



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Fern Woods Subdivision

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

Contact Person: Aaron Mount, Associate Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Carl and Tanya Damoude, PO Box 163, Sheridan, OR, 87378

Project Agent's Name and Address: Carl Damoude PO Box 163, Sheridan, OR, 87378

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Carl Damoude PO Box 163, Sheridan, OR, 87378

Project Location: East side of Larkspur Lane approximately 0.1 miles north of the intersection with Cedar Drive in the Cedar Grove area.

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 076-111-01

Zoning: One-acre Residential (R1A)

Section: 3 **T:** 10N **R:** 12E

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Description of Project: Tentative subdivision map creating 12 parcels ranging in size from 1.0 to 1.45 acres, on a 14.71 acre site. The project would include an encroachment onto Larkspur Road and two on-site access roads terminating with cul-de-sacs. Domestic water would be supplied by El Dorado Irrigation District and each lot would utilize individual septic facilities.

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:	R1A	MDR	Undeveloped
North:	R1A	MDR	Single Family Residences
East:	R1A	MDR	Single Family Residences
South:	R20K	HDR	Single Family Residences
West:	R1A	MDR	Single Family Residences

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 14.71 acre subject parcel is at an average elevation of 3,500 feet above mean sea level and the aspect is generally northeast. The subject parcel is an infill parcel located in a Medium and High Density Residential area. The project lies within the Brushy Canyon watershed and drains into the Iowa Canyon watershed approximately 0.1 miles below the Slab Creek Reservoir Dam. There are no watercourses present within the project area. The project area is gentle to moderately sloping with slopes ranging from 0 to 30 percent. Vegetation is dominated by mixed conifer forest. Development includes two sheds that will be removed.

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

El Dorado County Department of Transportation, El Dorado County Fire Protection District, Cal Fire, El Dorado Irrigation District, El Dorado County Surveyors Office

--

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Aaron Mount For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a) No 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 would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The proposed subdivision is essentially an infill project consistent with the surrounding residential development and is consistent with surrounding lot design and density. There would be no impact.
- d) The creation of 12 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) El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land Use Overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan Land Use Map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan Land Use Overlay District area adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses because there are no adjacent agriculturally zoned properties. There would be no impact.

b, c) The creation of the twelve 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 would 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 non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) 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 would 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

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

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 proposed lots are not located in an asbestos review area. An air quality analysis was submitted by the applicant and it concluded that implementation of Conditions of Approval 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:

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

- 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) After Reviewing County resource materials for sensitive and protected species, it has been determined that the project would not affect locally designated natural communities, disturb wetlands, or affect migration corridors. The California Natural Diversity Database showed no occurrence of listed species within a five mile radius of the project site. There would be a less than significant impact.
- b,c) The U.S. Department of Interior National Wetlands Inventory Maps were reviewed and subsequent site visit was done to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project site. This review indicates that there are no wetlands or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project. There would be no impact.
- d) Review of the Planning Division GIS *Deer Ranges Map* (January 2002) indicates that there are no mapped deer migration corridors on the project site. The project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites. There would be no impact.
- e) The project would require some on and offsite road improvements that may result in some tree removal. However, any removal of oak canopy would be required to retain a percentage of the tree canopy as required under General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. An arborist report has been submitted showing conformance with Policy 7.4.4.4. The Interim Interpretive Guidelines for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires retention of 85 percent of the indigenous oak tree canopy on the subject parcel as a whole. The site contains 4.16 acres of oak canopy. Oak canopy retention of 85 percent would allow a permissible canopy take of 0.624 acres. The project proposes an initial removal of 0.291 acres of canopy due to road construction. Future proposed removal of oak tree due to parcel development plus the proposed road development would result in removal of 0.613 acres of oak canopy removal which is consistent with the 85 percent retention requirement as required by Policy 7.4.4.4. The project has been conditioned to provide an oak tree canopy replacement plan to meet the requirements of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, Option A. Should identified on-site replacement area not be sufficient, the applicant shall comply with Option B prior to filling of the final map. The impact would be less than significant.
- f) The project area is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-Legged Frog (*Rana Aurora Draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to the Draft Recovery/Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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

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

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 & b)

The applicant submitted a “Archaeological Survey report of Assessor’s Parcel Number 076-111-01, A proposed Parcel Split Near Cedar Grove, El Dorado County , California, January 1992”, prepared by Dana Supernowicz . According to the study, “After careful examination of the entire property a number of historic cultural sites and/or features were discovered, which where determined not to be significant archaeological sites”. In the event sub-surface historical, cultural or archeological sites or materials are disturbed during earth disturbances and grading activities on the site, standard conditions are included within Attachment 1 of the staff report to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or know fossil locales. There would be no impact.
- a) Due to the size and scope of the project, there is a potential to discover human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the standard conditions within Attachment 1 shall be implemented immediately. There would be a less than significant impact.

FINDING: Although the project has the potential to impact sub-surface cultural or historic resources, or disturb human remains located outside of a designated cemetery, the application of the standard conditions identified in Attachment 1 of the staff report address such impacts. Established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category.

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			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.			
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			
iv) Landslides?			
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			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 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) 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 Aiken Loam (AfC and AfD) which has a low to moderate 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 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				X

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
materials into the environment?			
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.
- 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.

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

- c) As proposed, the project would 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 would be no impact from hazardous material at this location. There would be no impacts.
- e) *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. 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.
- f) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there 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.
- g) 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.
- h) The El Dorado County 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.

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			X	

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
 - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) The project on-site waste discharge area analysis was reviewed and approved by the Environmental Management Department. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) 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. The proposed project would be required to connect to public water. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) Proposed grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply to this project. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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

d & e)

As stated in the submitted preliminary drainage report, “future proposed development of the project would decrease the 10-year and 100-year runoff from the site approximately 6%. The decrease is primarily due to alteration of the runoff flow path and the resultant change in the time of concentration reduces the storm intensity” (*Fern Woods Subdivision Hydrology and Hydraulic Analysis, May 27, 2006, Carl Damoude*). Therefore, substantial drainage pattern alteration or runoff would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site. The proposed septic system design for the project was reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, Environmental Health Division subject to the conditions of approval within Attachment 1 of the staff report. There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of the new septic system in conjunction with other existing septic system in the project area would degrade the area’s water quality. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

g & h)

The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0775 B) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.

- i) The subject property within the Camino/Pollock Pines area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters. Impacts would be less than significant.
- j) The proposed project is not located near a coastal area, and therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to tsunamis. No volcanoes or other active volcanic features are near the project site and, therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to mudflows. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: No significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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:

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

- 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. As proposed, the project is compatible with the surrounding residential and commercial land uses and would not create land use conflicts with surrounding properties. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) As proposed, the project is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance for a commercial zone district and applicable General Plan policies. The planned development request would allow greater project design flexibility in complying with development standards such as setbacks. As no conflict exists between the project and applicable land use policies, potential environmental impacts would be considered to be less than significant.
- c) The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other conservation plan. This condition precludes the possibility of the proposed project conflicting with an adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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
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 project is not listed under Table 6-1 of the General Plan as being a use subject to maximum allowable noise exposures from transportation source. As such, an acoustical analysis was not provided as part of the project application submittal. The creation of the twelve lots for single-family use would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- 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) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards contained within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport. No impacts would occur.
- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would 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.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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.

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 El Dorado County 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-

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

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.
- 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 El Dorado County Parks and Recreation Department 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 twelve 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.

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

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.

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 & b)

According to the traffic impact analysis, "the proposed project is expected to generate 640 daily trips, including 26 AM peak-hour trips and 56 PM peak-hour trips" (*Fern Woods Subdivision Traffic Analysis, Carl Damoude, August 29, 2006*). The analysis also determined that under all scenarios the intersections would operate at LOS b or better and would be in compliance with General Plan Policy TC-Xd. The Department of Transportation has provided conditions of

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

approval included within Attachment 1 of the staff report which address the issues identified in the traffic study. Implementation of these conditions of approval would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- c) The project would not result in a change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity. No impacts would occur.
- d) The proposed project does not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards. There would be a less than significant impact.
- 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 the El Dorado County Fire Protection District staff to ensure that adequate access onto Larkspur Lane is provided from the currently proposed interior roads to meet County Fire Safe and/or Department of Transportation standards. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) Single family residences are required to provide two parking spaces that are not in tandem. The proposed parcels would provide adequate space to comply with all parking requirements. There would be no impact.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The El Dorado County Transit Authority reviewed the proposal and had no comments. No bus turnouts would be required for this tentative map. According to Chapter 5 of the *El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan*, Class II bike lanes are proposed for Pony Express Trail in the vicinity of the project site. The project would not result in the removal of a bikeway/bike lane or prohibition of implantation of the facilities identified in the plan. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: No significant traffic impacts are expected for the project with the implementation of the standard conditions of approval identified above. For the “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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 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:

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

- 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 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 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 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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

Fern Woods Subdivision Hydrology and Hydraulic Analysis, May 27, 2006, Carl Damoude

Fern Woods Subdivision Traffic Analysis, Carl Damoude, August 29, 2006

Tree Survey, Preservation, and Replacement Plan for Fern Woods, James J. Kral, June 7, 2007.

Fern Woods Subdivision Air Quality Analysis, Carl Damoude, September 3, 2006.

Fern Woods Subdivision Land Capability report, Carl Damoude, August 29, 2006.

Archaeological Survey for APN 076-111-01, Dana Supernowicz, January 5, 1992.

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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