



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: TM07-1449/Z07-0035 Cordero Ranch

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

Contact Person: Pat Kelly

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Donald and Ruth Gilman

Project Applicant's Name and Address: 3000 Crystal View Drive, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Agent's Name and Address: Ken Purcell, P.O. Box 30, El Dorado Hills CA, 95623

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Ken Purcell, P.O. Box 30, El Dorado Hills CA, 95623

Project Location: North side of South Shingle Springs Road, two (2) miles west of the intersection with Latrobe Road in the Latrobe area.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 087-190-22 and 087-190-18

Zoning: RA-20

Section: 8 and 17 **T:** 8 **R:** 9

General Plan Designation: RR

Description of Project: The project would allow for a Tentative Subdivision Map to create eight (8) single-family ten (10) acre lots and a Rezone change from Residential Agricultural-20 Acre Zone District (RA-20) to Estate Residential Acre Zone District (RE-10). A Design Waiver has been requested to allow a maximum road grade of up to fifteen percent (15%) for Cordero Ranch Road.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RA-20	RR	Rural Residence
North:	RA-20	RR	Rural Residence
East:	RA-20	RR	Rural Residence
South:	RA-40	RR	Rural Residence
West:	RA-40	RR	Rural Residence

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site would be located west of South Shingle Springs Road and south of Settlers Trail in the unincorporated area of El Dorado County, west of the town of Latrobe. The project site is composed of mild to moderately sloped land and is vegetated with grass, shrubs and a few cottonwood trees. The project site presently contains four (4) stock ponds and two (2) residences. The surrounding land is undeveloped with several ranchettes. Access to the project site would be from South Shingle Road and another proposed roadway connecting to the existing Settlers Trail to the north. The two existing rural residences would be located on proposed Lot 2 and Lot 3. There are several aquatic features on the site. These

include four (4) stock ponds and three surface drainages. A channel enters and exists the northeast corner of the project site. Two other small systems (composed of a seep, a channel, several swales and stock ponds) drain the project site to the southwest. The site contains four (4) soil types; Argonaut very Rocky loam, 3-3% slopes, Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2-30% slopes, Auburn extremely rocky silt loam, 3-70% slopes and Perkins gravelly loam, moderately deep variant, 2-5% slopes.

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

1. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading permit for on site and off site road improvements.
2. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District require an approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan for air quality impacts during project construction.

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		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: July 22, 2008

Printed Name: Patricia Kelly For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: July 22, 2008

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed residential project. The project would allow the creation of eight (8) single-family ten (10) acre lots.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

Project Characteristics

The project would create eight (8) single-family ten (10) acre lots. One new road would be constructed within the project parcel providing access between South Shingle Road and Settlers Trail road. Road improvements along South Single Road and Settlers Trail Road would be required including widening of the road.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the project would be provided by a new road which would be constructed within the project parcel providing access between South Shingle Road, a County maintained road, and Settlers Trail Road. The project would provide two points of access into the development as required by the County standards. Parking would be limited to on-site parking, such as garages and driveways. A turn around at the end of "A" Court as required and approved by the responsible fire agency for fire protection purposes would be provided.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The new residential lots proposed would have individual septic systems and well water serving each home. The septic systems and well water would fall under the authority of the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management, and under the regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Septic systems designated and installed on site would be required to meet State and County Standards. Electric power would be available on the project site.

3. Population

The project would create eight (8) residential single-family ten (10) acre lots. The project would not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

4. Construction Considerations

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

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

Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

- it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
 3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
 4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
 5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
 6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
 7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
 8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to 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 would be approximately two (2) miles east from a scenic vista, Latrobe Road, as identified in the El Dorado County General Plan. The scenic vista is visible from all directions where rolling hills and occasional vistas of the Sacramento Valley allow for visual access. Due to the location and elevation of the project site, and distance from Latrobe Road, the project would not be visible from Latrobe Road. There would be a less than significant impact.
- (b) The project site would not be visible from a state scenic highway. The nearest state scenic highway to the project site would be Highway 49. Highway 49 would be located 8 miles east of the project site and the project site would not be visible from Highway 49 and would therefore not have an impact on views within a state scenic highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site. There would be no impact.
- (c) The project would create eight (8) single-family ten (10) acre lots. Lot 2 and Lot 3 as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map (TM-07-1449) each have an existing house. It is likely that the project would result in the construction of six (6) new single family residences on the newly created lots. The development of these homes and supporting infrastructure would represent a slight change to the existing visual environment. The removal of vegetation for home sites would also represent a slight change to the existing visual conditions. Overall impacts are considered less than significant.
- (d) With parcels of five acres and larger, the construction of individual homes and the introduction of related lighting within and around the home sites on newly created parcels would represent only a small change in the existing visual environment. These impacts are considered less than significant.

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

Findings

The proposed development would be residential in nature and would be consistent with the underlying land use designation for the property and surrounding area. The project would have less than significant impacts. For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
 - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
 - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- (a) The project site is zoned Residential Agricultural (RA-20), and has been historically used for grazing. There are four soil types within the project area; Argonaut very rocky loam, 3-3% slopes; Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2-30% slopes; Auburn extremely rocky loam, 3-70% slopes; and Perkins gravelly loam, 2-5% slopes. The Perkins gravelly loam is classified as Statewide Important Farmland by the California Department of Conservation and is identified as “choice” agricultural soil by the County Agricultural Department.

Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that the project site would be located within areas designated as “Grazing Land.” Less than an acre of the subject property located in the northeast portion of project site has been identified as “Farmland of Local Importance”. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site.

Two single family residences had been previously constructed on the project site. The two existing residential units would be located on two of the proposed lots. An existing 1,886 square foot single family residence would be

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

located within the two hundred foot (200') agricultural setback to be located on proposed Lot 2 as shown on the Tentative Map. Presently, the project site is not being used for agricultural purposes.

The Agricultural Commission reviewed the project and recommended denial upon the findings that the project site was historically used for grazing land; was not assigned urban or other non-agricultural uses in the Land Use Map for the 2004 General Plan; and since the project is proposed to be located on historical grazing land, and as such, should be protected, as described in **Policy 8.1.2.2** with a forty (40) acre minimum parcel size. **Policy 8.1.3.2** requires agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agricultural zoned lands to provide a minimum setback of two hundred feet (200') on parcels ten (10) acres or larger. The project site would include a two hundred foot (200') setback adjacent to the perimeter boundary because the project site would be bound by residential agricultural properties. The proposed setback and parcel size minimum would be consistent with applicable General Plan policies which require buffering between agriculture operations and residential uses. Presently, agriculture operations do not exist adjacent to the project site. North of the project site are four (4) ten (10) acre residential parcels approved April 30, 1979 and recorded as a Parcel Map. Impacts would be less than significant.

- (b) The proposed project would include the rezoning of the site from Residential Agricultural 20-Acre Zone District (RA-20) to Estate Residential 10-Acre Zone District (RE-10). This change in zoning would be compatible with the General Plan Land Use as described in the El Dorado County General Plan and is discussed in further detail in section IX, Land Use and Planning. The project site is not under Williamson Act Contract. This impact would be less than significant.
- (c) The entire site is classified as Grazing Land, with a small area classified as Farmland of Local Importance. The site is zoned for Agriculture however; the El Dorado County General Plan land use designation for the site is Rural Residential. The site would be used for single family development. All lands immediately surrounding the site is designated Rural Residential in the El Dorado County General Plan. This impact would be less than significant.

Findings

Implementation of the required setbacks would reduce potential impacts to agriculture. The project site contains grazing Lands and a small portion of Farmland of Local Importance, but due limited size of the choice soils and the surrounding residential land uses, the proposed project would be consistent within the project area. Impacts would be less than significant. For this "Agricultural Resources" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is 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	

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

Discussion:

The project would result in the creation of parcels allowing the construction of six (6) new single-family homes. Additional construction would be done to provide supporting infrastructure, including extension of utility lines, expansion of roads, construction of driveways, and related improvements. The potential impacts of these activities are discussed below.

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- (a) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). Any activities associated to the grading and construction of this project would pose a less than significant impact on air quality because the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) would require the project implement a Fugitive Dust Plan (FDP) during grading and construction activities. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions below a level of significance.
- (b) The project would create air quality impacts which may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction. Construction activities associated with the project include grading and site improvements, for roadway expansion, utilities, driveway, home, and building pad construction, and associated on-site activities. Construction related activities would generate PM₁₀ dust emissions that could exceed either the state or federal ambient air quality standards for PM₁₀. This would be temporary, but could potentially have a significant effect. The applicant must comply with AQMD Rule 223 and 223-1, which address the regulations and mitigation measures for fugitive dust emissions to be adhered to during construction process. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) The County currently is in nonattainment status for state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM₁₀. The project would likely generate emissions of ozone precursors and PM₁₀ through grading and site improvements as discussed in b) above. Nevertheless, the project would contribute ozone emissions in an area classified in “serious nonattainment” of federal ozone standards. The impact would be less than significant.
- (d & e) No schools, hospitals, parks, or other sensitive land uses are located within the immediate vicinity. The residential land uses associated with the project would not have the potential to create odors or expose sensitive receptors to negative impacts. Short-term heavy equipment emissions generated by the on site and off site road improvements would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash, or odors based upon an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan conforming to District Rules 223 and 223.1. District Rule 224 prevents additional release of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), by prohibiting the use of cutback or emulsified paving asphalt for paving, road construction or

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

road maintenance. Adherence to rules 215 and 224 is sufficient to ensure that emissions impacts due to the release of VOC from architectural coatings are less than significant.

Findings:

A significant air quality impact is defined 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 pollutant concentrations. Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District CEQA Guide. The proposed residential subdivision would not result in significant impacts resulting from odors. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;
- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;

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

- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species; or
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

The project is considered to have an anticipated high intensity effect on wildlife habitat of a particular designation as defined in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR:

High intensity: High-density residential, medium-density residential, low-density residential (i.e., lot sizes ranging from five to 10 acres), multifamily residential, industrial, commercial, research and development, public facilities, and the adopted plan. These are areas where mass grading of large blocks of undeveloped land would be expected and the landscape would become increasingly urbanized and fragmented.

- (a) Gibson & Skordal, LLC prepared a Jurisdictional Delineation Report and Special Status Species Evaluation (Evaluation) on the project site and determined that none of the rare plant species were found on the site. The Evaluation defined “special status” species as those listed as endangered or threatened under both federal and state Endangered Species Act, designated a Species of Special Concern by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and listed on California Native Plant Society (CNPS) plant inventory lists.

The Evaluation determined that the project site contains suitable foraging habitat for:

tricolored blackbird, California Species of Special Concern, was not observed on the project site during the field surveys, appropriate nesting and foraging habitats would be present within the project site;

great egret, CDFG-Special Animal, was not observed on the project site during the field surveys, the ponds and swales located on the project site would provide the appropriate foraging habitat;

great blue heron, CDFG-Special Animal, was not observed on the project site during the field surveys, the project site would provide the required foraging habitat for this species;

burrowing owl, California Species of Special Concern, was not observed on the project site during the field surveys, the project site would provide the required breeding and foraging habitat;

Swainson’s hawk, California Threatened, was not observed on the project site during the field surveys, the project site would provide nesting habitat within the cottonwoods being located along the stock ponds and the open fields would provide foraging habitat;

bank swallow, California Threatened, was not observed on the project site during the field surveys, the project site may provide forage on the site.

If these species occur on the project site, they would be impacted by construction activities including grading, road building and alterations in drainage patterns. These activities could result in lose of active bird nests. This is considered potentially significant impacts.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-1

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

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

the following actions shall be taken in order to avoid impacts to nesting raptors:

- a. Halt all construction within 150 feet of any trees containing active raptor nests; these areas shall be marked with fencing or tape in order to clearly delineate areas where construction is prohibited.*
- b. Construction shall not resume within 150 feet of any identified nest until the end of the typical nesting season; August 31. Construction may resume prior to the end of the nesting season, only if all raptor fledges have left the nest.*
- c. Construction shall not resume prior to consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game and determination that the proposed project would not result in a “take”.
(MM BIO-1).*

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

Incorporation of the above mitigation measure would reduce impacts to candidate, sensitive and special status species to less than significant.

- (b) The Jurisdictional Delineation Report and Special Status Species Evaluation identified 1.0569 acres of water features including 0.7122 acre of ponds, 0.2134 acres of swales, 0.0683 acre of seep, 0.0088 acre of channels, and 0.0543 acres of ditches. Special status plant species identified on the CNDDDB as occurring within close proximity to the site include pin cushion navarretia (*Navarretia myersii ssp. myersii*) and leggenere (*Legenere limosa*). Both are strongly associated with vernal pools and other seasonally ponded wetlands. The Evaluation determines that the appropriate habitat types would not be found on the project site and it would be unlikely that any of these species are present and would reduce impacts to riparian areas to less than significant. The Evaluation identified the water features as being intermittent except for one of the four (4) existing ponds. The largest pond, being 0.3085 acres, is identified in the Evaluation as a perennial pond. The developer does not intend to impacts these water features except for an on-site road improvement area which crosses one intermittent channel. General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 requires a minimum setback of One-hundred feet (100’) from all perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and fifty feet (50’) from intermittent streams and wetlands. The Tentative Subdivision Map shows the water features identified and discussed in the Evaluation and provides fifty foot (50’) easements adjacent to intermittent water features and a one-hundred foot (100’) easement surrounding the large perennial pond which would provide a buffer to the water features identified on the project site. The easements would allow for compliance with General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 and would ensure impacts to be less than significant.
- (c) The project site contains three (3) discrete surface drainages which eventually flow into the Consumnes and navigable Mokelumne Rivers, respectively. A channel enters and exits the northeast corner of the project site before emptying with Indian Creek to the south. Two other small systems (composed of intermittent seep, channel, several swales and three stock ponds) drain the study area to the southwest, merge outside of the project site, and flow into Deer Creek. Deer Creek and Indian Creek are tributary to the Consumnes River. The delineated areas represent those features that can be considered potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States because of their physical biological characteristics as well as their hydrologic relationship to downstream waters. The Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction under the Federal Clean Water Act over navigable waters of the United States, interstate waters, their tributaries and wetlands adjacent to these waters. These waters would be considered connected to or adjacent to waters of the United States; and are potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States and subject to interstate commerce. The project proposes the crossing of waterways within the site. Any dredging, filling, removal or other alterations to wetlands or waters of the United States on the project would require permitting pursuant to

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

sections 401 and 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act. Additionally, Under CA Department of Fish and Game (DFG) Code Section 1602, a discretionary Stream Alteration Agreement permit may be required for any construction activities that would substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake designated by the DFG. The state and Federal regulations governing the protection of wetlands are sufficient to ensure impacts are less than significant.

- (d) The Evaluation did not identify the project site as being part of a migration corridor for wildlife. However, the Evaluation indicated the existence of potential nesting habitat for bird species, as discussed in a) above. Construction activities could affect these potential nesting sites. Compliance with the mitigation measure described in a) above would avoid or minimize impacts on these sites. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.
- (e) The project site consists of approximately two percent (2%) of trees. All of the trees would be located with the fifty foot (50') seasonal pond and drainage areas or the one hundred foot (100') perennial pond area as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map. No trees would be removed. The impact would be less than significant.
- (f) Protected and sensitive and natural resources/areas within El Dorado County includes: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database and the El Dorado County General Plan. However, the project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. This impact would be less than significant.

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**.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- 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) The project site consists of two homes including dirt access roads. Table 5.13-1 of the County General Plan provides properties in the unincorporated area of El Dorado County on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. Table 5.13-2 of the General Plan lists California Historic Landmarks in unincorporated El Dorado County. Neither table shows any sites or landmarks in the Latrobe area. There is no impact.
- (b) The Cultural Resource Assessment prepared by Peak & Associates, Inc. identifies a small midden on the project site. The Cultural Resource Assessment recommends that the midden site should be protected from all construction activities by installing temporary fencing around the midden prior to installation of construction activities on the property and permanent fencing should be installed prior to completion and final approval of the proposed residence on the project site. The developer shall protect Site P-9-3670 from all construction activities by installing temporary fencing during installation of construction activities on the property and permanent fencing shall be installed prior to completion and final approval of the proposed residence on the project site. Access to this portion of the project site shall be limited in the deed and the owner of the property shall be responsible for maintaining the fence surrounding the midden site. The temporary fence material shall be a high visibility fabric and shall be machine produced, orange colored mesh manufactured from polypropylene or polyethylene. The fencing materials shall not contain biodegradable filler material that can degrade the physical or chemical characteristics of the finished fabric. The permanent fencing shall be a made of natural materials, such as stone or wood, designed appropriately for a rural setting, and shall be a minimum of four feet (4') in height. Impacts to the midden could be considered potentially significant.

MITIGATION MEASURE CULT-1

An environmental sensitive area easement, prepared by the applicant, measured five (5) feet from the edge of P-9-3670 as noted in the cultural resource study dated April 2007, shall be recorded with the final map. A qualified archaeologist shall accurately locate P-9-3670 so as to precisely represent the easement. The easement shall be shown on the subdivision map, or recorded as a separate instrument. (MM CULT-1)

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the required easement has been recorded prior to filing the map. Staff shall verify that a note records with the map prior to filing or is shown on the subdivision map.

MITIGATION MEASURE CULT-2

The developer shall protect Site P-9-3670 from all construction activities by installing temporary fencing to installation of construction activities on the property and permanent fencing shall be installed prior to completion and final approval of the proposed residence on the project site. Access to this portion of the project site shall be limited in the deed and the owner of the property shall be responsible for maintaining the fence surrounding the midden site. The temporary fence material shall be a high visibility fabric and shall be machine produced, orange colored mesh manufactured from polypropylene or polyethylene. The fencing materials shall not contain biodegradable filler material that can degrade the physical or chemical characteristics of the finished fabric. The high visibility fabric shall be fully stabilized ultraviolet resistant, and shall be a minimum of four feet (4') in width

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

with a maximum mesh opening of two inch (2') by two inch (2'). The permanent fencing shall be a made of natural materials, such as stone or wood, designed appropriately for a rural setting, and shall be a minimum of four feet (4') in height. (MM CULT-2)

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the temporary fencing has been installed prior to issuance of a grading permit and permanent fencing has been installed prior to completion and final approval of the proposed residence on the project site. . The project Archaeologist shall provide Planning Services with a letter pre and post construction verifying that all fencing has been installed as required.

- (c) No paleontological resources or unique geological features were identified on the project site. The County 2004 General Plan 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. The impacts 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.

Findings:

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 and CUL-2** would reduce the impacts on such resources to a less-than-significant level.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site			X	

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			
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 ground shaking, 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) i) According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, there are no Alquist-Priolo fault zones within El Dorado County. The nearest such faults are located in Alpine and Butte Counties. There would be no impact related to Alquist-Priolo zones.
- ii) The County 2004 General Plan states there are no active faults in El Dorado County. The nearest fault to the project site is the Melones Fault zone, which would be located approximately ten (10) miles east. The Melones Fault zone is classified as a pre-Quaternary fault, a type of fault considered inactive (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.9-5 and Exhibit 5.9-2). The potential intensity of seismic events varies across the County, generally increasing from west to east, with the highest potential ground shaking intensity located in the Lake Tahoe Basin (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.9-5). Existing seismic safety regulations within the adopted County building code, which is based on the California Building Code, would ensure that structures and improvements on the site are safe from impacts related to seismic shaking. The impact would be less than significant.
- iii) Seismic-related ground failure includes lateral spreading and seismically-induced landslides and avalanches. Lateral spreading occurs mainly in areas with soft, saturated clay soils and beneath fills. The project site does not contain such soils. Seismically-induced landslides and avalanches occur mainly in areas with high potential for seismic activity. El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.9-2). Liquefaction most likely occurs in areas with water-saturated silts, sands and gravels having low to medium density. The only area on the project site that contains such soils is the seasonal wetland. This wetland is

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

dry outside the rainy season, and the project would most likely fill this wetland. Therefore, the liquefaction hazard would be considered low. The impacts would be less than significant.

iv) The project site is moderately sloped with ninety-seven percent (97%) of the project site being twenty percent (20%) slope or less. A site investigation concluded that no geologic risks, such as land slides, mud flows or other non-seismic movement would be anticipated. The potential for landslides on the site would be limited by the planned grading associated with the project. The impact would be less than significant.

(b. & c.)

All grading activities exceeding fifty cubic yards (50cy) of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During site grading and construction of any on-site and off site road improvements, there would be the potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

Adherence to the County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance would reduce the potential impacts to less than significant.

(d) The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has mapped soils on the site as predominantly Argonaut very rocky loam (AmD), Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD), and Auburn extremely rocky silt loam (AyF). Review of the *Soil Survey of the El Dorado County Area* indicates that the mapped soil types for the proposed project have a thin mantle of soil 20 to 30 inches in depth. Based upon this review, the impact from expansive soils would be less than significant.

(e) The applicant provided a Report of Percolation Test. The El Dorado County Environmental Management Department has reviewed the project and had no specific concerns related to percolation rates. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings:

No significant geophysical impacts would occur from the Tentative Subdivision Map request either directly or indirectly. The impacts would be less than significant. For this “Geology and Soils” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would			X

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			
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 & b)

No hazardous substances would be involved with the project. Temporary use of heavy equipment for road improvements would be required. A diesel fuel storage tank may be located on site for the heavy equipment. The potential storage and transport of diesel fuel in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment would require an approved hazardous material business plan issued from the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. Said hazardous material business plan would identify potential impacts to the environment and require mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Based on the amount of road improvements required and the duration of heavy equipment on-site and off-site to complete the road improvements, and that fuel storage would most likely not occur, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant with an approved hazardous materials business plan. This impact would be less than significant.

Hazardous materials would be used in the construction of homes and improvements associated with the project. During times of construction, these materials would be transported to and from the project site. The safe transport and use of these materials would be required by federal law, and safety information for all such products would be

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

included on packaging materials and labels. The temporary transport and use of these materials by construction personnel would not result in significant adverse health impacts in typical circumstances. This impact would be less than significant.

- (c) There are no schools within ¼ mile of the proposed project site. There would be no impact.
- (d) The site would not located on a known hazardous materials property, as identified on State and Federal databases. The site has been in use as rural lands and rural residential property for its known history. There would be no impact.
- (e) The nearest airport to the proposed project site would be Cameron Park Airport, which is nine (9) miles away from the project site. There would be no impact.
- (f) The project site would not be within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There would be no impact.
- (g) The proposed project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. This impact would be less than significant.
- (h) The degree of hazard in wild-land areas depends on weather variables like temperature, wind, and moisture, the amount of dryness and arrangement of vegetation, slope steepness, and accessibility to human activities, accessibility of firefighting equipment, and fuel clearance around structures. To reduce impacts to a less than significant level, the project shall be required to comply with the “Fire Safe” requirements.

Findings:

No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. The proposed residential subdivision would not result in significant impacts resulting from odors. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
 - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- (a) The proposed project would create eight (8) single-family ten (10) acre lots which would be served by individual septic systems. The El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management would be responsible for protecting public health and the environment from the potential adverse impacts associated with on-site, individual sewage disposal systems. The proposed project’s septic system design would be reviewed by the Department to ensure compliance with County Ordinance Chapter 15.32, Private Sewage Disposal System, as well as County Resolution No. 259-99, Design Standards for the Site Evaluation and Design of Sewage Disposal Systems. Review by the Department of Environmental Management and compliance with these existing regulations would ensure that all septic systems constructed as part of the project would function properly and would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. This impact would be less than significant.
- (b) El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are identified in El Dorado County. Water service for the proposed project would be provided by individual water wells. There would be no established water table under the site. These water sources would be found in pockets or running through rock fractures. There would be no evidence that the

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

project would substantially reduce the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The applicant has provided a well production report for the proposed project. The Rumsey-Lang Well Drilling & Pumps, Inc., well production report provided two test well sites. One well produced 4.5gpm at a depth of seven-hundred feet (700’); the second well produced 10gpm at a depth of six-hundred and forty feet (640’). Based on the results of the on-site well reports and the general geo-hydrologic conditions in the area, the domestic water supplies would be adequate for the project site. This impact would be less than significant.

- (c) There are several aquatic features on the project site. These include four (4) stock ponds and three minor intermittent drainageways. An intermittent channel enters and exits the northeast corner of the project site. Two other small systems (composed of a seep, a channel, several swales and stock ponds) drain the project site to the southwest. The existing stock ponds and drainage areas would be identified as easements on the tentative map to protect these environmental sensitive areas. There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. *The Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* contain specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards would apply to this project when a building permit request is submitted to the County. This impact would be less than significant.
- (d) As identified in (c) above there are several aquatic features on the project site. These drainageways generally carry water from the site during storm events and are expected to be dry during part or all of the summer. Alterations would be made to drainage patterns on the project site due to changes in grading and the creation of impervious surfaces associated with new roads, homes and driveways. However, water would be channeled through drainage ditches along roads and through culverts under roads, the placement of which would coincide with existing drainage patterns. The project would not result in substantial changes in drainage volumes or patterns, nor would the proposed project result in on-site or off-site flooding. Compliance with the standards and requirements contained in the Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance would limit any potential impacts to drainageways on or adjacent to the project site, and would limit erosion and siltation to a less than significant level.
- (e) There would be insignificant impacts from stormwater runoff directly caused by the approval of this application request and minor road improvements.
- (f) The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All storm-water and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site. The impact would be less than significant.
- (g) The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (Flood Zone C; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel 060040 0700 C; areas of minimal flooding). There would be no impact.
- (h) The closest dams and levees to the project site are Cameron Park dam and dams and levees on Folsom Lake. This project site would be eight miles from Cameron Park Lake dam. Additionally, failure of Folsom Dam is considered remote. There would be no impact.
- (i – J) The project area would not be near a body of water large enough to generate a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The nearest large bodies of water are Lake Tahoe and Folsom Lake. Neither is close enough or large enough to predict seiche risk. Mudflow on this type of soil is unlikely, see geology and soils section. There would be no impact.

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

Findings:

Any future development plans submitted for a building and/or grading permit would be analyzed to address erosion and sediment control. No significant hydrological impacts are expected with this project either directly or indirectly. The impacts would be less than significant. For this “Hydrology and Water Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
 - Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
 - Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
 - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- (a) The proposed project would introduce additional housing surrounding lands containing open undeveloped land with several ranchettes. Properties located north and adjacent to the project are designated ten (10) acre lots. The project would require rezoning agricultural land to residential land. This change in zoning is intended by the El Dorado County General Plan. The surrounding area is already residential in nature and the character of land use would not be significantly altered by the proposed project. The project would not divide an established community. This impact would be less than significant.
- (b) The proposed project would include the rezoning of the site from Residential Agricultural-20 Acre Zone District (RA-20) to Estate Residential 10-Acre Zone District (RE-10). This project would not conflict with the El Dorado County General Plan. Additional plans, policies and regulations are addressed in various sections of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. This impact would be less than significant.
- (c) Protected and sensitive natural areas within El Dorado County include: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database and shown in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR. However, the

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

project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. This impact would be less than significant.

Findings:

The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan policies for residential uses. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the project site. For this “Land Use Planning” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

(a - b)

The project site would not be in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist are present, (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001), and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. There would be no impact.

Findings:

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

There would be no impacts.

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X	

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

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
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 – d)

The on-site and off site road improvements would generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment, trucks, bulldozer) at a potentially significant level (greater than 60 dB L_{eq} and 70 dB L_{max} between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 GP table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in rural regions-construction noise). Construction operations for road improvements would require adherence to construction hours as required by General Plan Policy 6.5.11. Construction activities would be limited to 7a.m. to 7p.m. during weekdays and 8a.m. to 5p.m. on weekends and federally recognized holidays. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant. The long-term noise impacts would be related to current vehicle traffic along the South Single Road which would be under the maximum noise level thresholds in the 2004 General Plan Table 6-1 of 60 dB L_{dn} /CNEL or less. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

(e) The project site would not be located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. Cameron Park Airport would be the nearest airport to the project site and is eight miles northeast. The project site would be located outside of the 55dB CNEL area on the airport noise contour map for Cameron Park Airport. There would be no impact.

(f) The project site would not be located within two miles of a private airstrip. There would be no impact.

Findings: Potential short and long term noise sources would be required to comply with established noise standards and policies. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
 - Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
 - Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.
- (a) The proposed project would create eight (8) single-family ten (10) acre lots and would not induce growth directly or indirectly by providing infrastructure that would create development beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. The development area on the project site is designated on the 2004 General Plan Land Use Map for Rural Residential development. The allowable density for this designation is one dwelling unit per 10 to 160 acres. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (b) The project would not result in the loss of existing housing. There would be no impact.
- (c) The project would not result in the displacement of residents. There would be no impact.

Findings: The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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 Latrobe Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project site. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. However, it has been determined by the Fire District that the level of service would not fall below the minimum requirements as a result of the project. The responsible Fire District would review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (b) The El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department would provide police services to the site, as they do presently. The creation of additional homes on the site would result in an increased demand for services, and may be subject to the payment of fees to offset the increase in service demand associated with the growth. As the Department currently serves the site and driveway improvements would be sufficient to allow for access by public safety vehicles, no additional impacts would result.
- (c) The project site would be located within the Latrobe School District. The occupancy of homes may add school-age children to the District, adding demands to school facilities. The District may assess fees, as permitted by State law, to offset the potential impacts associated with population growth. Fees are assessed as part of the County’s building permit process and are sufficient to offset the environmental impacts to the school district. Impacts to schools are less than significant.
- (d) Parks services would be provided by the County and special districts which maintain facilities in the County. The proposed development would not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. Provisions to provide parkland or the payment of an in-lieu fee are included as the project is residential in nature. The impact would be less than significant.
- (e) No other public facilities or services would be directly substantially impacted by the project. Any future potential impacts would be further analyzed in the in any future development application process. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

Findings: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the development of the project site either directly or indirectly. No significant public service impacts are expected. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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 & b) The proposed project would not increase population that would substantially contribute to increase demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increase use of existing facilities. There would be a less than significant impact.

FINDING: No impacts to recreation or open space would result from the project. For this “Recreation” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X

Discussion:

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

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

(a & b)

The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that the project would not exceed the thresholds established in the 2004 General Plan. The number of vehicles associated with the project would not change current vehicle trip rates and would not measurably affect traffic volumes or levels of service on a permanent basis such that County standards would be exceeded. A traffic study was not required as the project would generate less than 100 ADT or less than 10 peak hour trips. The impacts would be less than significant.

- (c) The project would not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing fields in the project vicinity. There would be no impact.
- (d) The project site would be readily accessible form South Shingle Road, a county maintained road. The proposed project does not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards. The impact would be less than significant.
- (e) The project site would receive access off of South Shingle Road, a county maintained road, and Settlers Trail Road and Cordero Ranch Road, a proposed new road, which would provide through access for the project. Road improvements would be required to provide the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to the fire safe regulations that are being placed upon the conditions of approvals for the project prior to final map recording. Based upon the required road improvements there would be no disruption of emergency access to and from the existing residences or those on surrounding parcels. The impact would be less than significant.
- (f) Single family residences would be required to provide two parking spaces that are not in tandem. The proposed lots would provide adequate space to comply with all parking requirements. There would be no impact.
- (g) The project proposes no design characteristics, uses, or features that conflict with any plans, policies, or programs supporting alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

Findings: No significant impacts to transportation/traffic are expected. For this “Transportation/ Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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 - b) The project proposes the subdivision of the site into eight (8) single-family ten (10) acre lots, with the new residential lots proposed to have individual septic systems and well water serving each home. The septic systems and well water fall under the authority of the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management, and under the regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Septic systems designed and installed on site must meet State and county standards, and thus would not exceed any standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. There are no anticipated wastewater treatment or facility impacts. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

- (c) All required drainage facilities for the project would be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (d) As referenced above, the proposed project would provide for well water and septic systems for each proposed lot. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (e) Septic percolation testing data was reviewed and accepted by County Environmental Management. The eight (8) lots are able to provide areas for on-site septic treatment and disposal. Future residential development would be reviewed by Building Services during the building permit review phase to ensure the septic areas are established to County design standards. The impact would be less than significant.
- (f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g. concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30 year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655 acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.

 After July of 2006, El Dorado Disposal began distributing municipal solid waste to Forward Landfill in Stockton and Kiefer Landfill in Sacramento. Pursuant to El Dorado County Environmental management Solid Waste Division staff, both facilities have sufficient capacity to serve the County. Recyclable materials are distributed to a facility in Benicia and green wastes are sent to a processing facility in Sacramento, impacts would be less than significant.
- (g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. The project would generate waste similar to other single-family residential uses. No local, state, or federal statutes related to the generation, treatment, or disposal of solid waste would be violated by the project. The impact 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.

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

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

Discussion:

- (a) The proposed project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to biological and cultural resources. Potential impacts to biological resources include the alteration of habitat and or direct impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species. This impact would be mitigated by **MM BIO-1** which requires on-site pre-construction surveys for raptors and their nests conducted by a qualified biologist. Additional impacts to biological resources are less than significant.

Impacts to cultural resources are potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated due to the high potential for historic-period cultural resources to occur within the project site. This impact is mitigated by **MM CULT-1**, which requires an environmental sensitive area easement to be shown on the tentative subdivision map at the location on the project site identified by the project archaeologist as significant cultural resources. Impacts to cultural resources could also occur if impacted during construction activities on the project site. **MM CULT-2** requires the developer to install fencing around the environmental sensitive easement area prior to construction activities.

Impacts to biological and cultural resources would be addressed by the above mitigation measures. **MM BIO 1** and **MM CULT-1** and **CULT-2** would reduce the potential to degrade the environment and impacts to biological and cultural resources to less than significant.

- (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 Initial Study, it has been determined that the project would not result in cumulative impacts.
- (c) The project would not result in significant environmental effects on humans in the project vicinity. As discussed in the Air Quality, Noise, and Hazardous Materials Sections above, no significant effects would occur. It has been determined that the impact would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

El Dorado County 2004 General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, Adopted February 5, 2007

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Additional References:

Jurisdictional Delineation Report and Special Status Species Evaluation, Cordero Ranch Property, prepared by Gibsons & Skordal, LLC (February 2007)

Cultural Resources Assessment of the proposed Cordero Ranch Project, prepared by Peak & Associates, Inc. (April 2007)

Preliminary Drainage Study report for Cordero Ranch Tentative Subdivision prepared by Ken W. Purcell (June 30, 2007)

California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Soil Candidate Listing for Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. (updated July 19, 2004)

El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District. CEQA Guide First Edition. (February 2002)

El Dorado County Development Services Department --- Planning Services. Parcel Data Information System.

Latrobe Fire Protection District