residential parcels. The project would be accessed via a cul-de-sac road which would be accessed from Woodleigh Lane. The proposed road would extend from the project site north to provide access for Sierra Sunrise II, the adjacent Tentative Subdivision map TM92-1261.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the project parcel would be provided by Woodleigh Lane which is a County-maintained road. The County Department of Transportation has requested the applicant to construct "A" Street to a total width of 28 feet by the provisions of County Standard Plan 101B. "A" Street would be constructed as a cul-de-sac road, unless the roadway would be connected through to the adjacent approved Sierra Sunrise II Subdivision (TM92-1261). DOT request the applicant to offer to dedicate, in fee, 30 feet wide of right of way from the centerline of Woodleigh Lane along the entire property frontage and a 50 foot wide right of way for "A" Street, which will be rejected by the County.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site is currently undeveloped. As part of the project, the extension of utility services would be required. The project site would be served by EID.

3. Population

The project would create eighteen (18) residential parcels. The project would not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of onsite road improvements including grading for onsite roadways and driveways.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from the County Department of Transportation and obtain an approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan from the Air Quality Management District.

Project Schedule and Approvals

This Initial Study is being circulated for public and agency review for a 30-day period. Written comments on the Initial Study should be submitted to the project planner indicated in the Summary section, above.

Following the close of the written comment period, the Initial Study would be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and would be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency would also determine whether to approve the project.

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 would 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. The surrounding land uses are predominantly residential.

- (a) The project site is located on Woodleigh Lane. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan as a scenic view or resource. There would be no impact.
- (b) The project site is not adjacent or visible from a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site as described in the California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, page 2. There would be no impact.
- (c) The project would not affect the visual character of Woodleigh Lane or the project vicinity. There would be no impact.
- (d) The project would create eighteen (18) residential parcels. Potential sources of light and glare would result from the residential development. Woodleigh Lane contains parcels which have residential development. Future sources of lighting as a result of the project would be typical of residential development. Lighting resulting from the project would be required to conform to Section 17.14 170 of the El Dorado County Code, and be shielded to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) full cut-off designation. The project would not result in new sources of light that would significantly impact the neighborhood. Therefore, the impacts of existing light and glare created by the project would be less than significant.

Finding: The proposed development is residential in nature and would be consistent with the land use designation for the property and surrounding uses. The project would have a less than significant impact to aesthetic resources. No impacts to aesthetics are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. The impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 – c)

Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County development under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that no areas of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected by the project. The project is neither designated nor surrounded by land designated for agricultural use, or under a Williamson Act contract. The project site is zoned for residential use, and adjacent lands are zoned for residential use. There are no parcels zoned for agricultural uses in the immediate vicinity. The project site would be surrounded by residential development. Therefore, the project would not involve a change in the existing environment that could result in conversions for Farmland to non-agricultural uses. There would be no impact.

Finding: The project would result in no loss of Farmland, or conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts. The project would not facilitate the loss of agricultural lands. The proposed project would have no impact on agricultural resources.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | | X |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | X |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | X |

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, would result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82 pounds per day (see p. 6-2 of the Air Pollution Control District Guide), except for industrial sources covered by Table 6.1 of the Air Pollution Control District Guide; 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) In 1994, the Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan was adopted. This is also called the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Clean Air Plan was designed to bring the Sacramento Region, which includes all of El Dorado County, except for the Lake Tahoe Basin, into compliance with the federal one-hour ozone standard. The SIP includes adopted measures and commitments to adopt measures to reduce ozone emissions, along with contingency measures and a demonstration of emission reductions sufficient for attainment of air quality standards. In 2006, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District initiated a Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan Update, which would be designed to bring the region into compliance with the federal eight-hour ozone standard promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1997.

As discussed in c) below, the project would be considered in compliance with the Clean Air Plan if the County requires the project to implement any applicable emission reduction measures contained in and/or derived from the Clean Air Plan. A list of emission reduction measures, applicable to a variety of land uses, is available in Appendix E of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) CEQA Guide. As of 2006, the County is in non-attainment status of state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM₁₀. Emissions of these pollutants generated by the project would be less than significant.

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

(b - c)

As of 2006, El Dorado County is in non-attainment status of all federal and state ambient air quality standards, except state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM10. Air pollutant emission sources from the project upon completion would be from vehicle trip emissions and landscape equipment. Table 5.2 of the AQMD CEQA Guide provide size or activity cutoff points for various types of land uses the AQMD has determined would result in a project exceeding the emission thresholds of 82 pounds/day for ROG and NO_x. The project may create short-term impacts as grading or construction proceeds. The project size would be significantly under that which is likely to generate 82 lbs. of ROG and NO_x per day, the level of potential significance. It can be determined that PM10 and SO₂ emission levels would be less than significant.

Construction activities associated with the project would include grading and excavation operations for road improvements, home site pads and driveways, which would result in a temporary negative impact on air quality with regard to the release of PM10 in the form of dust. These emissions would be temporary and would cease when construction work would be completed. Current county records indicate that this property would be not located within the Asbestos Review Area. District Rule 223 and 223-1 which addresses the regulations and mitigation measures for fugitive dust emissions would be adhered to during the construction process.

The project would be required to conform with the El Dorado County AQMD conditions provided for in the staff report pertaining to Rule 223 and 223-1, which addresses the control of fugitive dust; use of low emissions factors and high energy efficiency construction equipment; and disposal of waste. Compliance with existing AQMD rules and regulations would reduce the amount of emissions generated by project construction and operations, particularly of ozone precursors and PM10. Project impacts related to local and regional air quality would be less than significant.

(d) 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 project does not, by itself, result in the addition of sensitive receptors to the site. The impact from pollution sources on sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

The most significant pollutant generated by the project would be PM10 emissions during construction, and such emissions would cease after construction work ends. As described in b) above, AQMD Rule 223-1 requires measures to control dust emissions during construction. Thus, the project would not expose existing residents in the area to substantial pollutant concentrations. The impact would be less than significant.

(e) Residential development would not be classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3-1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide. The project would not result in significant impacts resulting from odors.

Findings: The project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The project would result in increased emissions due to construction activities. However, the implementation of standard AQMD regulations would result in a less than significant level of impacts to air quality. Therefore, no significant air quality impacts are expected.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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) The project proposes no impacts to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, or regulators, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The project site would be located within Mitigation Area 1 which are lands not with soil types capable of supporting the Pine Hill Endemic Plant species. The residential parcels would be required to pay the Mitigation Fee as required by Section 17.71.220.C of the Zoning Ordinance prior to building permit issuance. There would be a less than significant impact to any special status species or natural communities as a result of the project.

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

- (b) A review of the 2004 General Plan confirms that the project site would not be located in any protected and sensitive natural habitat areas on or adjacent to the project. There would be no impact.
- (c) Review of the U.S. Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Maps determined that there are no wetlands or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project. There would be no impact.
- (d) Review of the Planning Services GIS *Deer Ranges Map* (March 2004) indicates that there are no mapped deer migration corridors within the project site. The project would 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. The impact would be less than significant.

(e - f)

The proposed project would not be expected to have an impact on existing oak woodland. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 seeks to minimize the impact of development projects on oak woodlands.

Upon initial review, the 9.44 acre, eighteen (18) parcel project site consists of approximately four (4) percent of oak tree canopy thereby providing adequate space for future home development sites on the eighteen (18) parcels while conforming to General Plan policy 7.4.4.4. There would be a less than significant impact to oak tree canopy as a result of the project.

The project would 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 would not be 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.

There are no special status species and sensitive natural communities that would be adversely affected by the proposed Parcel Map.

The proposed project would be located in Mitigation Area 1, as identified on the County designated Ecological Preserve Mitigation Area Map. The County has approved the creation of five ecological preserves intended to protect eight sensitive plant species known as the Pine Hill endemics and their vegetative habitat, which are associated with the gabbro and serpentine soils. Projects located within this area are required to participate in an in-lieu fee program intended to finance the County's share of land acquisition and operations and maintenance cost over a twenty year time period. The impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: No Special-status plant species were found onsite. For this "Biological" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

| | | | |
|---|--|----------|----------|
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? | | | |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | X |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | X | |

Discussion:

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

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

(a - b)

The cultural resources record search completed for the project site indicates that there would be a low to moderate possibility of identifying cultural resources in the project vicinity. There are no sites known to be located within the boundaries of the project site. Standard conditions of approval applicable to the project would ensure that impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

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

(d) There are no known burial sites within the project site. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the provisions of CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(e) and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall apply. Under these sections, no further disturbance of the remains shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are identified as Native American, the County Coroner shall identify the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American, and the descendant may make recommendations for means for treating and disposing of the remains and any grave goods with appropriate dignity. The requirements discussed would be included as standard conditions within Attachment 1 of the staff report. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: The project would result in no impacts to cultural resources based on information provided in the Archaeological records search discussed above. In the event of a accidental discovery of human remains the project would be conditioned requiring implementation of Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines reducing the impacts on such resources to a less than significant level.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as ground shaking, 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.

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

- (a) i) According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, there are no Alquist-Priolo fault zones within El Dorado County. The nearest such faults are located in Alpine and Butte Counties. No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are two known faults within the project vicinity; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site would be located within the West Bear Mountain Faults Zone. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive. The impact would be less than significant.
- ii) The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan states there are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. The project would be located between the East Bear Mountains and West Bear Mountains Faults. The East Bear Mountain Fault and West Bear Mountain fault are classified as a pre-Quaternary fault, a type of fault considered inactive. Existing seismic safety regulations within the adopted County building code, which is based on the California Building Code, would ensure that structures and improvements on the project site are safe from impacts related to seismic shaking. The impact would be less than significant.
- iii& iv) Seismic-related ground failure includes lateral spreading and seismically-induced landslides and avalanches. Lateral spreading occurs mainly in areas with soft, saturated clay soils and beneath fills. The project site does not contain such soils. Seismically-induced landslides and avalanches occur mainly in areas with high potential for seismic activity. El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity. Liquefaction most likely occurs in areas with water-saturated silts, sands and gravels having low to medium density. The project site does not include a wetland area where such soils are likely to exist. Therefore, the liquefaction hazard is considered low. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (b) 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* (Chapter 15.14, adopted 3/3/07). 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. Prior to grading developer would be required to obtain approval of an erosion control plan if it is determined that the grading would or may pose a significant erosion or sediment discharge hazard for any reason. The plan may need to address mitigation of sediment runoff beyond project boundaries through the use of settlement catchment installations that meet the satisfaction of the designated Development Services inspector. Revegetation and stabilization of all disturbed soils both within and outside of County right-of-ways may be required. Compliance with this ordinance would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level when grading occurs.
- Adherence to the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* would reduce the potential impacts to less than significant.
- (c - d) According to the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, prepared by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service (now the Natural Resources Conservation Service), the project site contains one soil type: Rescue extremely stony sandy loam. The soil type has stones on 3 to 15 percent of its surface. The thickness of the surface layer is only 3 to 8 inches. Surface runoff is medium to rapid, and the erosion hazard is moderate to high. This soil is used mainly for watershed. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- (e) The proposed project would be connected to the wastewater system of the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). The project does not involve the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. There will be no impacts.

Findings: It has been determined that the risks related to geologic features would be considered to be less than significant impacts.

| 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 & b) No hazardous substances would be involved with the project. Temporary use of heavy equipment for road improvements would be required. A diesel fuel storage tank may be located on site for the heavy equipment. The potential storage and transport of diesel fuel in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment would require an approved hazardous material business plan issued from the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. Said hazardous material business plan would identify potential impacts to the environment and require mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Based on the amount of road improvements required and the duration of heavy equipment onsite to complete the road improvements, it is unlikely that would be necessary; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant with an approved hazardous materials business plan.

(c & d) There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.

The project site is not on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, commonly called the “Cortese list.” There are no Cortese list sites in El Dorado County. A check of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s EnviroStor mapping program indicated only one hazardous material site in the County – Promontory Elementary School in El Dorado Hills. The Central Valley RWQCB maintains a list of leaking underground storage tank sites. The nearest site is the ARCO gas station on 3969 Cameron Park Drive, east of the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Palmer Drive. The most recent quarterly report, from April 2007, indicates the ARCO site is undergoing post-remediation monitoring. This indicates that cleanup actions have occurred on this site. There would be no impact.

(e) The nearest public airport is the Cameron Airpark, located approximately one mile to the east of the project site. In 1986, the Foothill Airport Land Use Commission adopted the Cameron Airpark Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). The CLUP establishes policies related to height restrictions, noise, and compatibility of land uses with airport operations. Compatibility of land uses with airport operations are determined based on the location of the land use within three safety zones: clear, approach/departure, and overflight. Each zone places restrictions on the types of land uses allowed. There are no restrictions placed by the CLUP on land uses outside these three zones. The project site would be located within Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport. Safety Zone 3 is defined as the overflight zone of the airport. The project would allow for residential development which would be compatible within Safety Zone 3. No land uses would be allowed on the project site that would conflict with the Cameron Park Airport. Impacts would be less than significant.

(f) There is no private airstrip(s) in the immediate vicinity that have been identified on a U.S. Geological Survey Topography Map. There would be no impact.

(g) The project would not be expected to interfere or negatively affect any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Plans for the proposed project indicate that it would not block or significantly decrease access to Cambridge Road and Bass Lake Road, which are the most likely evacuation routes. The impact would be less than significant.

(h) The project site would be located in an area classified as having a moderate fire hazard. As part of the conditions of approval for the project, the applicants would be required to install fire hydrants and provide systems for fire flow.

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

that would meet the requirements of the Fire District. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

Finding: The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials. The project site would be located in an area where risk of wildland fires would be considered moderate. Compliance with Fire Safe County regulations would reduce this impact to be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- 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 storm water pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- (a) General Plan Policy 7.3.2.2 states that projects requiring a grading permit shall have an erosion control program approved, where necessary. The purpose of the erosion control program would be to limit storm water runoff and discharge from the site. Specific water quality objectives have been established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and any project not meeting those objectives are required to apply for a Waste Water Discharge Permit. There is no evidence indicating that the project or activities associated with the proposed project would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the RWQCB. Adherence to a grading permit erosion control program would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.
- (b) 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, which 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. The proposed project would not withdraw groundwater from the site, as the project would connect to EID’s water supply system. There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. There would be no impact.
- (c - f) The *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, Chapter 15.14 of the Zoning Code, (Section 15.14.410) and the *El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards Manual, Volume IV*, Section 4 Design and Construction Standards (4) (C) (D) contain specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system. The standards apply to any grading that involves more than 50 cubic yards of earth, which would require a permit. General Plan Policy 7.3.2.2 states that “projects requiring a grading permit shall have an erosion control program approved, where necessary.” The plan would need to address mitigation of sediment runoff beyond project boundaries and may require revegetation and stabilization of all disturbed soils both within and outside County right-of-ways that meet the satisfaction of the designated Development Services inspector. Compliance with this ordinance would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level when grading occurs.
- (g & h) The project would be located within FEMA prepared Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel No. 060040-0700D, dated October 18, 1995. This map covers the proposed project site and indicates areas that are part of the 100-year floodplain. The 100-year floodplain is the area anticipated to be flooded in the event of a storm that occurs on average once every 100 years, and is the basis for flood planning. According to the FEMA map, the project would not be located within a 100-year flood zone. There would be no impact.
- (i) As discussed in g) above, the project would not be located within a 100-year flood zone. The nearest dam is the Cameron Park Lake Dam; however, the project site would not be within the dam failure inundation zone as indicated in Appendix A of the County General Plan. The project site would not be within an area protected by a levee. There would be no impact.

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

- (j) The project would not be in any area at risk for seiche or tsunami because it is not next to or near any body of water. The project would not be located in an area prone to inundation by mudflows. There would be no impact.

Findings: No significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. Implementation of County regulations and standards, along with compliance with RWQCB permit conditions, would limit potential impacts related to erosion and drainage to levels that are 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) The project site would not be surrounded by residential uses and would be located within the Cameron Park Community Region. The future residential development would not physically divide an established community. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (b) The project would be consistent with the existing General Plan designation, High Density Residential (HDR). The project is zoned Single-family Residential/airport Safety District (R1-AA) and allows single family residential development. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) The project site would be in the Cameron Park Community Region and in Rare Plant Mitigation Area No. 1, which requires payment of mitigation fees prior to issuance of a building permit reducing the impact to less than significant.

Findings: The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance Code and General Plan policies for residential uses. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property.

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

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 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) There are no known mineral resources of value on the project site. There would be no impact.
- (b) The County General Plan has not designated any mineral resource areas other than the Mineral Resource Zones designated by the state. There are no designated mineral resource recovery sites of local importance. There would be no impact.

Findings: No impacts to any known mineral resources would occur as a result of the project.

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| 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, c & d)

The on-site and off-site road improvements would generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment, (i.e. trucks, bulldozers) at a potentially significant level (greater than 60 dB L_{eq} and 70 dB L_{max} between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 General Plan Table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in rural regions-construction noise). Construction operations for road improvements would require adherence to construction hours as required by General Plan Policy 6.5.11. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant. The long-term noise impacts would be related to current vehicle traffic along Woodleigh Lane which would be under the maximum noise level thresholds in the 2004 General Plan Table 6-1 of 60 dB L_{dn} /CNEL or less. No known changes in traffic-generated noise levels along Woodleigh Lane would occur. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

(b) The project may generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction. However, those impacts would be considered temporary and would be confined to standard construction hour limitations, as described above. Moreover, the nearest sensitive land use to groundborne vibrations or noise are the residences to the south of the project site, which are approximately 100 feet away or more. It is unlikely that residences would experience groundborne vibration or noise impacts at that distance. The impacts would be less than significant.

(e & f) The project would be located within Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport. The project site would be located outside of the 60db CNEL contour interval for the Cameron Airport CLUP. Impacts from airport noise on the project would be less than significant.

Finding: For the Noise section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would occur from the proposed development. No significant noise impacts are expected.

| 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 - c) The project site would be in an area zoned for residential use and is designated as High Density Residential land use under the 2004 General Plan. This land use designation identifies those areas suitable for intensive single-family development at densities from one to five dwelling units per acre and the population growth for the County has been analyzed within the 2004 General Plan. No further land division would occur without both a General Plan and Zoning amendment. Utility services are available at the project site. No housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The project would not displace any housing or people. The project would not directly or indirectly induce significant population growth. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|----------|
| 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.

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

- (a) The project site would be served by the Cameron Park Fire Department, part of the Cameron Park Community Service District (CSD). The Cameron Park CSD has a cooperative agreement with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection for fire prevention and suppression and emergency medical services for the community of Cameron Park. The Fire Department maintains a fire station at Country Club Drive, within two miles of the project site. The proposed project would not be expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for fire services. The project site has been designated for residential use, and the project would be consistent with the General Plan Policy 5.1.2.2 which establishes provisions of public services to new discretionary development shall not result in a reduction of service below minimum established standards to current users, pursuant to Table 5-1 and Table 5-2 in the General Plan establishes minimum levels of service for public services such as schools, parks, fire districts, ambulance and sheriff. The General Plan indicated that the Fire Department would need to expand an existing facility to accommodate demand generated by additional population growth. Mitigation set forth in the General Plan includes review of projects for land use compatibility and siting and design considerations. The project would not be expected to induce significant population growth (see Population and Housing section), therefore, an expanded Fire Department facility would not be required. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (b) Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department. The El Dorado County Sheriff's Department would serve the project site with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The current staffing is approximately 1 to 1.2 officers per 1,000 County residents compared with the statewide average of 1.8 officers per 1,000 population. Because of the size and scope of the project, it would not be expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for police services. The property has been designated for residential use, and the project would be consistent with the General Plan and the analysis of impacts to police services contained in the General Plan. The General Plan set forth mitigation that would limit the range of appropriate land uses on with law enforcement facilities could be developed, and would subject proposed facilities to review of land use compatibility and siting and design considerations. These mitigation measures would reduce potential environmental impacts of any future Sheriff's Department facilities. The project would not be expected to induce significant population growth (see Population and Housing section); therefore, expanded Sheriff's Department facilities would not be required. The impact would be less than significant.
- (c) School services in the Cameron Park area are provided by the Buckeye Union Elementary School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The state allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit issuance and are designated to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The payment of fees at the time of building permit issuance would insure that the project should have no impact on local school districts. The impact would be less than significant.
- (d) The project would be located within the Cameron Park Community Service District. Section 16.12.090 of the County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount. Provisions to provide parkland were not included as part of the project design in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of the County Code. The tentative map would be subject to payment of parkland dedication in-lieu fees. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (e) There are no other governmental services anticipated to be adversely impacted by the proposed project. There would be no impact.

Findings: As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services either directly or indirectly. For this Public Services section, 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) The proposed project would not increase population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. Park facilities are maintained by Cameron Park Community Services District. The Cameron Park Community Services District charges park impact fees in conjunction with building permits. There would be a less than significant impact.

Finding: No significant impacts related to parks or recreational facilities would result from the project. For this Recreation Section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | | | 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) The 2004 General Plan Policies TC-Xe and TX-Xf (which incorporate Measure Y) require that projects that “worsen” traffic by 2% or 10 peak hour trips, or 100 average daily trips must construct (or ensure funding and programming) of any improvements required to meet Level of Service standards in the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. The County Department of Transportation (DOT) has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that the project does not exceed the thresholds established in the 2004 General Plan and that the project would not generate a significant level of trips to require a traffic study or mitigation. Road improvements and dedications are included and have been assessed under the Initial Study. Road improvements for the tentative map, as recommended by DOT should include the following: (1) widen Woodleigh Lane to a total width of 28 feet, with curb, gutter, as required by the provisions of County Standard Plan 101B; (2) construct A Street to a total width of 28 feet, with curb, gutter, and sidewalk as required by the provisions of County Standard Plan 101B; (3) a cul-de-sac should be constructed at the end of “A” Street, per the provisions of the local Fire District, unless the roadway is connected through to Woodleigh Drive for the adjacent Tentative Subdivision Map, Sierra Sunrise II (TM92-1261E); (4) offer to dedicate, in fee, 30 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Woodleigh Lane along the entire property frontage; (5) offer to dedicate 50 feet wide right-of-way for A Street. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (b) The creation of the eighteen (18) new parcels would accommodate potential residential density of one unit per parcel. The proposed density would not have a significant traffic and /or circulation impact to either Bass Lake Road or Woodleigh Lane. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) The project site would be located within Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport. The project would result in residential development of the site. No significant obstructions would result from the project. There would be no impact.
- (d) The project site would be readily accessible from Cambridge Drive and Bass Lake Road. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (e) The project site receives access off Woodleigh Lane and A Street, a new road which would provide access through the project. Road improvements are required to increase the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to fire safe regulations and are being placed upon the conditions of approvals for the project prior to final map

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

recording. Based upon the required road improvements there would be no disruption of emergency access to and from the existing residence or those in surrounding parcels. There would be no impact.

- (f) The project would result in eighteen (18) additional residential parcels. The project conforms with the County’s off-street parking requirements, set forth in Chapter 17.18 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. Parking requirements for conventional single-family detached homes are two spaces not in tandem. Future requests for building permits shall be reviewed for conformance with parking during the review process. The project would not result in insufficient parking. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (g) No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected because such features are not present at or adjacent to the project site. Sidewalks would be required as conditions of approval to provide for pedestrian access through the project. There would be no impact.

Finding: Environmental impacts of the project related to transportation would be a less than significant level. Motor vehicle traffic generated by the project would be anticipated to be accommodated by existing traffic facilities, with improvements along Cameron Park Drive. Other transportation-related impacts are considered to 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 |
| h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand. | | | X |

Discussion:

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

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) Wastewater treatment would be provided for the project site by EID. The existing facilities serving the Cameron Park area have adequate capacity for the requirements of this project. The project would not involve discharge of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements. The proposed impacts associated with the project would be considered less than significant.
- (b) This project would require connections to public water and sewer. This project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. The expansion of the existing facilities would not cause significant environmental effects. The proposed impact associated with the project would be less than significant.
- (c) While the project would generate some storm water runoff, this would be considered upon review and approval of the grading and drainage plan by the Department of Transportation. All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the *El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards Manual, Volume III*, related to storm drainage. Compliance with these provisions would ensure existing drainage facilities can accommodate the additional runoff. As determined by the Department of Transportation, the project would be required to receive an approved drainage plan consistent with the provisions of the County's Design and Improvement Standards Manual related to storm drainage. There are no unusual characteristics of the project that cannot be resolved through the application of normal drainage design. Less than significant impact would be anticipated concerning the drainage impacts.
- (d) The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) would provide water services for the area. EID operates on a first come, first serve basis and should the system water supply be depleted, water meters would not be sold. Less than significant impact would be anticipated concerning EID's ability to provide water service.
- (e) Sewage disposal would be provided by EID. Per a letter from EID this project would require an additional 18 equivalent dwelling units (EDU) of water supply, of the 2434 EDUs available in the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (f) The solid waste for the site would be collected and disposed by the El Dorado Disposal Service. Solid waste would be disposed at the Union Mine site that is operated by El Dorado County. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (g) The collection and disposal of solid waste by El Dorado Disposal Service is required to be in compliance with the El Dorado County Integrated Waste Management Program which complies with the intent and requirements of the California Public resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management. There would be no impact.

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

- (h) Power and telephone facilities are currently in place and utilized at adjacent residential developed properties. Expansion of power facilities is anticipated and available to accommodate this project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The project would not result in any substantial increase in demand for utilities and service systems. Therefore, no new or expanded utilities and service systems would be required.

| 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) As discussed in Item IV (Biological Resources) there would be no effects on fish habitat. There would be a less than significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV). As discussed in the Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources
- (b) Due to the small size if the proposed project, type of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, 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) The project would not result in significant environmental effects on humans in the project vicinity. As discussed in the Air Quality, Noise and Hazardous Materials Sections above, no significant effects would occur. It has been determined that the impact would be less than significant.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Tentative Subdivision Map prepared by Cooper, Thorne and Associates, Inc. November 1991

California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways

California Department of toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List