



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** Cambridge Road Town Homes Planned

Application File Nos.: Planned Development PD07-0021 and Tentative Subdivision Map TM07-1450, Special Use Permit S08-0013

**Lead Agency Name and Address:** Development Services- Planning Division El Dorado County, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

**Contact Person:** Mel Pabalinas

**Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Louann Partridge. 2981 Windsor Court. Rescue CA, 95762

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** Louann Partridge. 2981 Windsor Court. Rescue CA, 95762

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

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

**Project Location:** The project is located on the west side of Cambridge Road approximately 1,000 feet north of the intersection with Estepa Drive in the Cameron Park area.

**Assessor's Parcel Number(s):** 082-531-15/082-531-16

**Zoning:** Limited Multifamily Residential- Planned Development- Airport Safety (R2-PD-AA)

**Section:** 33    **T:** 10N    **R:** 98E

**General Plan Designation:** Multifamily Residential (MFR)

**Description of Project:**

Corresponding to applications referenced above, the project includes the following requests:

- 1) A Planned Development to allow the construction of 12 attached multi-family units. The units would be clustered in four attached arrangements: two clusters would contain four units and two clusters would contain two units. The floor area ranges from 1,400 to 1,700 square feet of living space. The request includes a deviation from the specific Limited Multifamily Residential (R2) zone development standards including minimum lot size, yard setbacks, building coverage, and lot width;
- 2) A Tentative Subdivision Map would create a total of 14 lots consisting of 12 residential lots ranging in size from 1,730 square feet to 2,407 square feet, one Open Space lot, and one private drive access lot. The development would be served by public water and sewer from El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Access to the site is via 25-foot wide private driveway with encroachment off Cambridge Road. Project frontage would include standard 4-foot sidewalk and curb and gutter. As required by the Department of Transportation (DOT), an off-site 4-foot sidewalk and curb gutter shall be constructed along the frontage of the property located at APN 082-531-13;
- 3) A Special Use Permit for proposed retaining walls within rear and side yard of the subdivision in excess of 10 feet (maximum height of 12 feet) in accordance with El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.14.155.B.3;
- 4) In accordance with Subdivision Ordinance Chapter 16.08.020 of the El Dorado County Subdivision

Ordinance, three Design Waivers have been requested for the following El Dorado County Design and Improvement Manual (DISM) standards: 1) reduction in the frontage improvements on Cambridge Road from Standard Plan 101B to 101C, 2) Modify driveway improvements on Cambridge Road from Standard Plan 103G to 103C, and 3) to eliminate the off-site sidewalk improvements on Cambridge Road from Calido Court to the project boundaries.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

The project is located within the Cameron Park Community Region. The project is located in a developed area and is surrounded by existing single and multifamily development as further described below.

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	R2-PD-AA	MFR	Undeveloped
North:	R2-PD-AA	MFR	Undeveloped
East:	R2-DC-AA	MFR	Existing multi-family residential
South:	R2-PD-AA	MFR	Existing multi-family residential
West:	R1-AA	HDR	Existing single-family residential

**Briefly Describe the environmental setting:** The approximately 1.2-acre site is located within the Cameron Park Community Region. Vegetation on-site is comprised of chaparral habitat and scattered oak trees. Slopes on-site are generally mild with the majority of the on-site slopes falling within the 0-10% slope range. The site slopes from the western portion of the site towards Cambridge Road to the east. The site is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1 which is defined as lands not known to contain Special Status Plant Species, but containing soil types capable of sustaining those species. No rare plants were found on the project site. No drainage features exist.

**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	<b>X</b>	Air Quality
<b>X</b>	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	<b>X</b>	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: Mel Pabalinas For: El Dorado County

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

#### **Introduction**

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from a residential infill project on a 0.53-acre lot with road frontage improvements in the Cameron Park area.

#### **Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses**

The project is located within the Cameron Park Community Region. The project is located in a developed area and is surrounded by existing single and multifamily development.

#### **Project Characteristics**

##### 1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The project would be access from Cambridge Road via a common access driveway. The access driveway would provide for a 24-foot wide drive aisle as required by County code. Each of the proposed 12 residential units would provide attached two-car garages. Four additional uncovered parking spaces would be provided on-site. The proposed parking would be consistent with County requirements.

##### 2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site would be serviced by public water and sewer systems. Power utilities and telephone service have been extended to the site by local utility companies.

3. Population

The proposed residential units would not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of off site and on site road improvements including grading. The project would require construction of the residences and landscaping along the project boundaries.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading and encroachment from the Department of Transportation and obtain an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan from the Air Quality Management District.

Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project 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.

DRAFT 5-23-2008

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> <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. **Scenic Vista.** The project site is located on Cambridge Road in the Cameron Park area. The project site and immediate vicinity has not been identified by the County as a scenic view or resource. There would be no anticipated impact.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is not adjacent or visible from a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site. There would be no anticipated impact.
- c. **Visual Character.** The project would not affect the visual character of Cambridge Road or the project vicinity. The proposed residential development would be consistent with existing uses in the area. There would be no anticipated impact.
- d. **Light and Glare.** The project would create 12 attached townhome units. Potential sources of light and glare would result from the residential development. Future sources of lighting as a result of the project would be typical of residential development and would be consistent with existing residential lighting in the area. The project would not result in new sources of light that would significantly impact the neighborhood. Therefore, the impacts of existing light and glare created by the project would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** Given the project location and characteristics, impacts to aesthetics are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. Common residential lighting would be anticipated to be less than significant and consistent with the existing lighting in the area.

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

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** 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 the project site would not be within an Agricultural zone or Agricultural overlay. The site has a General Plan Land Use designation of Multifamily Residential and correspondingly zoned as Limited Multifamily Residential. No impact would be anticipated.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The property is not located within a Williamson Act Contract and the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. There would be no impact.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** No conversion of agriculture land would occur as a result of the project. No impact would be anticipated.

**FINDING** For this “Agriculture” category, there would be no impact.

<b>III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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<sub>x</sub>, 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 PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, 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. **Air Quality Plan.** El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>). Any activities associated to the grading and construction of this project would pose a less than significant impact on air quality because the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) would require that the project implement a Fugitive Dust Mitigation (FDM) plan during grading and construction activities. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions below a level of significance.

b. **Air Quality Standards.** The project would create air quality impacts which may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction. Potential air quality impacts would result from construction related impacts during project construction and operation air quality impacts as a result of future residential development of the site. An Air Quality Analysis was prepared for the project which analyzed the potential impacts of construction and operational impacts to air quality (Rimpo and Associates, July 2007).

Construction activities associated with the project include grading and site improvements, for roadway expansion, utilities, driveway, home, and building pad construction, and associated on-site activities. Construction related activities would generate PM<sub>10</sub> dust emissions that would exceed either the state or federal ambient air quality standards for PM<sub>10</sub>. This is a temporary but potentially significant effect. The Air Quality Analysis recommended mitigation measures that would be implemented in standard conditions of approval by the El Dorado Air Quality Management District. These conditions include the approval of a Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan and adherence to all



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

District rules during project construction. Compliance with the FDM Plan and adherence to District rules would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Operational air quality impacts would be minor and temporary, and would cause an insignificant contribution to existing or projected air quality violations. Source emissions would be from vehicle trip emissions, natural gas and wood combustion for space and water heating, landscape equipment, and consumer products. The Air Quality Analysis determined that the operational impacts would not exceed the established County thresholds and would be a less-than-significant impact.

- c. **Cumulative Impacts.** The project site is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin which is designated as non-attainment for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>. The Air Quality Analysis prepared for the project has recommended conditions of approval listed in (b) above that would reduce impacts related to PM<sub>10</sub> to a less than significant level. The Air Quality Analysis determined that the project would not generate a potentially significant level of ozone emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Sensitive Receptors.** The project would create 12 residential units within the Cameron Park Community Region. The proposed residential use would not be considered a use which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Objectionable Odors.** Table 3-1 of the *El Dorado County APCD CEQA Guide* (February, 2002) does not list the proposed residential use as a use known to create objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** The proposed project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The project would result in increased emissions due to construction and operation, however existing regulations would reduce these potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Additional impacts to air quality would be less than significant. The proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts.

<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <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		

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X	
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Special Status Species.** The project site is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1 which is defined as lands not known to contain special status plant species but containing soil types capable of sustaining special status species. A Biological Resource Assessment was performed for the project site (Foothill Associates, July 2007) which did not identify any special status plant species on the site. The project would be subject to payment of the established rare plant mitigation fee at the time of building permit issuance, in accordance with **El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Chapter**

Foothill Associates performed a field study to determine the presence of special status animal species on the project site. The study determined that the onsite woodland habit and existing vegetation would provide a suitable habitat for raptors and other birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The impacts to suitable habitat onsite would be a potentially significant impact unless mitigated.

**MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-1**

*Prior to any construction activities during the nesting season (February 1- August 31), a pre-construction survey shall be required to determine if active nests are present on-site. The survey shall be completed no more than 30 days prior to the commencement of construction activities. If nests are found and considered active, construction activities shall not occur within 500 feet of the active nest until the young have fledged or until a biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. The survey results shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game and Planning Services prior to issuance of a grading permit.*

**MONITORING:** This measure shall be applied and recommended as a project condition of approval. Planning Services shall verify that the survey results have been received and all recommendations by the biologist have been implemented prior to issuance of a grading permit. Planning Services shall coordinate with the applicant and/or biologist to verify conformance with this measure.

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

Implementation of the mitigation measure identified above would avoid construction-related impacts to nesting birds within the project site area. The mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of insignificance.

- b. Riparian habitat.** The Biological Resource Assessment prepared for the project did not identify any riparian areas that would be subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or any County standards. No intermittent streams or riparian areas were identified by an on-site reconnaissance performed by Planning Services staff. There would be no impact.
- c. Wetlands.** No wetlands were identified as part of the Biological Resources Assessment. There would be no impact.
- d. Migration Corridors.** As discussed in subsection (a) above, the project site contains suitable habitat for animal species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant impact. Implementation of BIO-1 would reduce impacts during project construction. The Biological Resource Study determined that long-term operation of the project would result in a less than significant impact to migration corridors. .
- e. Local Policies.** The proposed project would impact oak woodland habitat, which pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, requires retention and replacement of the affected habitat. The project would remove 0.03-acres of oak woodland habitat from the project site. As determined by the arborist report, the project site is comprised of 0.47-acres of canopy which would be subject to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 (Fallen Leaf Tree Service, November 2007).. The site contains 39% of oak canopy which would require 85% retention. The project would remove 0.03-acres of canopy which would be 7% of the on-site canopy. The proposed removal would be consistent with Policy 7.4.4.4. A condition of approval would be imposed on the project requiring conformance to the policy and related interim guidelines subject and prior to issuance of grading permit for the proposed development of the site.

**FINDING:** Impacts relating to Biological Resources include removal of oak woodland habitat and migrating birds. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** would require pre-construction surveys to reduce impacts to protected animal species. Implementation of a standard condition would reduce impacts to oak canopy consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. For this 'Biological Resources' category, the above Mitigation Measures would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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. Historic or Archeological Resources.** A Cultural Resource Study was performed on the project site which did not identify any significant historic or archeological resources (Historic Resources Associates, April 2007). There would be no impact.

**c. Paleontological Resource.** The site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil strata. No such resources were identified in the Cultural Resource Study. Impacts would be less than significant.

**d. Human Remains.** There is a small likelihood of human remain discovery on the project site. Standard protocol requires that, 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 would be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. Subsequent construction plans including grading plans shall include this standard as a note on the plans. Planning Services would review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit to ensure project notation and condition. The project would anticipate less than significant impact to disturbance of human remains.

**FINDING:** No significant cultural resources were identified on the project site. Standard conditions of approval would be required with requirements for accidental discovery during project construction. This project would have a less than significant impact within the Cultural Resources category.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				<b>X</b>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			<b>X</b>	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			<b>X</b>	
iv) Landslides?			<b>X</b>	

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

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
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.

**a. Seismic Hazards.**

- i) According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, there are no Alquist-Priolo fault zones within El Dorado County. The nearest such faults are located in Alpine and Butte Counties. There would be no impact.
- ii) The potential for seismic ground shaking in the project area would be considered less than significant. Any potential impacts due to seismic impacts would be addressed through compliance with the Uniform Building Code. All structures would be built to meet the construction standards of the UBC for the appropriate seismic zone.
- iii) El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity. The potential areas for liquefaction on the project site would be the wetlands which would be filled as part of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

iv) All grading activities onsite would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Compliance with the Ordinance would reduce potential landslide impacts to less than significant.

- b. **Soil Erosion.** According to the Soil Survey for El Dorado County, the soil types onsite are classified as Rescue Series which have a moderate to high erosion hazard. All grading activities onsite would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Geologic Hazards.** The onsite soil types have a medium to high runoff potential with medium to moderate erosion potentials. All grading activities would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance, impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Expansive Soils.** All grading activities would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance, impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Septic Capability.** The project would be served by EID for wastewater services. There would be no impacts related to septic systems.

**FINDING:** A review of the soils and geologic conditions on the project site determined that the soil types are suitable for the proposed development. All grading activities would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would address potential impacts related to soil erosion, landslides and other geologic impacts. Future development would be required to comply with the Uniform Building Code which would address potential seismic related impacts. For this 'Geology and Soils' category impacts would be less than significant.

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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			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>			
response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		X	

**Discussion:**

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

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

**a-b. Hazardous Materials.** The project may involve transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as construction materials, paints, fuels, landscaping materials, and household cleaning supplies. The use of these hazardous materials would only occur during construction. Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials. Prior to any use of hazardous materials, the project would be required to obtain a Hazardous Materials Business Plan through the Environmental Health- Hazardous Waste Division of El Dorado County. The impact would be a less than significant level.

**c. Hazardous Materials Near Schools.** The project site would not be located adjacent to or in the vicinity of any schools. Adherence to the required Hazardous Materials Business Plan would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**d. Hazardous Sites.** No parcels within El Dorado County are included on the Cortese List. There would be no impact.

**e-f. Aircraft Hazards.** The project would be located within Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport. Safety Zone 3 has been defined as lands within a one-mile radius of the Cameron Park Airport. The proposed multifamily development would be an allowable land use within Safety Zone 3 as established by the Cameron Park Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The project would not create height or visual impacts that would negatively impact airport operations. Impacts would be less than significant.

**g. Emergency Plan.** As discussed in the Traffic category, the project would impact the existing road systems. The project would be required to make road improvements which would address the additional impacts to the road systems. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**h. Wildfire Hazards.** The Cameron Park Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and determined that the installation of fire hydrants, sprinklering of the units, and implementation of a fire safe plan would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**FINDING:** The proposed project would not expose the area to hazards relating to the use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. Any proposed use of hazardous materials would be subject to review and approval of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan issued by the Environmental Management. The Cameron Park Fire Protection District would require conditions of approval to reduce potential hazards relating to wild fires. For this 'Hazards and Hazardous Materials' category, impacts would be less than significant.

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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



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

**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. Water quality standards.** There are no wetlands and drainage features onsite which would be impacted as part of the project. All project related construction activities would be required to adhere to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would require Best Management Practices (BMP’s) to minimize degradation of water quality during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Groundwater Supplies.** The project would connect to public water and would not utilize any groundwater as part of the project. Construction activities may have a short-term impact as a result of groundwater discharge, however, adherence to the Grading Ordinance would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.
- c-f. Drainage Patterns.** The project would be required to prepare a drainage study subject to review by the Department of Transportation. The drainage study would be required to conform to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g-j. Flood-related Hazards.** The project site is not located within any mapped 100-year flood areas and would not result in the construction of any structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. No dams are located in the project area which would result in potential hazards related to dam failures. The risk of exposure to seiche, tsunami, or mudflows would be remote. There would be no impact.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts to water quality or drainage features would result as part of the project. Adherence to the Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance would reduce impacts to less than significant. For this ‘Hydrology and Water Quality’ category, the project would not exceed the thresholds of significance and related impacts would be less than significant.

<b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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

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

**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. Established Community.** The project would be located within the Cameron Park Community Region. The project would be consistent within the Multifamily Residential (MFR) land use designation in the El Dorado County General Plan and would comply with the requirements of the Limited Multifamily Residential- Planned Development zone district. The project would not conflict with the existing land use pattern in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

**b. Land Use Consistency.** The project would comply with applicable General Plan policies and included Mitigation Measures and conditions of approval consistent with adopted policy and ordinances. Impacts would be less than significant.

**c. Habitat Conservation Plan.** There are currently no adopted HCP's or NCCP's in El Dorado County. There would be no impact.

**FINDING:** For the 'Land Use Planning' category, the project would have a less than significant impact.

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> <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?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>

**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-b. Mineral Resources.** There are no known mineral resources on the site according to the General Plan. There are no known mineral resources of local importance on or near the project site. There would be no impact.

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

**FINDING:** No known mineral resources are located on or within the vicinity of the project. There would be no impact to this ‘Mineral Resources’ category.

<b>XI. NOISE.</b> <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. and d. Noise Exposures.** The project would be located along Cambridge Road. The location of the project relative to potentially significant noise sources would impact the proposed residential uses. A Noise Assessment was prepared for the project to determine the maximum exterior and interior noise levels expected for the project (Environmental Noise Assessment Cambridge Road Town Homes, Bollard Acoustical Consultants, April 2007). The assessment determined that the interior noise levels would not exceed the maximum threshold established by the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

The project would include construction activities for the grading of the site and construction of the residential units. The short-term noise increases would potentially exceed the thresholds established by the General Plan. This is a potentially significant impact. Standard conditions of approval would limit the hours of construction activities to 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am to 5:00pm on weekends and federally recognized holidays.

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

Adherence to the limitations of construction would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

- b. Ground borne Shaking:** The project may generate ground borne vibration or shaking events during project construction. These potential impacts would be limited to project construction. Adherence to the time limitations of construction activities to 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am to 5:00pm on weekends and federally recognized holidays would limit the ground shaking effects in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Long-term Noise Increases.** The project would not increase the ambient noise levels in the area in excess of the established noise thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant
- e-f. Aircraft Noise.** The project is located within Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport. Safety Zone 3 is defined as lands within a one-mile radius of the airport. The proposed multi-family land use would be a compatible land use as defined within the Cameron Park Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As determined by the Acoustical Analysis, noise generated by aircraft would not exceed the interior or exterior noise thresholds established by the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** As determined by an Acoustical Analysis prepared for the project would not result in exposure to noise levels in excess of levels established by the General Plan. Adherence to standard conditions of approval during project construction would limit short term noise levels generated by the project. No long term noise impacts would occur as part of the project. For this 'Noise' category, thresholds of significance would not be exceeded and impacts would be less than significant.

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

**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. Population Growth.** The project would result in the creation of 12 residential units. Per the estimation under General Plan Policy 2.2.1.3, approximately 27 people would occupy the condominium complex. No significant

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

population growth would result as a part of the project. No additional public services or roads would be constructed as part of the project that would significantly contribute to growth in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. **Displace Housing.** The project would result in the creation of 12 residential units. No existing or proposed housing would be displaced as part of the project. There would be no impact.
- c. **Displace People.** The project would create 12 residential units. No people would be displaced as part of the project. There would be no impact.

**FINDING:** The project would not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project would not directly or indirectly induce growth. For this ‘Population and Housing’ Section, impacts would be less than significant.

<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> <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 Cameron Park Fire Protection District provides structural fire protection to the project site. The District would require fire protection measures that would be included as conditions of approval of the project. These measures include the sprinklering of the residences, preparation of a fire safe plan and other standard requirements of the Fire Safe Regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- b. Police Protection.** Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department. Due to the size and scope of the project, the demand for additional police protection would not be required. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Schools.** School services would be provided by the Rescue Union School District. The proposed residences would be required to pay the impact fees adopted by the District. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. Parks.** As discussed in the ‘Recreation’ category below, the project would be required to pay park in-lieu fees. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. Government Services.** There are no services that would be significantly impacted as a result of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** The project would not result in a significant increase of public services to the project. Increased demands to services would be addressed through the payment of established impact fees. 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. Parks.** The project would result in an increase usage of parks and recreational facilities. Payment of in-lieu fees to the Cameron Park Community Services District would be sufficient to ensure the impacts from the new development would be mitigated. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Recreational Services.** The project would not include additional recreation services or sites as part of the project. The increased demand for services would be mitigated by the payment of the in-lieu fees as discussed above. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts to open space or park facilities would result as part of the project. For this ‘Recreation’ category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> <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. **Traffic Increases.** The project would create 12 multifamily residential units on a 1.2-acre parcel. The project would not exceed the thresholds established by General Plan Policy TC-Xf. The Department of Transportation did not require a traffic study to be prepared and determined that road widening along the project frontage on Cambridge Way and the construction of sidewalks would reduce future traffic increases. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Levels of Service Standards.** The project would not exceed the thresholds of service established by the General Plan in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Air traffic.** The project is located within Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport. The project would not result in future land uses that would constitute a hazard to air traffic. The proposed buildings would not exceed the maximum height established by the Cameron Park Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan or the Zoning Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- d. **Design Hazards.** The project would not create any significant traffic hazards. The proposed encroachments would be designed and constructed to County standards. Review by the Fire District and the Department of Transportation did not identify any hazards associated with the design of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Emergency Access.** The project would create a 12 unit clustered development. The project would be accessed via a 24-foot wide common driveway. The driveway width would meet the requirements of the Fire Safe Regulations and County Code. The Department of Transportation and the Fire District reviewed the plan and determined that adequate circulation would be available to provide access to the site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. **Parking.** The project would result in the creation of 12 residential units. The Zoning Ordinance requires two parking spaces for each residential unit. The project would provide for a two-car garage for each of the proposed units. Additionally, four guest parking spaces would be provided throughout the development. There would be no impact.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** The project would not conflict with adopted plans, policies or programs relating to alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

**FINDING:** The impacts of the project related to Transportation would be less than significant. For the Transportation/Traffic category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**



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

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

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

- a. **Wastewater Requirements.** Wastewater treatment would be provided for the project by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). The Facilities Improvement Letter (FIL) dated May 2007 submitted by EID indicated that adequate public wastewater services exist to serve the project. EID is required to comply with requirements for the treatment, collection, processing, and disposal of waste as established by the RWCB. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Construction of New Facilities.** The Facilities Improvement Letter submitted by EID indicated that adequate sewer and water lines exist along the eastern portion of the project site and along the northern property line. Connection to these utility stubs would be further reviewed and verified by EID in Facility Plan Report (FPR). No expansion to the existing system would be necessary to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **New Stormwater Facilities.** The project would not require the construction of new stormwater facilities. The project would be required to comply with the stormwater requirements of the Design and Improvement Standards Manual. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Sufficient Water Supply.** The project would be served by EID public water. The Facilities Improvement Letter submitted for the project indicated that adequate public water is available to serve the project. No new public water improvements would be required, the existing water lines in the area are capable of providing the required water meters and fire flow. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Adequate Capacity.** EID has indicated that the existing water system in the area would be sufficient to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. **Solid Waste Disposal.** 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.

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

- g. Solid Waste Requirements.** County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting and loading of solid waste and recyclables. Onsite solid waste collection would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space would be available onsite. All containers would be located within the garage area or within fenced enclosure areas. The located would be defined within the recorded Conditions, Covenants, and Restriction (CCR's ). Impacts would be less significant.

**FINDING:** Adequate water and sewer systems are available to serve the project. For this 'Utilities and Service Systems' category, impacts would be less than significant.

<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:</b>			
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.** The project would have the potential to significantly impact fish or wildlife species as part of the project. The project would require oak woodland habitat removal and the modifications of onsite riparian features. The project would include conditions of approval requiring the replanting of impacted oak canopy in conformance with the specific general plan policy and surveys to reduce impacts to protected animal species during project construction. Implementation of these specific Mitigation Measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.
- b.** The project would not result in significant cumulative impacts. The project would connect to existing public water and sewer services and would not require the extension infrastructure or utilities outside of the Community Region. The project would be consistent with the existing General Plan Land Use Designation and the surrounding land use pattern. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c.** Based on the discussion contained in this document, potentially significant impacts to human beings would occur with respect to Air Quality and Noise. The project would include standard conditions of approval required by the Air Quality Management District which would apply to project construction. Adherence to these standard conditions would reduce potential impacts to less than significant. The noise assessment prepared for the project determined that interior noise levels would exceed the thresholds established by the General Plan. Implementation

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

of applicable standard conditions of approval and specific Mitigation Measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

**SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards Manual

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.)

**PROJECT SPECIFIC RESOURCE MATERIAL**

*Arborist Report/ Tree Inventory. Sterling Custom Homes, Inc. Lot 172, 3060 Cambridge Road. Kemper Tree Care. June 24, 2005.*

*Arborist Report/ Tree Inventory. Sterling Custom Homes, Inc. Lot 173, 3060 Cambridge Road. Kemper Tree Care. June 24, 2005.*

*Biological Resources Study, Partridge Property +/- 1.2-acre site. El Dorado County, California. Foothill Associates. July 5, 2007.*

*Environmental Noise Assessment, Cambridge Road Town Homes. Bollard Acoustical Consultants. April 20, 2007.*

*Final Report- Air Quality Analysis for Cambridge Road Town Homes Residential Development. Rimpo and Associates. June 30, 2007.*

*Land Capability Report for Cambridge Road Town Homes. CTA Engineering and Surveying. July 2007.*

*Revised Updated Arborist Report for Lots 172 & 173, 3060 Cambridge Road, Cameron Park. Fallen Leaf Tree Service. November 2007.*

*Updated Arborist Report for Lots 172 & 173, 3060 Cambridge Road, Cameron Park. Fallen Leaf Tree Service. September 21, 2007.*

DRAFT 5-23-2008