



**EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING SERVICES
2850 FAIRLANE COURT
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Project Title: TM07-1462 Whispering Oaks Tentative Subdivision Map

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

Contact Person: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Project Owner's Name and Address:

Project Location: On the east side of State Route 193, at the southeast corner of the intersection with Shoemaker Road in the Georgetown area, Supervisorial District IV.

Assessors Parcel No.: 060-330-21

Parcel Size: 43.604 acres

Zoning: Estate Residential Five Acre (RE-5) **Section:** 14 **T:** 12N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Low-Density Residential (LDR)

Description of Project: Tentative subdivision map creating eight parcels, ranging in size from 5.04 to 7.16 acres, on a 43.6-acre site. The project would include an encroachment onto Shoemaker Road and a cul-de-sac turnaround at the terminus of the access road within the parcel. The Shoemaker Road encroachment onto State Route 193 would be improved and domestic water would be supplied by extensions of the existing Georgetown Divide Public Utility District facilities that exist at Shoemaker Road and State Route 49 and three fire hydrants will be installed along the interior roadway. Each lot would utilize individual septic facilities. The existing single-family dwelling located on proposed Lot 4 would remain but the existing mobile home and all the accessory buildings associated with it would be removed.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
North:	RE-5	LDR	Residential, northwest, vacant and single-family dwellings, (two parcels, 5 and 7.6 acres and size, northeast, vacant, (portion of one parcel, 64 acres in size).
East:	RE-5/RE-10	LDR	Residential, vacant, (one parcel, 64 acres in size).
South:	RE-10	LD	Residential, vacant, (one parcel, 54 acres in size).
West:	RE-5	LDR	Residential, single-family dwellings, (seven parcels, 2.1 to 3.4 acres in size), Pine Forest Acres subdivision to the west of State Route 193 which adjoins the parcel.

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 43.604-acre parcel is located between the 2,520 to 2,600 elevations above sea level. The high points are located within roughly the center of the parcel running north and south and slopes and drains predominately to the east and west. The majority of the trees are conifers with a small percentage of indigenous oak trees and shrubs. There are remnant non-indigenous fruit trees and Scotch broom shrubs in the disturbed areas. There are an existing 2,453 single-family originally built in 1957 with a dirt and gravel driveway that encroaches onto Shoemaker Road, and five small accessory buildings with all supporting facilities and infrastructure. The mobile home on the parcel was existed when the parcel was purchased and has been used as storage and would be removed prior to filing the final map.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado County: Department of Transportation, Georgetown Fire Protection District, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, County Surveyor, Caltrans.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. The environmental factors checked below contain mitigation measures which reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

- a) No General Plan D.E.I.R identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway would be affected by this project. There would be no impact.
- b) The project is not located along a defined State Scenic Highway corridor pursuant to Caltrans definitions and thus would not impact scenic resources in such corridors including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources based on the location of the project. There would be no impact.
- c) The proposed project could degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings as viewed from State Route 193. Planning staff would recommend the adoption of a mitigation measure, **MM – Noise 1**, condition of approval #2, which would require an 80-foot non-building setback which, along with the presence of existing vegetation, would have the additional effect of reducing the impacts to aesthetics to a less than significant level.
- d) The creation of these eight parcels would allow new lighting by creating the potential for one primary and one additional second residential unit single-family dwelling on each parcel. These impacts would not be expected to be any more than any typical residential lighting similar and typical to those existing on the surrounding parcels and thus would be anticipated have a less than significant impact on nighttime views in the area designated for low density development by the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: No significant impacts are proposed to aesthetic or visual resources as part of this project. 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) The eight proposed lots are located on Sites clay loam of 15 to 30 percent slopes (SsD) which is classified as Unique and/or Soils of Local Importance but not classified as either prime farmland, statewide important farmland. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural District (A) General Plan land use overlay designation adjacent to or within the project site because the parcel is located within an area designated for Rural Center development instead by the 2004 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b, c) The creation of the eight parcels would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as determined by the Rural Center designation and lack of an Agricultural overlay, as a result of the proposed project. There would be no impact.

Finding: This project would have no impact on agricultural lands and will not impact properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. There are no designated Agricultural Lands in the project vicinity. For the ‘Agriculture’ category, the tentative subdivision map would have 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

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

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

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

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b, c) Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (O₃). Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM₁₀) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to meet the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

Short-term impacts related to construction activities; and
 Long-term impacts related to the project operation.

Short-term, superficial, minor grading and excavation activities that could be associated with the finish grading to the existing roadway, but that type of construction typically would only last a few days and intermittently at that.

Mobile emission sources such as automobiles, trucks, buses, and other internal combustion vehicles are responsible for more than 70 percent of the air pollution within the County, and more than one-half of California's air pollution. In addition to pollution generated by mobile emissions sources, additional vehicle emission pollutants are carried into the western slope portion of El Dorado County from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area by prevailing winds. Future grading would potentially emit minor, temporary and intermittent criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and would be subject to El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District standards at that time. The

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

proposed lots are located in an asbestos review area. Implementation of Conditions of Approval 46 to 50 that would be required by the El Dorado County Air Quality District would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

- d) The El Dorado County AQMD reviewed the project and sensitive receptors were not identified in the area and thus no such receptors would be affected by this project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide. The parcel map would create a less than significant impact onto the environment from odors.

Finding: Standard County conditions of approval have been included as part of the project permit to maintain a less than significant level of impact in the 'Air Quality' category. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

- a) The project proposes no impacts to 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. The project is not located within rare plant mitigation area and in lieu fees for single-family residential development would not be assessed to future residential development. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The project proposes a less than significant impact to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game. The site contains drainage channel with a 30-foot drainage easement. The tentative parcel map has been designed to observe the 30-foot required setback from drainage channel. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be designed during the grading and improvement phase to limit the potential of surface run-off pre- and post-construction to meet County and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards. All grading, drainage and construction activities associated with this project, including those necessary for road frontage improvements and those necessary to prepare and develop the site road access and turnaround, will be required to implement proper BMPs. There would be no impacts to oak woodland tree canopy with the approval of this project as none are to be removed. The required turnaround would be designed to impact less than 25 percent of the canopy of the mature oak in the vicinity. As a result, the project would reduce any potential impacts within this category to a level that is less than significant.
- c) The submitted *Final Biological Resources Study and Important Habitat Mitigation Program prepared by Sierra Ecosystem Associates, dated December 17, 2007* concluded that the project does not propose impacts to 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. The project site contains a *small area of poorly defined riparian vegetation exists in the northwest corner of the property within a low-lying area marking the starting point of an ephemeral drainage* that is located near the eastern-most portion of the parcel. There is another ephemeral drainage in the northwest corner of the parcel with a *poorly* defined bed but some riparian plant species. The General Plan does not require setbacks for ephemeral watercourses. There would be a less than significant impact from the project within this category.
- d) The majority of the site contains conifer trees. The proposal would not create excessive uses that would significantly interfere 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 as there are existing residences on both proposed parcels. The majority of the parcel has been previously disturbed by the existing development. Five-acre parcels and the typical improvements expected of single-family development would not necessarily have a major impact on wildlife movement within the parcel. The proposed developable areas are shown to remain close to the interior road and avoid the Traverse Creek wildlife corridor to the east. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Pursuant to the *Final Biological Resources Study and Important Habitat Mitigation Program prepared by Sierra Ecosystem Associates, dated December 17, 2007*, the subject parcel contains ponderosa pine habitat type along State Route 193 on the western 66 percent of the parcel and montane hardwood type on the eastern 33 percent of the parcel. (El Dorado County General Plan EIR, 5.12-7, May 2003). The Interim Interpretive Guidelines for Policy 7.4.4.4 states that, *all oak trees, of all sizes, are included in the measurement of oak canopy*. Additionally, the Guidelines require the project applicant to replace woodland habitat removed at a 1:1 ratio. The 1:1 ratio for woodland replacement is based on a formula, developed by the County, which accounts for the number of trees and the acreage affected. Pursuant to the Interim Guidelines for Policy 7.4.4.4, the permit is subject to tree canopy replacement requirements. Pursuant to the final *Tree Survey, Preservation, and Replacement Plan* prepared by Sierra Ecosystems Associates, dated December 17, 2007, the square footage of 37,475 square feet of canopy (37,475/43,560) to be removed equates to 0.86 acre. Using this formula, the applicant would be required to replant 172 one-gallon sized black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*) and canyon live oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*) trees (200 trees x 0.86 acre = 172). Alternatively, the applicant may plant 516 acorns [(200 trees x 0.86 acre) x 3 acorns = 516 acorns]. The areas identified as suitable for replanting, as well as the recommended

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

planting techniques are identified in Exhibits L1, L2 and L3. Those areas are those currently habited by the noxious shrub Scotch Broom (*Cytisus scoparius*). Prior to final occupancy, the applicant would be required to enter into an oak tree replacement and mitigation monitoring agreement with the County.

[MM Biological Resources-1]: The applicant is required to replant a combination of 172 one-gallon sized black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*) and canyon live oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*) trees (200 trees x 0.86 acre = 172). Of the two species, 26 seedlings shall be canyon live oaks and 146 shall be black oaks. Alternatively, the applicant may plant 516 acorns [(200 trees x 0.86 acre) x 3 acorns = 516 acorns]. Of the two species, 77 acorns shall be canyon live oaks and 429 shall be black oaks. The areas identified as suitable for replanting, as well as the recommended planting techniques are identified in Exhibits L1, L2 and L3. Prior to final occupancy, the applicant would be required to enter into an oak tree replacement and mitigation monitoring agreement with the County.

- f) The project does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: There would be a less than significant impact to listed local, state, or federal biological resources and to recognized or defined jurisdictional waters of the US, wetlands, or watercourses. Appropriate buffers and project conditions to address surface run-off by incorporating proper BMPs would ensure the drainage channel would not significantly be affected by this project. There would be no significant impacts to biological resources, oak trees and/or oak woodland tree canopy with mitigation. As such, the impacts in the ‘Biological Resources’ category would be less than significant for this project.

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

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

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

- a - d) The applicant submitted a “Cultural Resource Study of Assessor’s Parcel Number 060-330-21” was prepared by Historic Resource Associates, dated June 2007, that reported there were no significant prehistoric and historic-period

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

cultural resources sites, artifacts, historic buildings, structures or objects found. Because of the possibility in the future that ground disturbances could discover significant cultural resources, the following standard condition is required:

In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit, to ensure that this notation has been placed on the grading plans.

Finding: This site is located outside of a designated cemetery and according to the submitted Cultural Resource Study, the potential to find historic, archaeological, prehistoric, and/or human remains is not likely. By implementing typical discovery procedures as conditions in the project permit, any chance of an accidental discovery would be accounted for during grading and/or improvement activities and impacts to the ‘Cultural Resources’ category would be less than significant.

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

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from

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

earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;

- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. 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 no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive. (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001). Impacts would be less than significant.
- b, c) **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** 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* Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During future site grading and construction of foundations and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions. The issuance of a grading permit would address potential impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the site is located on Sites clay loam (SsD) which has a low shrink swell capacity. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) The applicants submitted an onsite sewage disposal capability report for the subject parcel that has been reviewed by the Environmental Health Division who determined it proved the potential for adequate septic facilities. The Environmental Health Division would review specific septic designs that accompany future development plans, including potential second-residential units on all eight parcels, to ensure that the final septic disposal designs meet County standard. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: Based on the review of information about the on-site soil conditions, a less than significant level of impact would result from any geological or seismic conditions that could have the potential to affect this property. Review of grading, building, and/or construction plans would include grading design and shall address BMPs and UBC Seismic IV construction

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

standards in order to address any potential impacts in the 'Geology and Soils' category. As such, impacts within this category would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

- a) Any hazardous materials used at the project site would need to comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*. This site and related future residential project would not be expected to include hazardous materials in the future construction or development of the new parcels. There would be no impacts.
- b) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be used for the project. The project would not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. There would be no impacts.
- c) As proposed, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. There are no schools located within the quarter mile radius. There would be no impacts.
- d) The project site has not been identified on any list that has been compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 which identifies hazardous material sites near this project site. There will be no impact from hazardous material at this location. There would be no impacts.
- a) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the property is not located within two miles of a public airport. Georgetown Airport is approximately 2.2 miles to the northwest as the crow flies. The project would not be subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan and would be no impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations that includes continued over-flight of aircraft near the site. There would be no impacts.
- b) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there would be no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impacts.
- c) The proposed project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. This is based on the location of the nearest fire station, availability of multiple access points to the project site, availability of water for fire suppression and provisions within the County emergency response plan. The County emergency response plan is overseen by the County Sheriff's Department. There would be no impacts.
- d) The Georgetown Fire Protection District reviewed the project and found that the project, with the recommended conditions implemented, would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area. Impacts 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, and/or would not expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires. For the 'Hazards and Hazardous Materials' category, as conditioned, any potential impacts experienced by this project would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

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

- a) Any grading or improvement plans for this project would be reviewed by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation engineering staff, as well as Development Services staff to ensure that such plans are prepared to conform to County of El Dorado *Design and Improvement Standards Manual*, the *Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, the *Drainage Manual*, and the *Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance*. All stormwater and sediment control methods must meet the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*. The project would be required to provide pre- and post- construction BMPs for run-off prior to the approval of grading, improvement and/or building activities. Staff would require that any such BMPs meet County standards which include RWQCB standards for run-off. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The site currently has domestic water supply supplied by the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District. As such, 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. A large portion of the property has been disturbed for many years in relation to the existing residential use. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit stormwater runoff and discharge from a site. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. Compliance with an approved erosion control plan would reduce erosion and siltation on and off site. A grading permit through either Development Services or El Dorado County Department of Transportation would be required for any future development to address grading, erosion and sediment control. The site improvement permit required for the road improvements would be reviewed for compliance. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) The proposed project encompasses 43.604 acres. The rate of surface runoff from development would be minimized through the application review process and adherence to Best Management Practices and review by the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District; there would be a less than significant impact from the current proposal's road improvements and future impervious surfaces created with development on the new parcels as the development is proposed on previously disturbed areas. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) There would insignificant impacts from stormwater runoff directly caused by the approval of this application request and minor road improvements as all grading would be required to follow Best Management Practices required of grading permits. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) Wastewater and stormwater runoff from any future potential development would be analyzed further to assure water quality protection standards have been established. The parcel map request would not involve major physical changes to the environment. Impacts would be less than significant impact.
- g, h and i) No portion of the project would be within the limits of the floodplain, as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate map. Therefore, no flooding impacts are expected. There would be no impact.
- j) A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami would be considered less than significant because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a water body. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. There would be no potential impact from mudflow because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a dam or other water body. There would be no impact.

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

Finding: Any future development plans submitted for a building and/or grading permit would be analyzed to address erosion and sediment control. No significant hydrological impacts would occur with the project. For this “Hydrology” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
 - Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
 - Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
 - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a) The project would not result in the physical division of an established community. The request for tentative parcel map would be consistent with the policies established by the General Plan and would be consistent with the established land use pattern of the neighboring area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) As proposed, the project would be consistent with specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted 2004 General Plan. The creation of the two new parcels takes into consideration the required development standards of the RE-5 zone. The Design Waiver request would allow a parcel less than the required width. Any future residential development on either of the two new parcels would be required to be designed to meet the requirements of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and local subdivision policies. All related setback areas for buildings and septic disposal areas to the man-made drainage channel and/or pond would need to be maintained at all times with the approval of this project. The project would meet the land use objectives that have been established by the County. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) As discussed in Section IV ‘Biological Resources’, this project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources, and the proposal would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: For the ‘Land Use Planning’ category, project related impacts associated to the tentative parcel map application would be less than significant.

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) The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan. There would be no impact.
- b) The western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category has been considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value. There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to any known mineral resources would occur as a result of the project and the 'Mineral Resources' category would not be affected.

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	

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

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL;
 - Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
 - Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- a) The residential use that would result from an approval of this application request is listed under Table 6-1 of the General Plan as being a use subject to maximum allowable noise exposures from transportation source. Table 5.10-3 of the *Draft Environmental Impact Report*, May 2003, the portion of State Route 193 from Main Street (Georgetown) to Shoo Fly Road in Kelsey, in order to reduce the outdoor exposure to noise levels that would meet those levels defined in Table 6.1, a 109-foot, non-building setback would be required measured from the centerline of the near-travel lane. The final map shall have a note explaining that the setback line is for the purpose of protecting the residents from traffic noise and for aesthetic reasons for views from State Route 193, pursuant to the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration. There fore, the following mitigation measure would be recommended. With the adoption of the mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures for Noise [1]

MM Noise-1: *An 80-foot non-building setback line from the western parcel boundary shall be shown on the final map.*

- b, c, d) Short-term noise impacts would be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the parcel vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. Noises associated with residential uses are not anticipated to increase ambient noise levels. The creation of the subdivision would require road improvements which would have a less than significant impact.
- e) General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including single-family residential development, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a County owned/operated airport facility. Georgetown Airport is approximately 2.2 miles away as the crow flies. There would be no impact.

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

f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. There would be no impact.

Finding: For the 'Noise' category impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
 - Create a more substantial imbalance in the County's current jobs to housing ratio; or
 - Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.
- a) The proposed project would have a minimal growth-inducing impact. All future residential development such as second-residential units would be required to comply with County development standards and would pay project related impact fees. These include traffic related impacts fees, park and public facilities impacts fees, school impact fees, and other fees, as required by the County's Building Services and affected County agencies. Any future development must meet comprehensive County policies and regulations before grading and/or building permits could be issued. The project does not include school or large scale employment centers. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) No existing housing stock would be displaced by this project and no replacement housing would be necessary with the approval of the tentative subdivision map. There would be no impact.
- c) No persons would be displaced by approving the tentative subdivision map and construction of replacement housing would not be required for this project. There would be no impact.

Finding: The project would not displace any individuals and would not remove existing housing. The project would not directly or indirectly induce a substantial growth in population by process of a eight-lot subdivision of land. For this 'Population and Housing' category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

- a) Fire Protection: The Georgetown Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. The District was solicited for comments to determine compliance with fire standards, El Dorado County General Plan, State Fire Safe Regulations as adopted by El Dorado County and the California Uniform Fire Code. The District did not respond with any concerns that the level of service would fall below the minimum requirements as a result of the proposed tentative subdivision map. The impacts would be less than significant.
- b) Police Protection: The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff's Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. No specific minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff's Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The creation of eight lots where one currently exists would not significantly impact current Sheriff's response times to the project area. The impacts would be less than significant.
- c) Schools: The State allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project proposal would not directly generate the need for additional school facilities and would not significantly impact school enrollment. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

- d) Parks: Section 16.12.090 of the County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for parkland dedication, and the in-lieu fee. Provisions to provide parkland were not included as part of the proposal in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of County Code. The project proposal would not significantly increase the demand for parkland. The applicants would be required to pay the park fee to the Georgetown Divide Recreation District prior to filing the final map. The impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Other Facilities: No other public facilities or services would be directly impacted by the project. The impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant impacts would occur with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, impacts would be less than significant.

XIV. RECREATION.			
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			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) By creating eight lots where one currently exists, no significant increase or effects in the use of area wide neighborhood or regional parks would be experienced by approving this project. There is no potential for a substantial physical deterioration of neighboring or regional recreational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The project does not propose any on-site recreation facilities and is not required to construct any new facilities or expand any existing recreation facilities with the scope of this project. In lieu fees for the acquisition of parklands would be assessed during the process of the final subdivision map. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: No significant impacts to recreation or open space would result from the project. For the ‘Recreation’ category, there would be a less than significant impact.

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

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

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
 - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
 - Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.
- a) The County Department of Transportation has determined that the project would not generate a significant level of trips to require a traffic study or mitigation. Approval of the project would result in the creation of eight lots allowing for density of a primary and secondary residential unit and supporting accessory structures on each newly created parcel. Each parcel would provide for fire safe access and would be accessible from Shoemaker Road. Road improvements and dedications are included and have been considered with this Initial Study. Full road improvements for the access road and encroachments are required. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - b) Approval of the tentative subdivision map would accommodate the allowed density. As conditioned by the El Dorado county Department of Transportation and Caltrans for road improvements, the proposed density would not have a significant traffic and/or circulation impact to Shoemaker Road, or the surrounding road circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - c) The project would not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity. There would be no impact.

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

- d) Currently Shoemaker Road has a substandard width for easy passing in an emergency, as well as line of sight problems looking north along State Route 193 towards downtown Georgetown. There would be 8 lots that would utilize Shoemaker Road, which is not County maintained, as the primary feeder road to the proposed subdivision interior road upon approval of the subject tentative subdivision map. The Department of Transportation has required width and surface improvements to the interior access road to County Standard Plan 101C terminating at a turnaround at proposed Lots 1 and 2 to the provisions of Standard Plan 114 would be required. The encroachment onto Shoemaker Road would be required to meet Standard Plan 103D requirements and Shoemaker Road would be required to meet Standard Plan 101C standards. The Shoemaker approach to State Route 193 would be required to be improved to Caltrans approach standards to a 24-foot width. A shoulder bypass lane would be required on the east side of State Route 193 on the opposite of the Shoemaker encroachment to permit southbound traffic from Georgetown to pass a vehicle that is turning left into Shoemaker Road. The project has been conditioned to comply with El Dorado County Department of Transportation and Caltrans requirements. Based on those required improvements, impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The project would not result in inadequate emergency access to any potential residential structure. Any future residential project would be reviewed by El Dorado County Department of Transportation and Georgetown Fire Protection District staff to ensure that adequate access onto Shoemaker Road is provided from the currently unnamed proposed interior road to meet County Fire Safe and/or Department of Transportation standards. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) Future development would be required to meet on-site parking identified by use and the Zoning Ordinance. Section 17.18.060 regulates the parking provisions and all on-site uses would include, and identify required parking. Future requests for building permits would be reviewed for conformance with parking during the review process. There would be no impact.
- g) The proposed project would not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

Finding: For the 'Transportation/Traffic' category, approving the eight-lot tentative subdivision map would have a less than significant impact within this category.

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			X	

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

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		X	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
 - Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
 - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
 - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a) No significant wastewater discharge or surface run off would result from this project as the majority of the proposed development is projected to occur in previously disturbed areas. Any future residential development on the parcels would be designed to meet the County standards to include BMPs for pre- and post construction development for wastewater discharge and surface run-off. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed and none are required as a result of this project. There would be no impact.
 - c) On-site stormwater drainage facilities would be required on the property in order to reduce run off to appropriate discharge levels. Any future request for a residential single-family unit, grading, or improvement plans would be required to show site discharge and/or run off at pre and post levels. All required drainage facilities would be built in conformance with the standards contained in the *County of El Dorado Grading and Drainage Manual*. Impacts would be less than significant with strict adherence to the required Best Management Practices.
 - d) There is an existing domestic metered water system account for the subject parcel with the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District. The resulting lots for the current proposal would be required to establish separate domestic water service accounts. The applicant would be responsible for the installation of all improvements, to the District's Standards and Specifications, necessary to provide these services. The exact improvements required would be determined by an applicant supplied modeling of the system. The project would be conditioned to ensure adequate water pressure for fire control with the final review and approval by the Georgetown Fire Protection District required prior to filing the final map. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
 - e) The applicants submitted an onsite sewage disposal capability report for the subject parcel that has been reviewed by the Environmental Health Division who determined it proved the potential for adequate septic facilities. The Environmental Health Division would review specific septic designs that accompany future development plans, including potential second-residential units on both parcels, to ensure that the final septic disposal design meets County standard. Future

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

residential development would be reviewed by Building and Planning Services and Environmental Management during the building permit review phase to ensure that septic areas are established to County design standards. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

- f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

After July of 2006, El Dorado Disposal began distributing municipal solid waste to Forward Landfill in Stockton and Kiefer Landfill in Sacramento. Pursuant to El Dorado County Environmental Management Solid Waste Division staff, both facilities have sufficient capacity to serve the County. Recyclable materials are distributed to a facility in Benicia and green wastes are sent to a processing facility in Sacramento. Impacts would be less than significant.

- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the proposed lots would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space would be available at the site for solid waste collection. There would be no impact.

Finding: As conditioned, impacts within the ‘Utilities and Service Systems’ category would remain at a less than significant level based on this tentative parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

- a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the project record that would indicate that this project has the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment. As conditioned and mitigated, and with strict adherence to County permit requirements, this tentative subdivision map and the typical residential uses expected to follow, would not appear to have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to

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

drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project would be less than significant due to the design of the project and required standards that would be implemented with the process of the final subdivision map and/or any required project specific improvements on or off the property.

- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as “two or more individual effects, which when considered together, would be considerable or which would compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Based on the analysis in this study, it has been determined that the project would have a less than significant impact based on the issue of cumulative impacts.
- c) As outlined and discussed in this document, as mitigated and conditioned, this project proposes a less than significant chance of having project-related environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts 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 El Dorado County Development Services Department, Planning Services in Placerville:

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

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.)

US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Services 1995 National Wetland Inventory for the Placerville, California Quad.

“*Cultural Resource Study* prepared by Historic Resource Associates, dated June 2007

Final Tree Survey, Preservation, and Replacement Plan prepared by Sierra Ecosystems Associates, dated August 24, 2007

Final Biological Resources Study and Important Habitat Mitigation Program prepared by Sierra Ecosystem Associates, dated December 17, 2007