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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

Project Title: GGV Walgreens; Rezone (Z 07-0017), Planned Development (PD 08-0001), Parcel Map (P 08-0001)

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

Contact Person: Gordon Bell | **Phone Number:** (530) 647-1932

Property Owner's Name and Address: Granite Grado Ventures LLC

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Leonard Grado, 4330 Golden Center Drive, Ste. D, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Agent's Name and Address: Bobbie Lebeck; Lebeck.Young Engineering, 3430 Robin Lane, Bldg. #2, Cameron Park, CA 95682;

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Lebeck.Young Engineering, 3430 Robin Lane, Bldg. #2, Cameron Park, CA 95682; Attn: Bobbie Lebeck

Project Location: 3850, 3858, & 3870 Forni Road, Northwest corner of the intersection of Missouri Flat Road and Forni Road, west of the City of Placerville

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 327-213-10, 11, 12 (4.08 acres)

Zoning: R1A, One-acre Residential

Section: 24 **T:** 10 **R:** 10

General Plan Designation: C, Commercial

Description of Project:

1. Request to rezone property from R1A (One-Acre Residential) to CG-PD (General Commercial-Planned Development.
2. Tentative Parcel Map (commercial) to create four parcels ranging in size from 0.67 acres to 1.72 acres.
3. Development Plan to create a commercial center with four retail buildings of 6,000, 7,132, 8,285 and 14,820 square feet in size respectively.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	R1A	C	Vacant Land/Residential
North:	R1A	C	Residential
East:	R1A	C	Shopping Center
South:	R1A	C	Residential
West:	R1A	C	Open Space

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is located on the west side of Missouri Flat Road just north of Forni Road. The project site currently consists of three parcels with elevations ranging from 1760 feet in the southeast corner to 1794 feet in the northwest corner. The easterly two parcels are relatively flat (with the exception of perimeter slopes which range up to 30%)and devoid of vegetation as they have been disturbed due

demolition of residential structures and preliminary grading for the proposed project. The westerly parcel is also relatively flat and is occupied by two vacant residential units slated for demolition. Vegetation on this parcel consists of non-native grasslands and an extensive oak woodland.
Two soil units have been mapped on the project site, Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes and Boomer gravelly loam (BhC), 3 to 15 percent slopes. Both soils are very well drained, with slow to medium runoff potential, and slight to moderate erosion hazard.

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

1. El Dorado County Building Department building permits
2. El Dorado County Department of Trnasportation: grading permit, encroachment permits
3. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District: Fugitive Dust Plan

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	**X**	Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	**X**	Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation	**X**	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: 7/16/2008

Printed Name: Gordon Bell For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____ For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

    a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
    b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				**X**
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				**X**
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character quality of the site and its surroundings?				**X**
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			**X**	

Discussion:

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

a. The project site is located within the Missouri Flat Corridor, which is an area designated primarily for commercial uses. There are no scenic vistas in this area as designated by the County's General Plan. As such, development of this project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. There would be no impact.

b. The nearest state scenic highway, as designated and listed by Caltrans, is U.S. Highway 50 beginning from the eastern limits of the Government Center interchange (Forni Road/Placerville Drive) to South Lake Tahoe. The Government Center interchange is approximately one mile north of the project site. However, the site is not visible from this interchange, nor are there any scenic resources in the area, thus there would be no impact.

c. The project site has historically been developed with residential uses and now stands as a vacant undeveloped cluster of parcels. The southernmost parcel does include a moderately dense oak woodland, while the southerly two parcels have been graded and cleared and are virtually devoid of vegetation. Surrounding land uses include an existing Walmart shopping center to the east, a commercial shopping center to the northeast, and large lot residential development to the west, north and to the south. The General Plan designates land use on this parcel and other parcels along Missouri Flat as Commercial, which is a land use designation that will ultimately define the visual character of the area. Development of the site with a retail shopping center will substantially change the character of the area from what was previously a large lot residential area to one that is more commercial in nature. This development will be in character with existing shopping centers to the east and northeast and will be consistent with that anticipated by the General Plan and the Missouri Flat Design Guidelines. Removal of existing trees on the southerly parcel will substantially change the character of this area, however, extensive landscaping proposed as part of this project would reduce this impact to less than significant levels.

d. The proposed project will introduce additional lighting in this area in order to light the shopping center. This additional lighting would be consistent with the Missouri Flat Design Guidelines and would not adversely impact day or nighttime views in the area consistent with the commercial land use designation. All future outdoor lighting for future development will be required conform to Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, and be fully

shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation. There would be no impact.

Finding: The proposed project would result in the construction of commercial buildings and parking lots on parcels previously utilized for residential purposes. This will result in a change in character of the area. However, the El Dorado County General Plan adopted in 2004 has designated these parcels for commercial uses and analyzed potential impacts resulting from the conversion of this land to such uses. The General Plan EIR concluded that these impacts were less than significant. As the project will not impinge upon scenic vistas, will fit in with existing and future designated commercial character of the area, and will ensure that all lighting is shielded to the extent that it will not produce significant glare on surrounding properties, impacts are considered to be less than significant for this "Aesthetics" category.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				**X**
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				**X**
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				**X**

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not considered to be "Prime Farmland" nor is there properties designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses and there would be no loss of productive agricultural land or conflict with agricultural uses. There would be no impact.

The El Dorado County Resource Conservation District (RCD) has indicated (letter dated February 11, 2008) that the BhC (Boomer gravelly loam) soils onsite are classified as Statewide Important Farmland. They are concerned with the loss of the agricultural potential of these productive soils due to conversion to urban uses. These soils comprise about 50% of the soils located onsite. However, as noted above, the site has been historically and currently designated for non-agricultural uses (residential and commercial). In addition, there are no contiguous agricultural operations in the

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

vicinity of the project, only residential and commercial. Because there are no agricultural support operations in the vicinity of the project, and surrounding land uses would be considered incompatible with agricultural operations, the impact resulting from the loss of these soils is considered less than significant.

b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract because the site is not designated for agricultural use. There would be no impact.

c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land under the Farmland Mapping Program. Surrounding properties are also similarly designated. There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding "urban" neighborhood. For this "Agriculture" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

III. AIR QUALITY. *Would the project:*				
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 non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		**X**		
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				**X**
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				**X**

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and NO_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);

- Emissions of PM_{10}, CO, SO_2 and NO_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or

- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must

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

demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

a. **Air Quality Plan.** In 1994, the Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan was adopted. This is also called the State Implementation Plan(SIP). The Clean Air Plan was designed to bring the Sacramento Region, which includes all of El Dorado County except for the Lake Tahoe Basin, into compliance with the federal one-hour ozone standard. The SIP includes adopted measures and commitments to adopt measures to reduce ozone emissions, along with contingency measures and a demonstration of emission reductions sufficient for attainment of air quality standards. In 2006, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District initiated a Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan Update, which would be designed to bring the region into compliance with the federal eight-hour ozone standard promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1997.

As discussed in c) below, the project would be considered in compliance with the Clean Air Plan if the County requires the project to implement any applicable emission reduction measures contained in and/or derived from the Clean Air Plan. A list of emission reduction measures, applicable to a variety of land uses, is available in Appendix E of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) CEQA Guide. As of 2006, the County is in non-attainment status of state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM_{10}. Emissions of these pollutants generated by the project would be potentially significant.

Based on the AQMD CEQA manual, the proposed retail development, measuring total of 36,237 square feet, is below the screening level threshold of 62,000 square feet in determining long-term air quality impacts. Therefore, the project would pose less than significant impact.

b. As of 2006, El Dorado County is in attainment status of all federal and state ambient air quality standards, except state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM_{10}. Air pollutant emission sources from the project upon completion would be from vehicle trip emissions, landscape equipment, and consumer products. Table 5.2 of the AQMD CEQA Guide provides size or activity cutoff points for various types of land uses the AQMD has determined would result in a project exceeding the emission thresholds of 82 lbs./day for ROG and NO_x. For a shopping center, the cutoff point is 62,000 square feet. The project as proposed would construct 36,237 square feet of commercial buildings, which is below the cutoff point. As noted above, the cutoff points also would apply to emissions of PM_{10}, CO and SO_2. Operational air quality impacts would be considered minor, and would not significantly contribute to existing ozone and PM_{10} air quality violations. According to an air quality study conducted by Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting, mobile-source CO is the localized pollutant of primary concern associated with the long-term operation of the proposed project. Localized CO concentrations are typically highest in the vicinity of congested roadway intersections. Based on a review of the traffic analysis prepared for the project, the Ambient study concluded that predicted localized mobile-source CO concentrations at nearby intersections would be unlikely to exceed applicable ambient air quality standards. Also, the Ambient study stated that the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the installation of any major sources of odorous or toxic air contaminants resulting in localized concentrations at nearby receptors in excess of applicable standards. Commercial activities that use toxic air contaminants, such as dry cleaning establishments, would be required to obtain permits from the AQMD, pursuant to its rules and regulations. Permits may be granted to such sources if they are constructed and operated in accordance with applicable regulations, including Rule 523 (New Source Review) and Rule 526 (Toxic New Source Review). In accordance with permitting requirements, the AQMD would evaluate sources to determine potential health-related impacts and to identify appropriate control measure to be implemented to protect nearby receptors.

Construction activities associated with the project would include grading and site improvements, building pad construction, utilities, entryways and associated on-site activities. Construction-related activities could generate PM_{10} dust emissions that could exceed state and/or federal ambient air quality standards. This is a temporary but potentially

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

significant effect. The applicant must comply with AQMD Rule 223-1, Fugitive Dust-Construction Activities. Requirements under Rule 223-1 include the following:

- Visible emissions shall not exceed 20 percent opacity at point-of-origin and shall not extend more than 50 feet from point-of-origin, or cross the project boundary line, whichever is less
- Vehicle speeds shall be limited to prevent visible emissions past the project boundary line, or 50 feet from the point of origin, whichever is less.
- The dust generating process must be suspended when wind causes visible emissions past the project boundary line, or 50 feet from the point of origin, whichever is less.
- Projects that require a County grading permit must submit a Fugitive Dust Plan and fee to the AQMD for approval. The Fugitive Dust Plan identifies potential dust-generating activities associated with the project and indicates measures to be implemented to control dust emissions. Notification must be made to the AQMD 10 days prior to the start of earthmoving activities.
- Applicable Best Management Practices shall be utilized throughout the project to comply with the requirements of Rule 223-1.
- Trackout from project site must be prevented and removed when exceeding 50 feet from the nearest unpaved surface exit point of the site.
- All trackout must be cleaned at the end of each workday by manually sweeping, with a rotary brush or broom with sufficient wetting, a PM_{10}-efficient street sweeper, or flushing with water if possible without causing adverse impacts on storm water drainage or potential violations of any National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program.
- Larger sites (>150 vehicle trips/day or >20 vehicle trips/day for $\geq$3-axle vehicles) must also install a trackout control device.
- Storage piles must have a means of dust control.

Compliance with the AQMD Rule 223-1 requirements would reduce dust emissions from construction activities to a level that is less than significant.

The use of construction equipment that emits diesel exhaust would result in the generation of ROG, NO_X, CO, and PM_{10}, which could adversely affect air quality. Compliance with existing AQMD rules and regulations would reduce the amount of emissions generated by project construction and operations, particularly of ozone precursors and PM_{10}. Project impacts related to local and regional air quality would be less than significant.

C. As noted in b) above, the County currently is in non-attainment status for state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM_{10}. The project is likely to generate emissions of ozone precursors and PM_{10}, through both construction activities and project operations. As noted in b) above, project operations are expected to generate ROG and NO_X emissions that are below significance thresholds established by AQMD, based on the anticipated amount of square footage of commercial development. Nevertheless, the project would contribute ozone emissions in an area classified in "serious non-attainment" of federal ozone standards.

The El Dorado AQMD CEQA Guide provides guidance for assessing the cumulative impacts of a project on air quality. For ROG and NO_x, the AQMD basically determines their cumulative significance on whether the project is consistent with an approved plan or mitigation program of AQMD-wide or regional application. For western El Dorado County, the Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan is the applicable plan. Development projects are considered consistent with the Clean Air Plan if:

- The project does not require a change in the existing land use designation and projected emissions of ROG and NO_x from the proposed project are equal to or less than the emissions anticipated for the site if developed under the existing land use designation;

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

- The project does not exceed the "project alone" significance criteria;
- The lead agency for the project (i.e., the County) requires the project to implement any applicable emission reduction measures contained in and/or derived from the Clean Air Plan; and
- The project complies with all applicable AQMD rules and regulations.

The project would be required to comply with all AQMD rules and regulations. The project also does not require a change in the existing land use designation, which is Commercial, as the project proposes commercial/retail development. As discussed in b) above, the project by itself would not exceed thresholds of significance for ozone precursors, PM_{10}, CO and SO_2.

As discussed in b) above, construction activities associated with the project would be expected to generate PM_{10} emissions. These emissions would be temporary and would cease when construction work is completed. In addition, AQMD rules would control PM_{10} emissions resulting from construction activities. Project operations are expected to generate very little amounts of PM_{10}. Therefore, the project would not contribute a cumulatively considerable amount of PM_{10}. Cumulative impacts on PM_{10} emissions are considered less than significant.

d. **Sensitive Receptors.** There is a school located approximately 1/10 of a mile east of the project site and residences located just west of the site. The most significant pollutant generated by the project would be PM_{10} emissions during construction, and such emissions would cease after construction work ends. Also, as described in b) above, AQMD Rule 223-1 requires measures to control dust emissions during construction. Thus, the project would not expose existing residents in the area to substantial pollutant concentrations. The impact would be less than significant.

e. **Odors.** Odors generated by construction activities such and use of as exhaust fumes from construction equipment, and the use of landscape maintenance equipment after project completion, can be considered objectionable by some residents in the area. These odors would be sporadic and temporary, and occur intermittently throughout the workday. Exhaust odors would dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity. Because of the temporary and sporadic nature of odor generation, the potential impact on residents or visitors to the area is limited and unlikely to be substantial. The impact would be less than significant.

Finding

A significant air quality impact is defines as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, inclusion of standard conditions of approval would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. For this "Air Quality" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
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**		

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				**X**
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		**X**		
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			**X**	
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				**X**

Discussion:

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

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

a. The project will not impact any riparian habitat, as none exists onsite and drainage which may end up in the Weber Creek watershed is not expected to be significant. However, the project will result in the removal of a significant number of trees that may provide roosting and nesting habitat for bird species that are identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status. Raptor species which are known to exist in the area that may be impacted by the project include Cooper's hawk (a California Species of Special Concern), red-shouldered hawk, red-tailed hawk, and the great horned owl. Taller trees of black oak and foothill pine could provide nesting habitat for these species. Construction activities that occur during the typical breeding season (approximately March 1 through August 31) could disturb the breeding and nesting of these species, thereby adversely affecting their numbers. The take of any raptor species is prohibited under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5. As a biological survey was not submitted with the proposed project, the existence of such species on the project site could not be definitively determined. Therefore, impacts associated with the potential incidental take of raptor species is considered a potentially significant impact.

MM BIO-1: If construction activities are scheduled to occur within the typical breeding season for raptors (March 1through August 31), on-site pre-construction surveys for raptors and their nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of the proposed development activities. The survey results shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and Planning Services prior to issuance of a grading permit. If active raptor nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the site, consultation must be initiated with CDFG to determine appropriate avoidance measures. The applicant shall follow the appropriate avoidance measures issued by CDFG, and no construction activities

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

shall occur on the project site until the avoidance measures are issued and implemented. If no active nests are found, then no further action is required, and construction activities may proceed upon approval by Planning Services.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services shall verify that the above measure has been incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Division shall coordinate with the applicant and/or biologist, assess the pertinent surveys/studies, and conduct on-site verification for conformance with this measure.

Implementation of the mitigation measure mentioned above would avoid direct impacts on nesting birds, including raptor species protected by the Fish and Game Code. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

b. The El Dorado County General Plan identifies this site as having blue oak woodland habitat. The project is also located within Rare Plant Mitigation area 2. Much of the onsite habitat has been highly disturbed due to activities associated with residential development and previous grading activities associated with grading permits associated with this project. Proposed development will result in the removal of a majority of the remaining blue oak woodland habitat onsite. Mitigation requiring payment of in-lieu fees consistent with Option B of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 is necessary in order to mitigate this impact to less than significant levels, as it is not feasible to implement Option A and still accommodate the proposed development. Since the existing oak woodland is fragmented with existing development and would be further fragmented with proposed future development as contemplated by the adopted General Plan, the impact to existing habitat is considered less than significant with the payment of fees associated with the oak tree removal and Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2 to the County's INRMP (Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan).

MM BIO-2: Any oak trees removed from the site shall be mitigated as specified in the Oak Woodland Management Plan for EI Dorado County as adopted by the County on May 6, 2008. Mitigation for loss of tree canopy shall be implemented to reduce impacts from oak tree loss. As it is infeasible to implement Option A of the Oak Woodland Management Plan (as described below), the applicant shall be required to implement Option B (as described below):

a. For tree replacement under Policy 7.4.4.4 of the General Plan, oak trees shall be replanted at a rate of 200 tree saplings per acre, or 600 acorns per acre, whether on-site or off-site. A tree planting and preservation plan is required prior to issuance of a grading permit. If the applicant chooses to replace removed trees off-site, an easement for off-site replacement must be obtained prior to the recordation of the tentative map. A letter from the certified project arborist or qualified biologist verifying the replacement of trees and a contract for intensive to moderate maintenance and monitoring shall be required for a minimum of 15 years after planting. The survival rate shall be 90 percent. Any trees that do not survive during this period of time shall be replaced by the property owner. The arborist or biologist contract, planting and maintenance plan, and all compliance documents necessary to meet the Oak Woodlands Interim Interpretive Guidelines shall be provided to Planning Services prior to issuance of a grading permit.

b. The project applicant shall provide sufficient funding to the County's INRMP conservation fund, described in General Plan Policy 7.4.2.8 to fully compensate for the impact to oak woodland habitat. To compensate for fragmentation as well as habitat loss, the preservation ratio shall be 2:1 and based on the total woodland acreage onsite directly impacted by habitat loss and indirectly impacted by habitat fragmentation. The costs associated with acquisition, restoration, and management of the habitat protected shall be included in the mitigation fee. Impacts on woodland habitat and mitigation

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

requirements shall be addressed in a Biological Resources Study and Important Habitat Mitigation Plan as described in General Plan Policy 7.4.2.8.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

MM BIO-3: The applicant shall prepare a Biological Resources Study and Important Habitat Mitigation Plan to determine impacts on woodland habitat and determine appropriate mitigation fees to be submitted consistent with Option B described above.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

c. This site is not adjacent to nor does it comprise of drainages, wetlands, rivers or lakes, and there will be no impacts to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

d. The El Dorado County General Plan does not identify this site as being part of a migration corridor for wildlife. However, as discussed in (a), above, the site may provide potential nesting habitat for bird species. Construction activities could affect these potential nesting sites. Compliance with the mitigation measures described in a) above would avoid or minimize impacts on these sites. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

e. As discussed above (b), the project does not conform to the General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 involving the oak tree canopy retention/replacement. The implementation of the project would impact 55,354 sq. ft. of oak tree canopy, which represents approximately 95% of the existing oak tree canopy on site (existing oak tree canopy = 58,532 sq.ft.). Because the majority of the project site is to be developed with structures and impervious surfaces, Option A under Policy 7.4.4.4 of the General Plan does not seem feasible as proposed mitigation for this project. Therefore, the applicant is seeking mitigation in the form of Option B, which requires the applicant to provide sufficient funding to the County's INRMP conservation fund, described in Policy 7.4.2.8, to fully compensate for the impact to oak woodland habitat. The removal of the oak woodland is considered a potentially significant impact that would be mitigated with adherence to Mitigation Measures BIO-2 & 3.

f. The project site is not currently covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. There would be no impact.

Findings: Potentially significant impacts to biological resources include potential impacts to nesting habitat for raptors and other bird species. Impacts to these species are reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-1.** Construction activities associated with the project would remove existing oak trees, requiring mitigation in accordance with County policies and guidelines. Specifically, implementation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-2 and BIO-3** would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. For the Biological Resources category, established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project with mitigation.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			**X**	
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		**X**		
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			**X**	
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			**X**	

Discussion:

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

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

a. On February 14, 2007, a complete records search was conducted by the North Central Information Center for the proposed project. The search reviewed State Office of Historic Preservation records, base maps, historic maps, and literature for El Dorado County. The results of this review indicated that the proposed project area contains no recorded contains no recorded prehistoric archaeological sites or historic period resources listed with the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). The office did have two records of archaeological studies conducted within or adjacent to the current project area, including an intensive cultural resource survey of the project parcel that was conducted in 1984. State and Federal inventories list no historic properties (buildings, structures, or objects) within the proposed project area.

b. There is no record of significant archeological resources on the project site. However, there is a possibility that subsurface deposits of artifacts could be inadvertently uncovered during grading and other construction activities associated with the project. These subsurface deposits may be considered historically significant. The County General Plan EIR states that any level of ground disturbance within the County, regardless of intensity, has the potential to affect cultural resources, since prehistoric resources can occur anywhere on the landscape regardless of topography (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.13-13). This is a potentially significant impact.

MM CUL-1: During preliminary site grading, a cultural resources specialist shall be present on site in the event that subsurface artifacts are uncovered. Work in the area of the discovery shall be halted until artifacts can be evaluated in accordance with state and federal regulations regarding cultural resources. If a deposit is found to be significant, data shall be collected and consultation shall be initiated with appropriate agencies. The cultural resource specialist, in coordination with appropriate agencies, shall provide

recommendations on the disposition of the resource that retains its cultural value. Recommendations may include, but are not limited to, excavation of the resource or covering of the resource by pavement. These recommendations shall be implemented by the contractor working at the project site. A contract demonstrating that a cultural resources specialist has been retained for site grading activity shall be submitted to Planning Services for review prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Timing/Implementation: During grading, building services representative shall ensure that a cultural resource specialist is on site.

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

With the incorporation of the mitigation measure, subsurface cultural resources uncovered during project grading and construction activities would be protected until their significance is evaluated and recommendations are made as to their disposition. Impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

c. No paleontological resources or unique geological features were identified on the project site. The County General Plan EIR states that paleontological resources are unlikely to be encountered in El Dorado County. Paleontological remains are found in sedimentary rock formations, which are virtually nonexistent in the County (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5-13.1). The impact would be less than significant.

d. There are no known burial sites within the project site. If human remains are unearthed during construction, the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall apply. Under these sections, no further disturbance of the remains shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are identified as Native American, the County Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American, and the descendant may make recommendations for means of treating and disposing of the remains and any grave goods with appropriate dignity. The impact would be less than significant.

Finding: The project could have potentially significant impacts on subsurface cultural resources that may exist on the project site. The incorporation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce the impacts on such resources to a less-than-significant level. With mitigation, established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the Cultural Resources category.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			**X**	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			**X**	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			**X**	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			**X**	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*				
iv) Landslides?				**X**
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			**X**	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				**X**
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?			**X**	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				**X**

Discussion:

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;

- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or

- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist- Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County (El Dorado County Planning Deparment, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR, May 2003, p.5.9-5). No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, CA, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1). There are no known faults on the project site, however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated west of the Melones fault zone and east of the East Bear Mountain fault zone. The East Bear Mountain fault zone is associated with the Foothills fault system, previously considered inactive but re-classified to potentially active after a Richter magnitude earthquake measuring 5.7 occurred near Oroville in 1975. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.

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

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 55 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 45 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002. http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha). While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquiefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project is located (El Dorado County Planning Deparment, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR, May 2003, p.5.9-6-5.9-9). The project site is relatively flat. There would be no risk of landslide. There would be no impact.

Development of the project would result in commercial retail uses in an area subject to low to moderate groundshaking effects. The proposed project would not include uses that would pose any unusual risk of environmental damage either through the use of hazardous materials or processes or through structural design that could be subject ot groundshaking hazard. There would be no significant impacts that could not be mitigated through proper building design, as enforced through the County building permit process, which requires compliance with the Uniform Building Code, as modified for California seismic conditions. There would be no impact.

b-c. **Soil Erosion and Loss of Topsoil.** The site has been disturbed previously for residential development and grading of a pad for the proposed project under a previously issued grading permit (Permit# 164804). Adherence to standard conditions of approval for grading would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

d. **Expansive Soils.** Expansive soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distorition of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the site has Auburn (AxD) and Boomer (BhC) soils. These soils are well-drained and consist of very rocky silt loam and gravelly loam, respectively. These soils are listed as having low, and moderate to low shrink/swell potential, respectively. Table 19-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The applicant has submitted a site-specific geotechnical study which includes design recommendations specific to soils onsite. This study would be subject to review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed commercial structures. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. There would be no impact related to septic systems because the proposed project is to be served by public water and sewer. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Geology and Soils" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			**X**	
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			**X**	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			**X**	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			**X**	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			**X**	
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				**X**
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			**X**	
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			**X**	

Discussion:

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

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

- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or

- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

a. **Hazardous Substances.** Construction activities associated with the project may involve the transportation, use, and disposal of construction materials, paints and fuels that may be considered hazardous. The use of these hazardous materials would only occur during construction. Some spillages of paints and fuels may occur, but they would be minor and not pose a significant hazard to workers and adjacent land uses.

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

The project proposes commercial uses that would be retail in character. Retail activities generally use a smaller amount of hazardous materials than other types of commercial activities. State law requires submittal of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan by activities that transport, store or handle 55 gallons, 500 pounds or 200 cubic feet of hazardous materials at any one time. The Business Plan identifies the hazardous materials used by the activity and outlines emergency procedures the activity will undertake in the event of a hazardous material release. Retail stores would be required to submit a Business Plan to the County Department of Environmental Health if the criteria for submittal are met. In addition, any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials, during both project construction and project operations. With existing regulations, the impact is less than significant.

b. **Creation of Hazards.** Hazardous materials may be used during project construction and operations, as discussed in (a) above. Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials, including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (CalOHSA) requirements for worker safety.

c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There is a public school located approximately 1/10 of a mile north of the project site and residential structures located just south of the site. The proposed project would not be likely to include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. Any potential hazardous emissions would be subject to a hazardous materials plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List, http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/). No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the proposed project site are known to have occurred. There would be no impact.

e. **Public Airport Hazards**. The project is not located near or within any Safety Zones of a public airport. There would be no impact.

f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** The project is not located near any private airstrips or landing pads. There would be no impact.

g. **Emergency Response Plan.** Construction and operation of the proposed commercial retail facilities would involve negligible or no disruption of emergency access to and from occupied uses along Missouri Flat Road or Forni Road. There would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.

h. **Fire Hazards.** The project site is located in an area of "Moderate Fire Hazard" according to the Fire Hazard Rating Map contained in the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan, Figure HS-1. Any potential development activity would be subject to SRA Fire Safe Regulations, which provide standards for basic emergency access and perimeter wildfire protection. The proposed development has been designed in compliance with state and local fire district regulations. This would reduce the risks associated with wildland fires to a less than significant level. Electrical equipment would be enclosed, and the project would not include any operations (e.g., use of hazardous materials or processes) that would substantially increase fire hazard risk. Emergency response access to the site and surrounding development would not be adversely affected, as discussed above. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

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

Finding: No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Hazards" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

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

- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

a&f.

Water Quality Standards. Construction of the proposed project would involve little, if any, ground disturbance that could increase the level of sediments in stormwater discharges at the site in the long-term. Short-term impacts resulting from increased sedimentation due to grading activities will be mitigated by adhering to a sedimentation and erosion control program incorporated into the grading permit. Operation of the proposed project would not involve any uses that would generate a significant increase in wastewater. The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) has issued a "Can and Will Serve" letter indicating that it has the capacity to serve the additional wastewater generated by the project. There is no evidence indicating that the project or activities associated with the project would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, no water quality standards would be violated, and no impact would occur.

b. The project would not withdraw any groundwater from the site, as it proposes to connect to EID's water supply system and not use wells. Site grading, paving, and construction of buildings would reduce the area available for groundwater recharge, as structures, parking lots and soil compactions may make the ground less permeable to water. However, the proposed landscaping would allow precipitation to percolate into the ground, thereby allowing recharge of aquifers beneath the site. Since the project would not withdraw any groundwater directly, and since EID uses surface water, the reduced recharge area would not lead to a net deficit in aquifer volumes or a lowering of the groundwater table. The impact is less than significant.

c. The project would have an impact on normal drainage patterns, through site grading and the creation of additional impervious surfaces. Substantial erosion or siltation can occur without use of appropriate revegetation and erosion control measures. As discussed in the Geology and Soils section, the County Department of Transportation and the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District have developed a list of storm water management practices applicable to all construction sites within western El Dorado County. These practices include management of disturbed soil areas by implementing soil stabilization measures, which would reduce potential soil erosion.

In addition, prior to construction of a project one acre or greater in size, the RWQCB requires a project applicant to file for a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit. The General Construction Permit process requires the project applicant to 1) notify the State, 2) prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and 3) to monitor the effectiveness of the plan. The SWPPP identifies pollutants generated by construction activities, including sediment, earthen material, chemicals, and building materials. It also describes the Best Management Practices that would be employed to reduce or eliminate contamination of surface waters by the identified pollutants. The State Water Resources Control Board, which oversees the RWQCB, currently is in the process of reissuing the statewide General Construction Permit with some modifications. The modifications would more appropriately allocate responsibilities and requirements to projects based on their relative risk to water quality, obtain better measures of performance from projects, and establish a standard that address impacts related to hydromodification (alteration of stream channel due to changes in sediment load). Since project construction would likely disturb at least one acre, the project would be required to obtain the NPDES General Construction Permit and comply with its conditions. The impact would be less than significant.

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

d. The project would generate an increase in surface runoff, through site grading and the creation of impervious surfaces. The project site is 4.1 acres in size. According to the County's Design and Improvement Standards Manual, drainage facilities for areas less than 100 acres shall be designed for an average recurrence interval of a 10-year flood (El Dorado County, 1986, p. 29). The 10-year flood is a flood that would occur on average once every 10 years. Compliance with the provisions of the Design and Improvement Standards Manual would reduce potential flooding impacts associated with increased runoff. The impacts are less than significant.

f. All impacts to water quality are discussed within the sections above, as well as the Geology and Soils section contained earlier in this Initial Study. No additional impacts have been identified. There would be no impact.

g. The project is a commercial project with no housing component, and as such the project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard. There would be no impact.

h. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood plain according to the FEMA prepared Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel No. 0600400750B, revised October, 18, 1983. There would be no impact.

i. The project would not place people or structures at risk due to flooding. The project site is somewhat higher than surrounding topography to the east and existing and proposed drainage will flow in that direction towards Weber Creek. As discussed above, the project is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area. There would be no impact.

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

Findings: No significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. Implementation of County regulations and standards, along with compliance with RWQCB permit conditions, would limit potential impacts related to erosion and drainage to levels that are less than significant. For the Hydrology and Water Quality section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;

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

- 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 proposed project would not divide an established community. The 2004 General Plan has designated land along Missouri Flat Road as a commercial corridor. The proposed project, including the rezone, would simply implement the use contemplated by the General Plan. There would be no impact.

b. As discussed above, the 2004 General Plan has designated this property for commercial uses. The General Plan evaluated the impact of future development on this site with commercial land uses and found that said commercial use would have a less than significant impact on any applicable land use plan or policy adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, would ensure that the project would have no impact.

c. There is currently no adopted HCP or NCCP that covers El Dorado County. There would be no impact.

Findings: The project may potentially conflict with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, which seeks to protect woodlands. Mitigation described in the Biological Resources section would reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant. For the Land Use Planning section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance with mitigation.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
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&b.

Mineral Resources. The project site is not located in an area where mineral resources are classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b per the County's General Plan Important Mineral Resource Areas map (Figure CO-1, El Dorado County General Plan, 2004). Also, there are no MRZ-2 classified areas within or adjacent to the project site, and the project has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. There

are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect proposed uses or be affected by the project development. There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Mineral Resources" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XI. NOISE. *Would the project result in:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				**X**
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				**X**
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				**X**
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			**X**	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?				**X**
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				**X**

Discussion:

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL;
- Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
- Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.

a) The most significant source of noise to which future development on the project site would be exposed would be traffic noise from adjacent roadways which include Missouri Flat Road and Forni Road. Figure B-7 (Map 3) of the County General Plan delineates traffic noise contours for the two adjacent roadways for the year 2025. According to Figure B-7, the entire project site is within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour of Missouri Flat Road and Forni Road by the year 2025. Therefore, the proposed buildings would be exposed to noise levels of 60 dBA or greater. However, based on the State's General Plan Guidelines, indicates the exposure of business commercial land uses to noise levels of up to 70 dBA is normally acceptable, while noise levels above 75 dBA are normally unacceptable. However, it is not likely that the building would be consistently exposed to noise levels exceeding 75 dB. Moreover, building practices and local building

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

codes applicable to commercial buildings would reduce the interior noise levels of the buildings. This impact would be less than significant. Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan are not applicable to this project, as commercial/retail land uses are not designated noise-sensitive land uses.

b) The project may generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction. However, those impacts are temporary and would be confined to standard construction hour limitations, as described in d) below. Moreover, the nearest sensitive land use to groundborne vibrations or noise are the residences south of the project site, which are approximately 150 feet away or more. It is unlikely that residences would experience long-term impacts from groundborne vibration or noise at that distance due to normal operations of the commercial retail center. The impacts would be less than significant.

c) The project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, due mainly to vehicular traffic generated by the proposed commercial/retail development. However, this development would occur in an area of substantial commercial development (both existing and planned), and is located adjacent to two busy roadways that already generate substantial ambient noise levels (Missouri Flat Road and Forni Road). The noise levels the project would would not be greater than those generated by the Walmart shopping center to the east and by traffic on Missouri Flat Road and Forni Road. The contribution of the project to noise levels would be relatively minor, and not likely to exceed the 3 dBA increase threshold. The impacts would be less than significant.

d) The project may generate temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity during construction periods. This noise increase would be temporary and would cease after completion of construction. Also, the distance to the nearest residence, the land use most likely to be disturbed by construction noise, is approximately 150 feet. Construction noise would be attenuated by this distance. Nevertheless, noise levels on the project site during construction may be sufficiently elevated to be noticeable by nearby residents. This is a potentially significant impact.

MM NOI-1: Construction activities shall be conducted in accordance with the County noise regulation or limited to the following hours and days: 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on any weekday; 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends and federally recognized holidays.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

Compliance with the mitigation measure would result in no construction noise during hours when residents are more likely to be disturbed by noise, particularly nighttime hours. With mitigation, the impacts would be less than significant.

e) The proposed project is not located within an adopted airport land use plan and is located 4 miles away from the Placerville Airport. People working in the project area would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from this airport. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Impacts to people working or residing in the area would be less than significant.

Findings: For the Noise category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would occur from the proposed development, with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure NOI -1.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 project may induce some population growth in the area directly by proposing commercial development that would generate employment. However, potential employees would most likely come from the City of Placerville and nearby communities, such as Diamond Springs, El Dorado, Cameron Park, etc.. Few employees are likely to come from areas farther away. The project is consistent with the land use designation under the County General Plan, which anticipates population growth in the County based on these designations. Therefore, anticipated population growth would not be altered by this project. The project would utilize existing infrastructure, and therefore would not require new infrastructure that may indirectly induce population growth. Impacts related to population growth would be less than significant.

b. The proposed project has resulted in the demolition of four residential units. This is not considered a substantial reduction in existing housing, as there is currently adequate housing stock within the County, and thus new housing would not be necessary to replace housing stock removed from the market by this project. There would be no impact.

c. The proposed project would not displace any people, as there are no people currently living on the project site. There would be no impact.

Finding: The project would not displace any housing or people. The project would not directly or indirectly induce significant population growth. For the Population and Housing section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. *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:*				
a. Fire protection?			**X**	
b. Police protection?			**X**	
c. Schools?				**X**
d. Parks?				**X**
e. Other government services?			**X**	

Discussion:

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

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

a) The project site would be served by the Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District. The Fire Department maintains a fire station at 501 Main Street in Diamond Springs, which is approximately 1.25 miles from the project site. The proposed project is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for fire services. The property has been designated for commercial uses, and the project is consistent with the General Plan and the analysis of impacts to fire services contained in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR indicated that Fire Department would likely need to expand an existing facility to accommodate demand generated by additional population growth. Mitigation set forth in the General Plan EIR includes review of projects for land use compatibility and siting and design considerations. Since the project is not expected to induce significant population growth (see Population and Housing section), it is not expected an expanded Fire Department facility would be required. However, in order to offset general impacts of development in the area, the Fire District Board of Directors enacted a Community Facilities District (CFD) in 2006. The proposed project will be required to annex into this CFD and pay appropriate fees prior to final approval.

b) Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department. Because of the size and scope of the proposed project, it is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for police services. The property has been designated for commercial uses, and the project is consistent with the General Plan and the analysis of impacts to police services contained in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR set forth mitigation that would limit the range of appropriate land uses on with law enforcement facilities could be developed, and would

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

subject proposed facilities to review of land use compatibility and siting and design considerations. These mitigation measures would reduce potential environmental impacts of any future Sheriff's Department facilities. Since the project is not expected to induce significant population growth (see Population and Housing section), it is not expected new or expanded Sheriff's Department facilities would be required. The impact would be less than significant.

c) School services in the Placerville area are provided by the Mother Lode Union Elementary School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The proposed project is a commercial, which by itself would not generate an increase in student population requiring additional facilities. As discussed in the Population and Housing section, the project may attract new employees, but most would come from the surrounding area. The project is not expected to attract a significant number of new residents. Future development would be required to pay impact fees for new facilities adopted by both districts, which would mitigate any potential impacts of the project. The impact would be less than significant.

d) The project is located within the El Dorado Recreation District which is maintained by the El Dorado County Department of General Services, Division of Airport, Parks and Grounds (County Parks). As discussed in the Population and Housing section, the proposed project would not induce significant population growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore the project is not expected to increase or expand demand for parks. There would be no impact.

e) There are no other governmental services anticipated to be adversely impacted by the proposed project. As previously noted, the project is not expected to induce significant population growth, which would stimulate demand for public services that could be met with new or expanded facilities. There would be no impact.

Findings: The proposed project would not result in any substantial increase in demand for public services, due to the lack of population growth the project would induce. Therefore, no new or expanded public service facilities would be required.

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. As noted in the Public Services section, the project is not expected to increase demand for park service, since it is not expected to induce significant population growth. There would be no impact.

b. The project does not include recreational facilities. As noted in a) above, the project would not generate an increase demand for park services. Therefore, the project would not require construction or expansion of additional facilities. There would be no impact.

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			**X**	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			**X**	
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				**X**
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			**X**	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				**X**
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				**X**
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				**X**

Discussion:

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
- Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
- Result in, or worsen, Level of Service "F" traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.

a) As required by County policy, a traffic study was prepared to analyze the potential traffic impacts resulting from the project. The *Traffic and Impact Analysis for Forni Road Commercial, El Dorado County, CA,* dated April 4, 2008,

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

prepared by KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., provides analysis and conclusions regarding traffic impacts of the project. Specifically, the project analyzed traffic impacts associated with a project that includes a 14,820 square foot drugstore with drive-thru pharmacy, a 6,000 square foot bank with drive-thru capability, and specialty retail comprising 15,400 square feet in two buildings. Primary access to the site will be provided along Forni Road with a right-in, right-out driveway (northerly driveway) and a full access driveway (southerly driveway). Secondary access will be provided along Missouri Flat Road with a right-in, right-out driveway.

These facilities are expected to generate approximately 3,469 daily trips on a weekday basis. The project would generate 139 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 444 trips during the p.m. peak hour. After accounting for pass-by traffic, the total new trips projected for the project are 100 a.m. peak hour trips and 244 p.m. peak hour trips.

The traffic study analyzed impacts on Missouri Flat Road and Forni Road, and impacts to eight (8) area intersections which included the following:

- Missouri Flat Rd/El Dorado Rd
- Missouri Flat Rd/Plaza Dr
- Missouri Flat Rd/US 50 WB Ramps
- Missouri Flat Rd/US 50 EB Ramps
- Missouri Flat Rd/Mother Lode Dr
- Missouri Flat Rd/Forni Rd
- Missouri Flat Rd/Golden Center Dr
- Missouri Flat Rd/Pleasant Valley Rd

The study addressed impacts on these intersections and roadways under a number of scenarios, which included the following:

1. Existing Traffic Conditions
2. Existing Plus Project Conditions
3. 2012 Traffic Conditions
4. 2012 Plus Project Conditions
5. Cumulative (2025) Traffic Conditions
6. Cumulative (2025) Plus Project Conditions

The traffic analysis came to the following conclusions regarding each of these scenarios:

Existing Setting. Five of the eight study intersections currently operate at LOS E or better. The Highway 50 WB ramps, the Highway 50 EB ramps and the Plaza Drive intersections with Missouri Flat Road currently operate at LOS F in the p.m. peak hour. The interchange and adjacent intersections including Plaza Drive are currently under construction with an L-1 (tight diamond) configuration to be completed by 2010. Additional work will include widening Missouri Flat Road to a four lane section with turn lanes from Plaza Drive to Mother Lode Drive. In addition, a new eastbound on-ramp configuration will be constructed with an on-ramp to Highway 50 at both Mother Lode Drive and the Highway 50 Eastbound Ramps intersections. When completed, the three intersections will operate at LOS E or better conditions. It is therefore not considered a significant impact.

Existing Plus Project Specific Impacts. The addition of the proposed project will contribute to the traffic volumes along the Missouri Flat Road corridor. Five intersections will continue to operate at LOS E or better in this scenario. After reconstruction of the interchange project all intersections will operate at LOS E or better. However, in order to

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

mitigate potential impacts associated with turning movements from driveways located on Forni Road, migitation measures are recommended to reduce these impacts to a level of insignificance and assure that these driveways operate at LOS E or better.

MM TRANS-1: The project should contribute its fair share to the cost of regional circulation improvements via the existing countywide traffic impact mitigation (TIM) fee program.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services and El Dorado County DOT

MM TRANS-2: The sight distance at the projected driveway locations should be reviewed once engineered plans have been prepared for submittal approval to the County. The sight distances at each of the project driveway locations should meet the stopping sight distance standards contained in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual based on the speed along Missouri Flat Road and Forni Road, and as required by the County Department of Transportation. A clear zone should be maintained along the line of sight to provide adequate sight lines. On-site landscaping along Forni Road should be limited to plants lower than 2 feet and tree canopies no lower than 10 feet.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services and El Dorado County DOT shall review final plans for conformance with this measure.

MM TRANS-3: In order to improve the level of service to acceptable LOS conditions at the South driveway, a continuous left turn lane (CLTL) should be constructed along Forni Road to provide a queue/storage location for vehicles entering or leaving the site. The CLTL should extend along the project frontage and tie into the northbound left turn lanes at the Missouri Flat Road intersection.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services and El Dorado County DOT shall review final improvement plans for conformance with this measure.

MM TRANS-4: Driveway locations shall be based on County Standard 109; this standard plan will set the minimum distances between the driveways and the Missouri Flat Road/Forni Road intersection.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services and El Dorado County DOT shall review final improvement plans for conformance with this measure.

MM TRANS-5: Curb and driveway radii should be verified on and off-site using Autoturn truck templates. This will define the radii required to avoid trucks from overtopping driveways and curbs.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits the applicant shall provide El Dorado DOT with evidence that all curb and driveway radii have been verified on and off-site.

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County DOT shall review final improvement plans for conformance with this measure.

2012 Setting. Growth is expected to occur along the Missouri Flat Road Corridor in the next five years. The County's Traffic Impact Protocols and Procedures note that two alternative methods shall be considered to identify the worst-case scenario for this scenario. The first method is the straight-line interpolation between existing traffic and cumulative traffic conditions; the second method assumes all existing commitments are completed. Traffic projections for the 1998 models results and 2025 model results were provided from the County traffic model maintained by Dowling Associates. Straight-line interpolation was used to develop annual volume increases along the roadways. These increases were then annualized over a five-year period to arrive at projected 2012 turning movement volumes. Traffic volumes at the interchange intersections, from Plaza Drive to Mother Lode Drive, were developed from the DEIR prepared in December 2003.

The second method identified three approved projects in the vicinity. The traffic volumes from these projects were added to the existing traffic conditions to develop an Existing Plus Approved Projects baseline condition. The Approved Projects methodology governed for the Missouri Flat Road/Pleasant Valley Road intersection for both peak periods while straight-line interpolation method governed for the remaining seven study intersections.

All study intersections will operate within accepted El Dorado County level of service standards, at LOS E or better in 2012. No mitigation is required.

2025 Setting. The project land use designation is Commercial and is consistent with the County's 2004 General Plan. The project trip generation projection prepared by Dowling Associates, Inc. shows that the project trip generation is greater than the 2025 thresholds; therefore, a cumulative analysis is required.

Peak hour roadway volumes were obtained from the County 2025 model. Turning movements for each study intersection not associated with the Missouri Flat Road Interchange DEIR (El Dorado Road, Forni Road, Golden Center Drive and Pleasant Valley Road) were developed using the Furness forecasting methodology. The 2025 traffic volumes identified in the DEIR (Plaza Drive, Mother Lode Drive, ramp intersections) were used as the basis for analysis for these intersections.

The roadway configuration along Missouri Flat Road is projected to remain as a four-lane roadway from Plaza Drive to Pleasant Valley Road and a two-lane roadway from Plaza Drive to Pleasant Valley Road; the north leg of the intersection will consist of four lanes leading into and out of the Plaza Drive intersection.

All study intersections will operate within accepted El Dorado County level of service standards, at LOS E or better in 2025. No mitigation is required.

2025 plus Project Conditions. With the addition of the project traffic, all intersections will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service, at LOS E or better. No mitigation is required.

b. The County does not have a designated congestion management agency. However, the El Dorado County Department of Transportation has reviewed the traffic study prepared by the applicant and determined that the project would not individually or cumulatively cause Level of Service Thresholds established by the County in its General Plan to be exceeded. As such, impacts are determined to be less than significant.

However, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), which is not a responsible agency for this project, has reviewed the traffic study prepared by the applicant and is of the opinion that traffic methodologies employed by the

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

County and traffic volumes forecasted by the General Plan are somewhat outdated and actually do not accurately predict future levels of service at the Missouri Flat Road/Highway 50 interchange. It is Caltran's opinion that future Levels of Service will actually approximate LOS "F" subsequent to Phase IA and Phase IB improvements at the interchange. The El Dorado County DOT and Caltrans are currently in negotiations to resolve these potential discrepancies in forecasting methodologies and resolve future LOS problems associated with cumulative development.

c. The project is not located adjacent to or within the safety zone of any airport. The closest airport, the Placerville airport, is 3.7miles away, and would not be affected by the proposed project, nor would the project be affected by existing air traffic patterns. There would be no impact.

d. As discussed in (a) above, certain mitigation measures are required to lessen the operational impacts of the proposed project. More specifically these include constructing all improvements to DOT standards, ensuring that all truck turning radii are adequate within the project design, ensuring that landscaping does not prohibit adequate sight distance on Forni Road, and installation of a left turn control lane along Forni Road to allow for queuing of traffic. With these measures, roadway design features around the project site would not substantially increase traffic hazards. Proposed land uses would be compatible with adjacent existing and proposed land uses, which are primarily commercial and office. The impacts would be less than significant.

e. The project as proposed would provide three access points – two off Forni Road and one off Missouri Flat Road. These access points would provide adequate emergency access. The impact would be less than significant.

f. The proposed project would provide parking in excess of zoning ordinance requirements. There would be no impact.

g. The project does not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs regarding alternative transportation. El Dorado Transit operates a bus line that passes by the project site on Missouri Flat Road. The project proposes to add a bus stop in front of the Walgreens in an effort to facilitate alternative transportation modes. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: Environmental impacts of the project related to transportation would be less than significant level. Motor vehicle traffic generated by the project is anticipated to be accommodated by existing traffic facilities, with improvements along Forni Road and completion of improvements at the Missouri Flat Road/Highway 50 interchange. Other transportation-related impacts are considered to be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures outlined above. For the Transportation/Traffic category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*				
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**

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				**X**
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				**X**
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				**X**
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				**X**
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				**X**

Discussion:

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

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

a. The preliminary drainage study prepared for this project identifies that this project would have a minor increase in discharge of water runoff of 2 cubic feet per second (cfs) to the Weber Creek watershed east of the project site. The study did not identify any downstream effects based on these results. By implementing pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) and tying into existing drainage points on Missouri Flat Road and Forni Road, there will be a less than significant impact within this category.

b. No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required because of the project based on a letter received from the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) dated March 23, 2007. There is an existing 10-inch water line in Forni Road which the project will tie into. The project will provide a looped connection that will tie into this existing line. The EID has also indicated that there is adequate sewer capacity to serve the project, and the project can tie into a 4-inch sewer force main in Forni Road. However, the project will be required to construct on an onsite full sewage lift station with two submersible grinder pumps. All of the improvements necessary to connect the water line, to create the looped EID water connection, and those that are necessary to connect the project to the sewer system have been accounted for in the environmental review of this project. There would be no impacts related to implementation of

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

these improvements, as biological impacts associated with grading and tree removal have already been discussed in the Biological Resources Section IV.

c. On-site storm water drainage facilities will be installed and maintained on and adjacent this property in order to control, reduce, and/or eliminate run-off from this development. All storm water drainage facilities shall be designed to meet the *County of El Dorado Drainage Manual* standards and will be installed to reduce discharge levels to County, state, and federal standards. There will be a less than significant level of impact in this category.

d. El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) identified that there are 2285 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of water available in the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region. The EID has determined that the project will not require any additional EDUs, and that there is adequate water capacity to serve the project. The project will connect to the 10-inch water line in Forni Road at driveway points as shown on site plans. The fire flow will provide the minimum 1500 gallons per minute for a period of two hours at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) to meet fire flow requirements.. This looped connection will be able to provide the necessary water pressure for the fire suppression system and hydrants that will be installed for this development. This project would draw potable water from that looped water line, as well. All related improvements, impacts, and mitigation have been considered within the Biological Resources Section IV in this study. There will be a less than significant level of impact with this project.

e. The El Dorado Irrigation District has identified available capacity for wastewater disposal and treatment. The applicant will be required to connect to the existing 4-inch sewer line located within Forni Road and construct a lift station on site.

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. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years. There would be no impact.

g. County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the project site would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Solid waste collection and disposal within California is subject to the provisions of the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This legislation mandates a 50 percent diversion from the solid waste stream going to landfills by 2000. According to the most recent information available from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (2005), unincorporated El Dorado County currently meets the 50 percent diversion rate. The solid waste collection service provided to the project site includes a recycling program, which would ensure continued compliance with state diversion requirements. The impacts would be less than significant.

Findings: No significant impacts would result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the Utilities and Service Systems section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects would result from the project.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. *Does the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			**X**	
b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			**X**	
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			**X**	

Discussion:

a) Without mitigation, there is a potential that this project will degrade the quality of the environment by impacting biological resources such as oak woodland habitat that may support raptors and/or songbirds nesting within the breeding season. This also accounts for the impacts that would be require for improvements on and off- the project site, to include improvements that are necessary for road, drainage, water and sewer connections. Based on the mitigation outlined for this project, there is protection of raptors and/or songbirds during their breeding season, as well as replacement of affected oak woodland canopy and potential habitat for such species with the tree canopy. Refer to Biological Resources Category IV for specific mitigation. Other environmental elements referenced within this section will not be affected and the impacts within this category will remain below a level of significance, as a result.

b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as "two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." Based on the analysis in this environmental review, it has been determined that other projects in the area may have a cumulative effect. In particular, the overall effects of the project, as it relates to biological impacts, oak woodland impacts, road and related project improvements, as well as specific impacts associated to transportation and specifically parking are addressed within each of the categories that are affected. Refer to the 'Biological Resources' category IV and the 'Traffic and Transportation' category XV for specific mitigation that will reduce the cumulative effects of the project in each category and for the project in its entirety to a level that is below a level of significance within the Mandatory Findings of Significance Category XVII.

c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts in this category will 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 Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9
Appendix A
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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