



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Z07-0032/PD07-0019/TM07-1447/S08-0014

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

Contact Person: Michael C. Baron

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Steve & Tina Farren, 2045 Salmon Falls Rd, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Engineer/Agent Name and Address: Lebeck Young Eng. Inc., Bobbie Lebeck, 3430 Robin Ln #2, Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Location: The property is located on the east side of Salmon Falls Road 1,700+/- feet north of the intersection with Green Valley Road in the El Dorado Hills area.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 126-100-11

Zoning: Estate Residential 5-acre (RE-5)

Section: 14 **T:** 10N **R:** 8E

General Plan Designation: Low-Density Residential (LDR)

Description of Project: The proposed project would create a 12 lot residential subdivision including access roads and associated infrastructure on a 35.46 acre site. The lots would range in size from one to fifteen acres in size. The project would also include one open space lot totaling approximately 15.5 acres. The project includes a request for approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map, a request to Rezone the property from Estate Residential 5-acre to Estate Residential 5-acre with a Planned Development Overlay (RE-5/PD), as well as a Special Use Permit request to allow a private entry gate. Design Waivers have been requested to allow Lot 4 to exceed a 3:1 depth to width ratio, allow two 12 foot paved lanes with unpaved shoulders for road and cul-de-sac (Court A), and allow a 50 foot right-of-way in place of 60 foot right-of-way. LAFCO requires annexation of the property into the local fire and water District.

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:	RE-5	LDR	Single-Family Residential
North:	RE-5	LDR	Vacant Single-Family Residential
East:	RE-5	LDR	Single-Family Residential
South:	R1A	MDR	Single-Family Residential
West:	RE-10	MDR	Single-Family Residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site consists of an 35.46 acre parcel, located on the east side of Salmon Falls Road in the El Dorado Hills area. The site and surrounding properties are primarily composed of oak woodland and non-native grasslands on moderately sloped terrain. Oak woodland is characterized by a canopy of interior live oak with scattered foothill pine, blue oak and California black oak trees above a variety of naturalized and native grasses and forbs. The site is situated at an elevation range of approximately 560 to 730 feet and generally slopes from the east into the creek valley to the west. An existing residence is located on Salmon Falls Road on the western portion of the project site. The site contains both intermittent and ephemeral streams as well as a single wetland. The intermittent stream (New York Creek) meanders from the north down to the southern portion of the property. The ephemeral drainages flow from the western edge of the property into New York Creek. The existing wetland is at the southern edge of the property and is included within the proposed Open Space Lot. The site contains two soil types; Auburn very rocky silt loam 2 to 30% slopes and Auburn silt loam 30 to 50% slopes. Surrounding land uses include rural residences, pastureland, as well as oak savannah. The project site currently has a single family dwelling with accessory structure, which would remain as part of the project.

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

El Dorado County Environmental Management Department
 California Department of Fish and Game
 El Dorado Irrigation District
 El Dorado County Department of Transportation
 El Dorado County Surveyors Office
 LAFCO

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
X	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: June 30, 2008

Printed Name: Michael C. Baron For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: June 30, 2008

Printed Name: Larry Appel For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

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

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Area. The project site is surrounded by existing and undeveloped residential parcels.

Project Characteristics

The project would create 12 residential parcels and one open space lot. Interior roads would be constructed within the project area for internal circulation and access onto Malcom Dixon Road.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the project parcel would be provided an access easement to Malcom Dixon Road, which is a County maintained road. The project would create 23 residential lots, which would require two parking spaces per parcel. Parking for each parcel would be provided within private garages. No impacts to parking would occur as part of the project.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site is currently undeveloped. As part of the project, the extension of utilities services would be required. The project would be required to receive the discretionary approval of the El Dorado Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for annexation into the local water district in order to receive public utility service.

3. Population

The project would not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of both on and off-site road improvements including grading for on-site roadways and driveways.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from Development Services and obtain an approved Fugitive Dust Plan from the Air Quality Management District.

Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project 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 Aesthetics would result from the obstruction of an identified public scenic vista, a substantial change to the natural landscape, introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, or the introduction of a new, significant source of light or glare.

- a. A review of the Important Public Scenic Views identified in the El Dorado County General Plan revealed that the only scenic vista near the project site would be from southbound Salmon Falls Road between Highway 49 and the Folsom Reservoir toward the south and west. The project site would be located on the east side of Salmon Falls Road and would not affect views at this scenic vista. The project site would not be visible from any other identified public scenic vista; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic vistas.
- b. The nearest state scenic highway to the project site would be Highway 50 from Placerville to South Lake Tahoe. The project site would be located several miles west of this portion of Highway 50 and would be not visible from the highway. The proposed project would have no impact on scenic resource within a state scenic highway.
- c. The project would create 12 new low-density residential lots, ranging from 1.0 to 7.2 acres in size, and one open space area, totaling 15.46 acres. The project would enable the construction of 12 new single family residences on the newly created lots. Development of these homes and supporting infrastructure, including the removal of existing vegetation, would result in a change to the existing visual character of the site. Adjacent land uses include similar development consisting of homes on similarly sized parcels. Therefore, the project would be an extension of existing, similar development and would not result in substantial changes to the visual character of the site and its surroundings. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- d. The project would consist of single-family residential development on lots one to 7.2 acres in size. The large lot size would allow for buffers between homes and adjacent uses. Additionally, development of single family dwellings in the future would have to comply with Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, which contains outdoor lighting requirements, intended to control artificial light and glare to the extent that unnecessary illumination of adjacent property would be prohibited. These requirements include the shielding and downward direction of all outdoor lighting. These requirements would also reduce project impacts on night skies. This impact would be considered less than significant.

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

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

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Agriculture Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
 - a. The project site would be zoned for residential use and has historically been used for residential as well as horse pasture. There are two soil types within the project area; Auburn silt loam and Auburn very rocky silt loam. Neither of these soil types is identified as an Important Farmland soil by the California Department of Conservation. The proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland. There would be no impact as a result of the proposed project.
 - b. The project site is currently zoned Estate Residential 5-acre (RE-5). The proposed project includes rezoning the site from Estate Residential 5-acre to Estate Residential 5-Acre Planned Development (RE-5/PD). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would eliminate potential conflicts with any surrounding or existing agricultural zoning. The project site would not be under a current Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the potential impact would be less than significant.
 - c. An increased density of single family residential use would result in utility and roadway extensions, which may aid in the future development of other agricultural sites nearby. However, the lands immediately surrounding the site have a Residential General Plan Land Use Designations. Therefore, residential development of these sites would be anticipated and would be consistent with the General Plan. This impact would be considered less than significant.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to agriculture resources. Identified thresholds of significance for the agricultural category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

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

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

- Emissions of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) or Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x) from construction or operation of the proposed project exceed 82 lbs/day (see Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District’s *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*); or
- Emissions of Particulate Matter (PM₁₀), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Sulfur Dioxide (O₂) or NO_x from construction or operation of the proposed project result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS); or
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants result in the lifetime probability of contracting cancer exceeding one in one million (ten in one million if best available control technologies for toxics are applied) OR result in ground-level concentrations of non-carcinogenic toxic air contaminants exceeding a Hazard Index of one. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
 - a. The project site would be regulated by the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District and the applicable air quality plan is the 1994 Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan (State Implementation Plan). The updated air quality plan would be based on the growth projections and land use designations contained in the General Plans of each jurisdiction within the Sacramento region. The project would be consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan and would therefore be included in the updated air quality plan. Because growth resulting from the proposed project was anticipated and included in the air quality plan, no conflict would occur. Therefore, impacts as a result of the proposed project would be considered less than significant.
 - b. The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of six standard conditions of approval, the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality. As part of the conditions, a fugitive dust plan application must be prepared and submitted to the AQMD prior to the beginning of project construction. These measures are included as conditions of project approval and would reduce any impacts in this category to a level of less than significant.
 - c. As stated above under section “a,” construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in cumulative impacts to the air basin.
 - d. Sensitive receptors are considered residences, schools, parks, hospitals, or other land uses where children or the elderly congregate, or where outdoor activity would be the primary land use. Sensitive receptors within the vicinity of the project site may consist of residences on adjacent lands. As noted in Response (a) above, neither the

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

construction nor operation of the proposed project would result in substantial increases in pollutant concentrations. Once developed, the project site would contain residences which are considered sensitive receptors. However, no sources of substantial pollutant concentrations are located in the vicinity of the project site. Thus potential impacts would be considered less than significant.

- e. Future Construction activities would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel powered engines that emit exhaust fumes. Asphalt paving as well as the application of architectural coatings are also sources of construction-related odors. However, construction-related emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday, and the exhaust odors would dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity of the equipment. Operation of the proposed project would involve the use of products for home maintenance such as paints or fertilizers and other landscaping materials. Odors created by home maintenance activities would be minimal, would quickly dissipate and would not differ substantially from those created by surrounding land uses. This impact would be considered less than significant.

Findings: It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project in that no sensitive receptors would be adversely impacted, no objectionable odors would be created and the project would not obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan. Based on the inclusion of standard conditions of approval, no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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:

- 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;

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

- 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. Foothill and Associates conducted a biological assessment of the project site April 23, 2008. During the survey, information was collected covering the types of biological communities within the site, plant and animal species observed or their sign and the suitability of habitat on site and adjoining areas to support special-status species. Foothill and Associates concluded that the project site does contain suitable habitat for special status species. The primary biological community found on the project site is mixed oak woodland. Oak woodland is dominated by interior live oak and scatterings of foothill pine, blue oak and California black oak. Understory vegetation may include chaparral honeysuckle, poison-oak, toyon and monkeyflower, but is generally dominated by species found in adjacent and interspersed grassland areas. Wetland vegetation also occurs on the site, on the southwestern end of the project site adjacent to New York Creek. The Biological Assessment of the project site by Foothill and Associates concluded that the site did not contain special status plant species within the project area. However the site did contain suitable habitat for special status wildlife, which is further discussed below.

Special Status Wildlife: The site contains habitat which may support special status wildlife including Cooper’s hawk and White-tailed kite.

Cooper’s hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*) is a breeding resident throughout most woodland habitats of California. Breeding takes place in dense-canopied trees from foothill pine-oak woodlands up to ponderosa pine forest. Nesting sites are usually located near water. This species hunts in broken woodland and habitat edges, where they catch small birds in the air. They prefer nesting sites in riparian growths of deciduous trees, as in canyon bottoms and on river flood plains, although live oaks are often used. The typical breeding season runs from March through August. Nesting of other raptors known from the region, including red-shouldered hawk, red-tailed hawk, and great horned owl, could also be adversely affected if construction takes place during the identified breeding/nesting season. Take of any active raptor nest is prohibited under Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5.

Cooper’s hawk was not observed on site during the field assessment portion of this study; however, suitable foraging and nesting habitat for this species occurs throughout the project site and surrounding woodland areas. This species prefers nesting in riparian woodland habitats, but is also known to nest in live oaks. The project site is therefore expected to provide good nesting habitat for this species. The following mitigation measure is applied to the project to reduce potential impacts to Cooper’s hawk and other nesting raptors including red-shouldered hawk, red-tailed hawk, and great horned owl, all of which could occur within the project site.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-1

To avoid take of active raptor nests, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of proposed development activities. Pre-construction surveys shall follow protocol guidelines issued by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). If no active raptor nests are found to occur, necessary tree removal shall proceed. If active raptor nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the site, the following actions shall be taken in order to avoid impacts to nesting raptors:

1. **Prohibit construction within 150 feet of any trees containing active raptor nests; these areas shall be marked with fencing or tape in order to clearly delineate areas where construction is prohibited.**
2. **Construction shall not resume within 150 feet of any identified nest until the end of the typical nesting season; August 31. Construction may resume prior to the end of the nesting season, only if all raptor fledges have left the nest.**
3. **Construction shall not resume prior to consultation by the applicants biologist with the California Department of Fish and Game to determine that the proposed project would not result in a “take” of any rare, threatened, endangered or special status species.**

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

The applicant shall provide Development Services with a letter from a qualified Biologist verifying compliance prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Incorporation of the above mitigation measure would reduce impacts to Cooper’s hawk and other raptors to less than significant.

White-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*) is an uncommon to fairly common resident and is found in grassy foothill slopes interspersed with oaks (including interior live oak, agricultural areas, and marshy bottomlands). They generally forage in undisturbed open grasslands, farmlands, meadows and emergent wetlands, in areas with a high prey base. Nest trees range from single isolated trees to trees within larger stands, located adjacent to foraging areas. Nests are constructed near the top of dense oak or other tall trees from 20 to 100 feet above ground. Breeding takes place from February to October, with peak activity from May to August.

The white-tailed kite was not observed during site surveys. Additionally, only limited areas of suitable nesting and foraging habitat for this species occur on the project site and nearby locations. Therefore, it is expected that white-tailed kite has a low potential for nesting within the project site. Impacts to white-tailed kite are considered less than significant.

Incorporation of **MM BIO-1** would reduce impacts to rare, threatened and endangered species to less than significant.

- b. The project site contains an intermittent stream known as New York Creek and a small riparian area connected to New York Creek on the southern end of the development. Interim policy 7.3.3.4 for the adopted 2004 El Dorado County General Plan, Conservation and Open Space Element, addresses buffers and setbacks for the protection of riparian areas and wetlands and shall be incorporated into the proposed project. Impacts to riparian areas are considered less than significant.
- c. A wetland delineation was not provided for the project, however the project proposes to avoid all intermittent streams and riparian areas.

The project site lies in the South Fork American River HUC unit. The project site slopes to the east and west bisected by New York Creek running from north to south through the parcel. Several streams and upland swales across the project site flow west to east and empty into New York Creek.

These waters should be considered connected to or adjacent to waters of the United States; and are potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States and subject to interstate commerce. The project may require the crossing of the riparian area within the site. Any dredging, filling, removal or other alterations to wetlands or waters of the United States on the project would require permitting pursuant to sections 401 and 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act. Additionally, Under California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) Code Section 1602, a discretionary Stream Alteration Agreement permit may be required for any construction activities that would substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake designated by the DFG. State and federal regulations governing the protection of wetlands are sufficient to ensure impacts are less than significant.

- d. Migratory Deer Herd Habitats occur within some areas of El Dorado County. The project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any migratory deer herd habitats as shown in the El Dorado County General Plan. This impact would be less than significant.
- e. As determined by an Arborist Report, conducted by Foothill and Associates, dated March 22, 2007, the project site is covered by 26.7 acres of Oak Canopy. The on-site canopy comprises approximately 76 percent of the project site. Oak canopy would be impacted as part of road and infrastructure improvements and future residential development

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

of the site. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes retention and replacement provisions under “Option A” and payment of a conservation in-lieu fee in accordance with “Option B”. The required retention under “Option A” would be 70 percent which would be consistent with Policy 7.4.4.4. The project would be required to pay the mitigation fee established by “Option B”. The mitigation fee is determined by the amount of oak canopy removed as a result of development. The arborist report prepared for the project estimated that a total of 8.1 acres of oak canopy would be impacted. The applicant proposes to comply with Policy 7.4.4.4 by utilization of either a combination of Option A & B or only Option B, which would be consistent with the Oak Woodland Conservation Ordinance. Impacts to oak woodlands would be less than significant.

- f. Protected and sensitive and natural resources/areas within El Dorado County include: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database and shown in exhibit 5.12-7 of the El Dorado County General Plan EIR. The project site does not include, nor would it be adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. This potential impact would be considered less than significant.

Findings: Potential impacts could result to biological resources due to the proposed project. The project could impact threatened, sensitive or rare animal species. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified above would reduce the potential for impacts to biological resources to less than significant. Impacts to riparian habitat, wetlands, and migratory wildlife habitats, as well as conflicts with community conservation plans and habitat conservation plans have been determined to be less than significant. It has been determined that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to biological resources with the incorporation of the above mentioned mitigation measure.

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 to cultural resources 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 “Determination of Eligibility and Effect for the Farren Subdivision Project Area” prepared by Peak & Associates Inc. in June 2007. According to the study, “For the purposes of CEQA, we conclude that there will be no impact to important cultural resources from implementation of the project.” 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.

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

- c. A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil locales.
- d. Due to the size and scope of the project, there would be the potential to discover human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery. However, based on the results of the cultural resource study, the project would be unlikely to disturb any human remains. In the event that remains are discovered, all work shall be halted and the significance of the remains shall be evaluated in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Findings: The project does not have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to cultural resources. Potential impacts to cultural, historical, archaeological and paleontological resources have not been identified. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources are less than significant.

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Geologic Resources and Soils would occur if:

- 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; or
- 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

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

- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
 - a. There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. There would be no impacts.
 - b. Road building and site development would occur on grades of up to 30 percent. These activities could alter drainage patterns in the project area, causing erosion and/or loss of topsoil. All grading activities must comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. Adherence to these regulations would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.
 - c. The project would be located on a moderately-sloping site in El Dorado County. The potential for earthquake or ground shaking activity is low in the region due to the lack of faults or geologically active sites in the area. The potential for impacts related to the stability of the soils would be low because of the lack of geologic activity. Therefore, impacts resulting from potentially unstable soils are less than significant.
 - d. According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*, the erosion hazard of soils at the subject site is moderate. Based upon this information, the impact from expansive soils would be less than significant.
 - f. The project proposes to connect to the public sewer system where adequate capacity exists (FIL Dated February 22, 2007). Therefore, there would be no impacts to soils as a result of waste water disposal.

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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. Hazardous materials may be used and transported to and from the project site during construction of the proposed project including construction equipment fuels, paints, debris, etc. Additionally, once constructed, residents of the site may use common household hazardous materials such as fertilizers, pesticides, paints, solvents, etc. The transport, use and storage of hazardous materials on the project site would be minimal and are strictly regulated at the federal, state, and local levels. In the unlikely event of a hazardous material leak or spill, the El Dorado Hills Fire Department would respond to manage the emergency. The closest fire station would be over one mile south of the site. See Section XIII, Response (a) for a full discussion of fire protection services. The transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials resulting from project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public. The potential for impact would be less than significant.
 - b. Hazardous materials may be used during construction and operation of the proposed project; however, such use would be minimal and would be strictly regulated at the federal, state, and local levels. In the unlikely event of the release of hazardous materials, the El Dorado Hills Fire Department would respond to manage the emergency. The closest fire station would be over one mile south of the site. See Section XIII, Response (a) for a full discussion of fire protection services. The potential for upset or accident conditions to occur would be considered low and therefore the potential impact would be less than significant.
 - c. There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site and therefore there would be no potential for impact.
 - d. The project site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and therefore there would be no impact.
 - e. The project area is not located with an airport land use plan area. The nearest airport to the proposed project site, Cameron Park Airport, is located approximately five miles east of the project site. Therefore there would be no potential for impact.

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

- f. There are no private airports or airstrips within two miles of the project site and therefore no for potential impact.
- g. The proposed project would not conflict with any County-adopted emergency or disaster response or evacuation plans as it would not change any existing roads, highways or traffic patterns. According to the Traffic Impact and Operations Analysis prepared, the proposed project would not adversely affect emergency vehicle access at the project site or study intersections. Additionally, the project design must comply with emergency access standards contained in the El Dorado County SRA Fire Safe Regulations (Title 14, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Article 2 Emergency Access) with regard to road width, surface, grade, and radius; turnouts; driveways; and gating. County review of the proposed Tentative Subdivision Map would ensure compliance with these standards. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- h. The site is located within a relatively rural area, with grasslands and vegetation capable of supporting or spreading a wildland fire. CDF has established a fire hazard severity classification system, which assesses the fire potential for wildlands based on three factors: fuel load, climate, and topography. The classification system provides three classes of fire hazards: Moderate, High, and Very High. According to El Dorado County General Plan, the project site is within an area classified as High fire hazard severity. In compliance with CDF regulations, the county requires the creation of defensible space around structures and roads. In order to comply with the state’s defensible space requirement, the project must incorporate the following design features:
 1. Clearance of 30-100 feet of flammable vegetation from around buildings; on steeper parcels, fire safe Clearance requirements are determined by the local fire protection agency;
 2. Removal of branches from within 10 feet of a chimney; and
 3. Removal of all flammable vegetation from roof tops, including dry leaves and pine needles.

In addition to the above requirements, all buildings within the project area must comply with Chapter 8.08 of the El Dorado County Code, also known as the County Fire Hazard Ordinance, which includes rules and regulations covering emergency access, signing and numbering, and emergency water. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce the potential impact to less than significant.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts resulting from hazardous materials nor would the project result in exposure of schools or other sensitive areas to hazardous materials. There are no airports or dangerous intersections which would impact the project. Impacts in this category would be reduced with adherence to all existing, applicable safety regulations and policies. Identified thresholds of significance for the hazards category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase			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>			
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; or
 - 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; or
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge; or
 - 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 proposed project would include the eventual construction of 12 new homes which would be serviced by public water and sewer. Therefore, the potential impacts are less than significant.
 - b. Water service for the proposed project would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District. The District obtains water entirely from surface water sources. Therefore, the eventual construction of single family dwellings would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. Groundwater recharge rates on the project site are low, due to the nature of the soils and the steepness of the slopes and would only be minimally altered as a result of the proposed project. The potential impacts are considered 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.
 - d. A single intermittent stream (New York Creek), two ephemeral drainages, and a single wetland are found on the project site. These waterways generally carry water from the site during storm events and are expected to be dry during part or all of the summer. Alterations would be made to drainage patterns on the project site due to changes

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

in grading and the creation of impervious surfaces associated with new roads, homes and driveways. However, water would be channeled through drainage ditches along roads and through culverts under roads, the placement of which would coincide with existing drainage patterns. The project would not result in substantial changes in drainage volumes or patterns, nor would the proposed project result in on- or off-site flooding. This impact would be less than significant.

- e. According to the drainage study prepared for the proposed project, the carrying capacities of existing natural drainage ways would be unaffected by project implementation.

Pollutant discharges from construction activities would be minimized through the implementation of an approved SWPPP (see Response (c) above). Once the project site has been developed, pollutant discharges to waterways, including automotive greases and oils, heavy metals, pesticides and fertilizers, may increase due to runoff flowing over project driveways, roads, and landscaped areas. Operational phase stormwater pollution is not regulated by the Clean Water Act; however, El Dorado County has developed programs to inform residents of ways to minimize polluted runoff from lawn care, septic system maintenance, auto care, and landscaping activities. The proposed project consists of only 12 new residential homes and would not be expected to provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This impact would be considered less than significant.

- f. Impacts to water quality resulting from the proposed project are addressed by regulations and permit requirements including a SWPPP, dredge and fill permits, construction set-back requirements and Best Management Practices. Impacts to water quality are discussed in detail in this section as well as the Biological Resources section of this document. There are no additional impacts that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. This impact would be less than significant.

g&h. The project site would not be located within a 100-year floodplain. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel 060040 0679 D, the project site is classified as flood zone C or an area of minimal flooding. Therefore there would be no impact.

- i. The project site would not be located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters. According to the land capability report, “no evidence flooding and flood hazards downstream of the project site were found for this project.” (*Land Capability Report, Lebeck & Young Engineering Inc., June 2007*). Impacts would be less than significant.
- j. The project site is not located near an ocean and is not subject to risk of tsunamis. The project site is not near a body of water large enough to generate a seiche. Mudflows are unlikely due to the soil types in the project area and therefore there would be no potential for impact.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to hydrology or water quality. Identified thresholds of significance for the hydrology and water quality category have not been exceeded 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

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. The project would introduce additional housing into a partially developed area and require a rezone. The surrounding area is residential in nature and the character of land use would not be significantly altered by the proposed project. The project would not divide an established community. Thus the potential impact would be considered less than significant.
 - b. The project includes the Rezoning of the site from Estate Residential 5-acre (RE-5) to Estate Residential 5-Acre/Planned Development (RE-5/PD). The El Dorado County General Plan land use designation for the project site is Low Density Residential. The proposed project would be consistent with this land use designation and would not require a General Plan Amendment. This impact would be considered less than significant.
 - c. Protected and sensitive natural areas within El Dorado County include: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database and the El Dorado County General Plan. The project site does not include, nor would it be adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. Therefore there would be no potential impact.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to land uses. The proposed project would change the Zoning for the proposed site from Estate Residential 5-acre to Residential 5-acre/Planned Development, however this would not result in significant impacts. Identified thresholds of significance for this category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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 located within the Mineral Resources Overlay Zone designated in the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance for areas with known mineral resources. Therefore there is no impact.
 - b. The project would not limit the ability of property owners to extract mineral resources should such resources become known in the future. Therefore there is no impact.

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

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to mineral resources. Identified thresholds of significance for the mineral resources category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

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; or
- 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. Noise would be generated on the project site from construction activities associated with new homes and improvements to roadways and infrastructure. This noise generation would be temporary and intermittent in nature. Construction noise is subject to Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. This policy identifies maximum allowable noise exposure for construction generated noise, and outlines limited construction hours to ensure less than significant impacts from construction-related noise. Compliance with the above noise policy is sufficient to ensure that impacts due to construction noise are less than significant.
 - b. Ground borne vibrations are associated with heavy vehicles (i.e. railroad) and with heavy equipment operations. All noise generation due to construction activities would be required to comply with the Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element as noted above. Vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project would be typical of traffic generated by the adjacent residential uses; passenger cars and trucks, which are not a source of significant vibration. This impact would be considered less than significant.
 - c. Subdivision of the land and construction and occupation of the 12 additional homes would result in periodic noise generation from the use of vehicles, noises generated on home sites, and landscape maintenance. The overall types

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

and volumes of noise would not be excessive and would be similar in character to surrounding land uses. This impact would be considered less than significant.

- d. The construction phase of the project would result in an increase in noise levels. Construction noise would be temporary and would be minimized by compliance with Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. Project operation would also result in periodic noise generation above current levels from the use of vehicles, landscaping equipment, etc. The overall types and volumes of noise from project operation would not be excessive and would be similar in character to surrounding land uses. Thus, as a result, this impact would be less than significant.
- e. The project site would not be located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The Cameron Airpark Airport would be the nearest airport to the project area and would be approximately five miles away. The project site would be located outside of the 55dB CNEL area on the airport noise contour map for Cameron Park Airport. Thus there would be no impact.
- f. The project site would not be located within two miles of a private airstrip and there would be no potential impact.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts due to noise. The project would increase ambient noise levels during construction; however, this would be mitigated by limiting the hours of operation. Additional noise increases would result from implementation of the project, however, identified thresholds of significance for the noise category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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 community of El Dorado Hills has a population of over 25,000 people. The proposed project would result in the addition of 12 new, low density residential lots to an area which is already used in a similar fashion. The increase in population resulting from the project would be minimal and the number of new residences, and corresponding increase in population would not be considered substantial. Additionally, the project would not extend infrastructure to adjacent properties or otherwise result in indirect growth. Furthermore, properties surrounding the project site have been designated for residential development; therefore, approval of the proposed project would not indirectly result in additional, unplanned growth. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.
 - b. The project would not result in the loss of existing housing and therefore there would be no impact.

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

c. The project would not result in the displacement of residents and therefore would be no impact.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to population or housing. The project would not substantially increase the population, nor displace housing or residents. Identified thresholds of significance for the population and housing category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

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; or
- 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; or
- Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services; or
- Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources; or
- 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 for the project site would be provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire. The project site would be annexed, through discretionary approval of LAFCO, into the El Dorado Hills Fire District and would be within the Department’s Response Zone 84b. The closest fire station to the project site would be Station 84 located at 2180 Francisco Drive. The development and annexation of new homes into the District would result in an increased demand for services but would not significantly impact the Department. The applicant would be responsible for the payment of development fees to the District which would help fund required capitol improvements. With annexation into the Department and payment of fees, this impact would be less than significant.

b. The El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department would provide law enforcement services to the proposed development. The development of new homes on the project site would result in an increase in calls for service but would not significantly impact the Department. The project applicant would be responsible for the payment of development fees to the Department to offset any project impacts. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.

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

- c. The project site would be located within the Rescue Union School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The occupancy of proposed residences may result in new enrollments at local schools. Under Senate Bill 50, school districts can levy developer fees from residential construction to pay for school improvements. Fees would be assessed as part of the County’s building permit process and are sufficient to offset any project impacts to the school district resulting in a less than significant impact.
- d. Park and recreation services would be provided by the County and special districts, which maintain facilities within the County. It should be noted that although the subdivision is not within the service boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Service District and no property tax increment would be allotted to the District, future residents would likely use the District’s parks and recreation facilities, creating a “free-rider” situation. There are numerous parks located within five miles of the project site with a total area of over 50 acres. Although the proposed project includes 15.4 acres of open space, this would not be considered developed parkland. The applicant would be required to dedicate land or pay a fee pursuant to Section 16.12.090 of the County Subdivision Ordinance to mitigate the increased demand for parkland. Thus, this impact would be considered less than significant.
- e. No other government services would be adversely affected by the project and any potential impacts are less than significant.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to public services. There are adequate police, fire, school, park, and other public services available to serve the proposed project without resulting in significant impacts to the physical environment. Identified thresholds of significance for the public services category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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. Park and recreation services would be provided by the County and special districts, which maintain facilities within the County. It should be noted that although the subdivision is not within the service boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Service District and no property tax increment would be allotted to the District, future residents would likely use the District’s parks and recreation facilities, creating a “free-rider” situation. There are numerous parks located within five miles of the project site with a total area of over 50 acres. Although the proposed project includes 15.4 acres of open space, this would not be considered developed parkland. The project applicant would be required to dedicate land or pay a fee pursuant to Section 16.12.090 of the County Subdivision Ordinance to mitigate the increased demand for parkland. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.
 - b. The project includes 15.4 acres of open space, which would not require construction of recreational facilities, and would be intended only for the use of residents within the project area and protect riparian features. The project does

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

not include nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities and therefore, there would be no impact.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to recreational resources. The project applicant would be required to dedicate land or pay a fee to offset impacts to community park facilities. Identified thresholds of significance for the recreation category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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; or
- 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. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that the project does not exceed the thresholds established in the 2004 General Plan. A Traffic Study was prepared for the project which determined that payment of the established mitigation fee under the Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) fee program would reduce potential traffic impacts. The number of vehicles associated with the project would not change current vehicle trip rates and would not measurably affect traffic volumes or levels of service on a permanent basis such that County standards would be exceeded. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the traffic study prepared for the project and determined that the required road improvements and payment of Traffic Impact Fees at the time of building permit issuance would reduce impacts to less than significant.

c. The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns and there would be no associated impacts.

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

- d. The project does not contain any design features that could create a hazard. The project may include road and driveway construction on grades of up to 30 percent; however, compliance with a required grading permit would ensure proper grading and safe conditions. Properties surrounding the project site are either undeveloped or developed with similar uses. No incompatibility would result from project implementation and thus this potential impact would be considered less than significant.
- e. The project includes a single access point to lots 1 through 11 and an existing encroachment onto Salmon Falls Road for Lot 12. The project design must comply with emergency access standards contained in the El Dorado County SRA Fire Safe Regulations (Title 14, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Article 2 Emergency Access) with regard to road width, surface, grade, and radius; turnouts; driveways; and gating. County review of the proposed Tentative Subdivision Map would ensure compliance with these standards. This impact would be less than significant.
- f. The proposed project would comply with Section 17.18.060 of the County Code requiring two off street parking spaces not in tandem per residential unit. In addition, proposed residences would likely include garages providing additional parking spaces. This impact would be less than significant.
- 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. 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.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to traffic, emergency access, air traffic, parking, or public transit. Identified thresholds of significance for the traffic and transportation category have not been exceeded and no significant impacts would result from the project.

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

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

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; or
- 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; or
- 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. The project would be connected to public sewer and water and therefore any potential impact would be less than significant.
- b. Water service for the proposed development would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Prior to any provision of service from EID, the subject parcel is required to be annexed into the District’s service boundaries, which can only be granted through discretionary approval of the LAFCO Commission. However, the subject parcel is not contiguous with EID’s current service boundaries. Contiguity must be established between the subject parcel and the District prior to, or in conjunction with, LAFCO approval of the annexation, per Government Code §56119 and El Dorado LAFCO Policy 3.9.3. The District’s Salmon Falls Water Storage Tank is located less than 1 mile to the north east of the project site. The El Dorado Hills Fire Department has determined that the minimum fire flow required for the project is 1,500 gallons per minute for a two hour duration, while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. The project applicant would be responsible for the construction of any on and off-site water supply infrastructure required for project development.

The proposed parcels would be serviced by the public sewer system and may require the expansion of existing facilities as a result, however associated impacts as a result of the expansion of existing facilities are considered less than significant.

- c. Storm drainage facilities required by the project are limited to on-site drainage ditches and culverts. Potential environmental effects of constructing these drainage facilities are considered throughout this document as part of the project. Any potential impacts would be avoided through the implementation of the County Grading Ordinance and thus this potential impact would be considered less than significant.
- d. The proposed project includes the annexation of the project site into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) for the provision of domestic water, sewer, and fire hydrants. LAFCO’s discretionary approval is required for annexation, and contiguity must be established prior to annexation. EID currently obtains water from surface water sources including Sly Park Reservoir and Folsom Reservoir. The proposed project would require 11 equivalent dwelling units of water supply. Because FIL’s can be up to two years old, the most accurate source for water availability is in EID’s *2007 Water Resources and Service Reliability Report (WRSRR)*. It should also be noted that the firm yield number does not take into account the existing EID contractual commitments in the region, which can also be found in the WRSRR, nor does it reflect recent annexations approved by LAFCO that have not yet purchased water meters. According to the EID Facility Improvement Letter for the project dated February 22, 2007, the District had 1,151 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) which may be available to the proposed project.

Pursuant to Section 15.16.050 of the El Dorado County Code, no permit shall be issued for the construction of a building having plumbing facilities therein, until proof of an adequate water supply is provided as required by the Division of Environmental Management.

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

EID anticipates availability of the required water supply for the proposed project and compliance with the County Code would ensure that the project would not be approved unless this water supply actually becomes available and would be committed to the project. EID service to the proposed project would be contingent upon the project's contiguity to EID's service area, LAFCO approval of the annexation, the future availability of water supply, approval of the Facility Plan Report, construction of all water facilities, and acceptance of the facilities by EID. The potential impact would be considered less than significant.

- e. The applicant provided a Facilities Improvement Letter (FIL), issued by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). According to the letter, a 6-inch sewer line abuts the property along the southern property line in Uplands Drive. The sewer line has adequate capacity at this time. Therefore impact would be considered 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. Assembly Bill 939, known as the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, mandates all jurisdictions to divert 50 percent of their waste from the landfill by the year 2000. El Dorado County did not meet the year 2000 diversion goal achieving only a 38 percent diversion rate in the year 2001. The County applied for and received a time extension until July 1, 2004. A preliminary diversion rate summary for the County indicates that the diversion goal was achieved in 2005. The proposed project would be required by County Ordinance to divert 50 percent of all construction debris. Additionally, residential recycling collection service would be provided to the proposed development by the County. This impact would be less than significant.

Findings: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to water, wastewater, drainage, or solid waste utilities. Identified thresholds of significance for the utilities and service systems category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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	
			X	

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. <i>Does the project:</i>			
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			

Discussion:

- a. The project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to biological resources. Potential impacts to biological resources include the alteration of habitat and/or direct impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species and the loss of oak woodlands. Impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species would be mitigated by **MM BIO-1**, which requires surveys for Cooper’s hawk at appropriate times prior to construction and consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game to determine appropriate avoidance measures. Additional impacts to biological resources are less than significant.

The project would not cause degradation of scenic resources, water quality, cultural and historic resources, or other resources associated with the physical and biological communities and environment of the project. With implementation of the mitigation measures described above, this impact would be less than significant.

- b. The project would not involve development or changes in land use that would result in increased population growth. Impacts due to increased demand for public services associated with the project would be offset by the payment of fees as required by service providers. The project would not contribute substantially to increased traffic in the area and the project would not require an increase in the wastewater treatment capacity of the County. As discussed throughout this environmental document, the project would not contribute to a substantial decline in water quality, air quality, noise, biological resources, agricultural resources, or cultural resources under cumulative conditions. Cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the project are less than significant.
- c. All impacts identified in this MND are either less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that 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:

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170, 4719)

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.)

Additional Resources:

Lebeck & Young Engineering, Drainage Study for Farren Property, May 2007.

Foothil & Associates, Habitat Assessment for Special Status Species for the Farren Project Site, May 5, 2008

EN2 Resources, Air Quality Analysis for the Farren Property June 19, 2007

Peak & Associates, Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment Farren Property, June 2007

Foothill & Associates, Farren Property; Initial Arborist Report and Tree Survey, Preservation, and Replacement Plan, March 22, 2007.

Lebeck & Young Engineering Inc, Land Capability Study for Farren Property. June 25, 2007