



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

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project Title: Tentative Map TM08-1468/Carlson Woods Residential Subdivision

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

Contact Person: Tom Dougherty

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: John and Gail Eldridge, P.O. Box 1692, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Agent's Name and Address: Gene Thorne and Associates, 4080 Plaza Golderado Circle, Cameron Park, CA 95682.

Project Location: On the north side of Carlson Drive approximately 0.6 mile north of the intersection with Meder Road in the Shingle Springs area, Supervisorial District IV.

Assessor's Parcel Number: 070-210-37 (21.70 acres)

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

Section: 26 T: 10N R: 9E

General Plan Designation: Low-Density Residential (LDR)

Environmental Setting: The 21.7-acre parcel ranges in elevation from a low of approximately 1,400 feet along the northern border to a high of 1,480 feet above sea level near the southeastern edge of the parcel. The parcel slopes predominately from north to south and is predominately covered with native oak trees and shrub types typical of the chaparral areas typically associated with gabbro soils. Numerous dirt driveways have been rough graded within the site.

Description of Project: The applicant requests approval of a tentative parcel map creating four parcels ranging in size from 5.0 to 5.81 acres on a 21.7-acre site. Design waivers have been requested to allow the existing one to five-foot wide shoulder width to be sufficient along Carlson Drive (instead of requiring 5-ft shoulders), Allow the existing 50-foot right of way for Carlson Drive to be sufficient (instead of requiring 60-feet), and to allow a 12-foot wide driveway to access Lot 2.. Proposed Lots 1, 3 and 4 would have direct encroachments onto Carlson Drive and Lot 2 would be accessed by a driveway through Lot 1.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park)
Site:	RE-5	LDR	Single-family residences, vacant.
North:	RE-5	LDR	Single-family residences, (four 5.018 to 5.107-acre parcels).
East:	RE-5	LDR	Single-family residences, (two 5.0 to 5.7-acre parcels).
South:	RE-5	LDR	Single-family residences, (two 5-acre parcels).
West:	R2A	MDR	Single-family residences, (one, 4.3-acre parcel).

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado County Department of Transportation, Rescue Fire Protection District, El Dorado County Environmental Health Division., El Dorado County Office of the County Surveyor.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

- a) Scenic Vista: The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). There would be no impact.
- b) Scenic Resources: The project site is not 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 (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>)). There would be no impact.
- c) The creation of these four lots would not directly change any views from what is currently available. There would be no impact.
- d) The creation of these four lots would allow new lighting by creating the potential for a new residence and potentially add one additional second residential unit single-family dwelling on each parcel. These impacts would not be expected to be any more than any typical residential lighting similar and typical to those existing on the surrounding parcels and thus would have a less than significant impact on nighttime views in the area.

Finding: The project and the potential introduction of new single-family dwellings would be compatible with the existing surrounding uses in the direct vicinity. For this “Aesthetics” category, impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:			
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

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

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:			
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 four proposed lots are primarily located on Rescue sandy loam soil (ReB) of 2 to 9 percent slopes, rescue very stony sandy loam (RfC) with 3 to 15 percent slopes, and Argonaut clay loam (AnB) with 3 to 9 percent slopes. Neither RfC or AnB are classified as either prime farmland, statewide important farmland, or unique, soils of local importance on the Important Farmland Maps prepared by the California Resources Agency using the USDA-NRCS Soil Surveys. ReB soils are classified as U.S.D.A Prime Farmland and they are located within 40 percent of the parcel.. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas or properties designated as being within the Agricultural District (-A) General Plan land use overlay designation adjacent to the project site. The project site was designated by the General Plan for Low Density Residential land uses and the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan anticipated that some Prime Farmland would be lost. The five-acre sizes of the parcels would potentially allow room for avoiding significant impacts to the soil and strict adherence to Best Management Practices and to the requirements of the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance would reduce the impacts to less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b, c) The creation of the four lots would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project. There would be no impact.

Finding: As discussed above, strict adherence to Best Management Practices and to the requirements of the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance would reduce the impacts to less than significant.

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

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

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

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, would 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, would result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b, c) Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone. Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM10) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to meet the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

Short-term impacts related to construction activities; and
 Long-term impacts related to the project operation.

Short-term, superficial, minor grading and excavation activities that could be associated with the finish grading associated with future development permits and improvements to the turnaround at Carlson Drive would be the only activities caused by the creation of these lots as they could potentially have second residential units and accessory buildings, but that type of construction typically would only last a few days and intermittently at that.

Mobile emission sources such as automobiles, trucks, buses, and other internal combustion vehicles are responsible for more than 70 percent of the air pollution within the County, and more than one-half of California's air pollution. In addition to pollution generated by mobile emissions sources, additional vehicle emission pollutants are carried into the western slope portion of El Dorado County from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area by prevailing winds. Future grading would potentially emit minor, temporary and intermittent criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and would be subject to El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District standards at that time. The proposed lots are located within a quarter-mile buffer of an asbestos review area. Significant impacts created through grading and construction activities would be reduced to insignificant levels with the implementation of Rule 223-2, *Fugitive Dust – Asbestos Hazard Mitigation* measures adopted by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, daycare centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. General Plan Policy 6.7.6.1 requires that the County ensure that new facilities in which sensitive receptors are located (e.g., schools, child care centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, and hospitals) are sited away from significant sources of air pollution.

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

It has been determined that the proposed lot sites are more than one mile from any sensitive receptors in the area, and impacts from the project would be less than significant.

- e) The single-family residential uses allowed after the creation of these four lots do not, under normal circumstances, create any excessive objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: 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. As discussed above, no significant impacts on air quality would occur and no mitigation is required. For this “Air Quality” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

- a, b) The submitted *Botanical Reconnaissance and Rare Plant Survey of the Eldridge* Propert, Michael Baad, Ph..D. dated August 10, 2006 found three species listed as rare or as Pine Hill endemics in the El Dorado County General Plan were identified within the project area: El Dorado County mule-ears (*Wyethia reticulate*), Lynes butterweed (*Senecio layneae*), and Roderick’s ceanothus (*ceanothus roderickii*). El Dorado mule ear is not federally or state listed. Lynes butterweed and Roderick’s ceanothus are considered rare and threatened and/or endangered plant species. The submitted study concluded that the *relatively discrete occurrences of these two species of listed plants within the boundaries of the Eldridge parcel may allow for mitigation “on-site” as the processes of parcel division and home site selection proceed and, in most cases, avoid the habitats of these highly localized populations of plants.”*

The proposed project is located in El Dorado County Plant Mitigation Area 1 of the County’s Gabbro soils rare plant preserve program which identify areas of the County that potentially contain rare plants. The subject parcel is not located within any Ecological Preserve overlay zone. The project was designed to avoid the areas where the plants were identified. Further studies may be required by the California Department of Fish and Game or United States Fish and Wildlife Service. While the payment of fees satisfies the County’s requirements for mitigation of the impacts to the rare plants, additional permits may be required by these agencies. The following mitigation measure will bring the impacts to the three species listed as rare in the General Plan to a less than significant level:

- 2) *The Rare Plant Mitigation fee, in lieu of on-site mitigation, shall be paid to El Dorado County at the time of issuance of any building permit for any of the four parcels subject to this permit. [MM Bio-1].*

Monitoring: *El Dorado County Building Services will be responsible for collecting the appropriate fee prior to issuance of any future development permit for any of the four lots created by the final map.*

- c) The submitted Tentative Subdivision Map shows the parcel has drainage channels that are labeled as ephemeral and thus are not subject to special setbacks pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4. All of these swales/channels are shown on the map with ten-foot wide drainage easements and would need to be recorded on the final map. The grading permit would require that the Natural Resource Conservation Service Best Management Practices be followed to reduce the impacts to the ephemeral drainage channels to a less than significant level.
- d) Review of the Department of Fish and Game’s Migratory Deer Herd Maps indicate the project site does not lie within the range of a deer herd. The five-acre lot sizes and conformity with oak canopy regulations would allow migration of other native species to continue and would have less than significant impacts.
- e) The subject parcel intergrades the chamise chaparral and blue oak – foothill pine habitat types. (El Dorado County General Plan EIR, 5.12-7, May 2003). Existing vegetation on the site consists predominantly of a tree - shrub. The majority of the trees include even-aged multi-trunked interior live oaks and black oaks. Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes the native oak tree canopy retention and replacement standards and requires that 80 percent of the existing oak tree canopy coverage for the 21.7-acre project area be retained as a result findings of the *Arborist Report for Eldridge Tentative Map*, Phillip Mosbacher, Certified Arborist WE-7351A, dated January 14, 2008, which reported a 41.2 percent oak canopy coverage. The report estimated that approximately 0.50 acre of oak canopy would be removed as part of this project proposal which is 18 percent of the canopy and thus would meet the General Plan retention standards. The interior of the project would be accessed by driveways which would not be required to be constructed prior to recording the final map however; the described potential impacts would need to be mitigated prior to issuance of any development permit. The applicants have the choice to use Options A or B at a 1 to 1 ratio to mitigate the impacts. With the adoption of the following recommended Mitigation Measure No. 3 [MM Bio-2], the project would be compliant with Policy 7.4.4.4 and thus impacts would be less than significant:

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

3. *The applicant shall choose to mitigate for oak canopy loss with either Option A or Option B, pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4.*

*If Option A is chosen, the applicant shall be required to replant 100 one-gallon sized black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*) and interior live oaks (*Quercus wislizenii*) trees (200 trees x 0.50 acre = 100). Alternatively, the applicant may plant 600 acorns [(200 trees x 0.50 acre) x 3 acorns = 300 acorns]. The areas identified as suitable for replanting, as well as the recommended planting techniques are identified in Exhibits K1, K2 and K3. Prior to finaling the map, the applicant is required to enter into an oak tree replacement and mitigation monitoring agreement with the County.*

If Option B is chosen, in lieu of the replanting and monitoring requirements set forth above, the applicant may mitigate the impacts to oak woodland by complying with the oak conservation in-lieu fee requirements (Option B) of the Oak Woodland Management Plan, adopted by the Board of Supervisors on May 6, 2008. The applicant shall pay the mitigation in-lieu fee for all oak canopy removed as part of development of the project. The mitigation fee shall be paid at a 1:1 ratio as required by the Oak Woodland Conservation Ordinance and shall be based on the fee established by the Board of Supervisors. [MM Bio-2].

Monitoring: *Should the application choose Option A, replanting, prior to recording the Final Map, the applicant is required to enter into a County of El Dorado Agreement for Maintenance and Monitoring of Existing Oak Trees and Oak Tree Replacement Plantings through Planning Services staff. Applicant shall adhere to the Revegetation and Restoration Plan in Exhibit K2 and shall annually report planting status with a letter to Planning Services each year for a period of ten years from the date of the said agreement for planting trees and for fifteen years for planting acorns. Should the applicant choose Option B, a receipt showing payment of the oak conservation in-lieu fee shall be received by Planning Services prior to issuance of any development permit.*

- f) The proposed lots do not fall within designated critical habitat or core areas for the Red-legged and Yellow-legged frog species. (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7). The project would have no impact on the provisions of any adopted or approved habitat conservation plan.

Finding: With mitigation and strict compliance with County Code, the impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

a-d) A *Cultural Resources Study* was done of APN 070-210-37, (Historic Resource Associates, Dana Supernowitz, February 2006) which reported there were no significant prehistoric and historic-period cultural resources sites, artifacts, historic buildings, structures or objects found. Because of the possibility in the future that ground disturbances could turn up significant cultural resources anywhere in the County, the following would be added as conditions to address any potential future discovery:

4. *During all grading and construction activities in the project area on the proposed parcels, an archaeologist or Historian approved by the Development Services Director shall be on-call. In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent and/or future parcel owner shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until the on-call archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. If the find is determined to be significant and authenticated, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item. Grading and construction activities may resume after appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance*
5. *In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit, to ensure that this notation has been placed on the grading plans.*

Finding: As conditioned and based upon the cultural resource study prepared for the site, it is determined that for this “Cultural Resources” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:			
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X
iv) Landslides?			X
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?		X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?		X	

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
 - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive. (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001). There would be no impacts.

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

- b, c) Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil: All grading activities exceeding 50 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During any future site grading and construction of foundations and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions and that is addressed by grading permits. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) Expansive soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the four proposed lots are primarily located on Rescue sandy loam soil (ReB) of 2 to 9 percent slopes, Rescue very stony sandy loam (RfC) with 3 to 15 percent slopes, both with low shrink swell potential, and Argonaut clay loam (AnB) with 3 to 9 percent slopes, with moderate to high shrink swell capacity. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high and each building permit would include engineered plans addressing the soil capabilities. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) A site soil mantle test was done by Ron Duncan dated August 22, 2007 which did soil mantle test pits on all four proposed lots. The onsite sewage disposal feasibility report was reviewed by El Dorado County Environmental Health Division staff and they determined that the requirements for demonstrating adequate sewage disposal for the proposed lots have been satisfied. The Environmental Health Division would review specific septic designs that accompany future development plans, including potential second-residential units on all parcels, to ensure that the final septic disposal design meets County standard. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: No significant geophysical impacts would occur from the parcel map request either directly or indirectly. For this “Geology and Soils” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:			
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?			
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) Hazardous Substances: The project being considered is for a tentative subdivision map to create four new lots which does not directly involve introducing a scenario that would introduce the routine use, transport, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) Hazardous Emissions: The proposed applications would not directly allow any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. Any future development proposal would be evaluated through the grading and/or building permit processes for those impacts at that time. There would be no direct impact.
- d) Hazardous Materials Sites: The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List). No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the subject site are known to have occurred. There would be no impact.
- e) Public Airport Hazards: The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.

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

- f) Private Airstrip Hazards: There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impact.
- g) Emergency Response Plan: The Rescue Fire Protection District would require adherence to the approved *Wildfire Fire Safe Plan*, William Draper, dated January of 2006. The emergency response plan for any future residents of the newly created parcels would be further analyzed for impacts at the time of their building permit review. With the approved plan, impacts would be less than significant.
- h) Fire Hazards: The creation of the four lots, would not directly allow any operations (e.g., use of hazardous materials or processes) that would substantially increase fire hazard risk under normal circumstances of residential usage. Emergency response access to the site and surrounding development would not be adversely affected, as discussed above. The impacts, as conditioned and with adherence to the approved *Wildfire Fire Safe Plan*, would be less than significant.

Finding: No Hazards or Hazardous conditions would occur with the subject application requests and no mitigation is required. For this “Hazards” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:			
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) **Water Quality Standards:** The proposed development that could potentially occur because of the approval of the subject application would generate wastewater that would connect to a septic system. Stormwater runoff from potential future development is required to be directed to an engineered drainage system and to contain water quality protection features in accordance with an NPDES stormwater permit if it is deemed applicable. These requirements would be further analyzed and then conditioned specific to the future development proposal. For the current road improvements to an existing road system, the existing drainage patterns would not be significantly changed. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Groundwater:** Potable water is to be supplied by private wells. El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. The geology of the Western Slope portion of El Dorado County is principally hard crystalline, igneous or metamorphic rock overlain with a thin mantle of sediment or soil. Groundwater in this region is found in fractures, joints, cracks, and fault zones within the bedrock mass. These discrete fracture areas are typically vertical in orientation rather than horizontal as in sedimentary or alluvial aquifers. Recharge is predominantly through rainfall infiltrating into the fractures. Movement of this groundwater is very limited due to the lack of porosity in the bedrock. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are identified in El Dorado County. The El Dorado County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the current application requests and determined the final map cannot be finalized until it is proven to them that the newly created lots have an safe, adequate, analyzed water source. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Erosion Control Plan:** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit stormwater runoff and discharge from a site. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. Compliance with an approved erosion control plan would reduce erosion and siltation on and off site. A grading permit through either Building Services or El Dorado County Department of Transportation would be required for any future development to address grading, erosion and sediment control. The permit required for the road improvements would be reviewed as well for compliance. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- d) Existing Drainage Pattern: The proposed project encompasses 21.7 acres. The rate of surface runoff from development would be minimized through the application review process; there would be a less than significant impact from the current proposal's minor road improvements and future impervious surfaces created with development on the new lots. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Stormwater Runoff: There would insignificant impacts from stormwater runoff directly caused by the approval of this application request and minor road improvements. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) Water Quality: Wastewater and stormwater runoff from any future potential development would be analyzed further to assure water quality protection standards have been established. The roadways were designed to occupy areas with existing dirt and gravel roads thus, the tentative subdivision map request would not involve major physical changes to the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g, h, i) Flooding: No portion of the project is within the limits of the floodplain, as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate map. Therefore, no flooding impacts are expected. There would be no impacts.
- j) Inundation: A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a water body. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. There would be no potential impact from mudflow because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a dam or other water body.

Finding: Any future development plans submitted for a building and/or grading permit would be analyzed to address erosion and sediment control. No development plan accompanies this tentative subdivision map request. No significant hydrological impacts would occur with the project. For this "Hydrology" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a) **Established Community:** The four new lot creations would be in keeping with the General Plan intended development pattern expected in a Low-Density Residential land use designated area and would not physically divide an established community as they would fit into the dominant pattern of parcel development for the area. There would be no impact.
- b) **Land Use Plan:** The General Plan designates the subject site as Low-Density Residential (LDR). This land use designation identifies those areas suitable for single-family residential development at densities of one dwelling unit per five acres. The creation of the four lots would be compatible and appropriate within the LDR designated area. There would be no impact.
- c) **Habitat Conservation Plan:** The proposed project is not located in an area covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or a Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). There would be no impact.

Finding: The proposed tentative subdivision map would be consistent with the General Plan intent for LDR designated areas as well as be consistent with the existing dominant neighborhood parcel development pattern. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan. For this “Land Use” category, impacts would be less than significant.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:			
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			
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?			

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- a, b) **Mineral Resources:** The project site is not 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. (El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7). There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to energy and mineral resources would occur and no mitigation is required. For this “Mineral Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL;
 - Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
 - Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- a) The project is not listed under Table 6-1 of the General Plan as being a use subject to maximum allowable noise exposures from transportation source. As such, an acoustical analysis was not provided as part of the project application submittal. The creation of the four lots to accommodate single-family usage would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b, c, d) Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the parcel vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. Noises associated with residential uses are not anticipated to increase ambient noise levels. The creation of the four lots would require road improvements which would have a less than significant impact.
- e) General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including single-family residential, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable

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

Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a County owned/operated airport facility. There would be no impacts.

- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to or from noise would occur with the creation of these four lots either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, impacts would be less than significant.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
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 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 Low Density Residential development. The impacts would be less than significant.

- b, c) The proposed parcel subdivision would not displace people or existing housing, which would prevent the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There would be no impact.

Finding: The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the creation of these four lots either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

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

- a) **Fire Protection:** The Rescue Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. The District was solicited for comments to determine compliance with fire standards, El Dorado County General Plan, State Fire Safe Regulations as adopted by El Dorado County and the California Uniform Fire Code. The District did not respond with any concerns that the level of service would fall below the minimum requirements as a result of the proposed tentative subdivision map. The impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Police Protection:** The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department with a response time of 8 minutes to 80 percent of the population located in the Community Regions. For the rural areas, there is no standard minimum level of service or response time. Currently, the County has 0.89 sworn officers per 1,000 daytime populations. The project proposal would not significantly impact current response times to the project area. The impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Schools:** The State allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project proposal would not directly generate the need for additional school facilities and would not impact school enrollment, as the project would not result in a dominant residential component. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d) **Parks:** Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, and an in-lieu fee amount for the subdivision of land. Provisions to provide parkland were not included as part of the proposal in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of County Code. The project proposal

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

would create an incremental increase the demand for parkland for which the fee is intended to offset. The impacts would be less than significant.

- e) Other Facilities: 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.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant impacts would occur with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, impacts would be less than significant.

XIV. RECREATION.			
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.

- a, b) The creation of four new lots would not substantially contribute to an increase in demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. There would be a less than significant impact.

Finding: No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources would occur with the parcel map application. For this “Recreation” category, there would be no impacts.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:			
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

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:			
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?		X	
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?		X	
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X

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

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

- a, b) Access to the site from an encroachment directly off of Carlson Drive and then onto minor access roads and driveways. Comments were received from the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) indicating that the level of service (LOS) would not be significantly impacted by the proposed lots. The impacts would be less than significant.
- c) The project would not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns as there are no publicly or privately operated airports or landing fields in the project vicinity. There would be no impact.
- d) The project would not substantially increase hazards because Carlson Drive is conditioned to meet SRA Fire Safe Regulations and California Fire Code. The impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Rescue Fire Protection District approved a *Wildfire Fire Safe Plan* Fire Safe Plan which must be implemented by the project if approved. The impacts would be less than significant.
- f) The parking requirement for residential uses is two spaces per dwelling and all future residences shall be required to show two spaces of the Zoning Ordinance required size prior to issuance of a building permit. The impacts would be less than significant.
- g) The proposed parcel subdivision does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts would occur with the creation of these four lots either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:			
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?		X	
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X	
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, e) Wastewater: The El Dorado County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the current application requests along with the submitted site soil mantle test was done by Ron Duncan dated August 22, 2007 which did soil mantle test pits on all four proposed lots, and they determined that the requirements for demonstrating adequate sewage disposal for the newly proposed lots has been satisfied. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Stormwater Drainage: All required drainage facilities for the road/encroachment improvements would be fine tuned during the grading permit process required by El Dorado County Transportation Department. Initial review of the proposed plan determined that the current drainage patterns would not change in a major way. Other than that, the

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

project proposal does not directly involve physical changes to the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Potable Water: All proposed lots would be conditioned to have a safe and reliable water source prior to the recording of the final map. The impacts would be less than significant.
- f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

After July of 2006, El Dorado Disposal began distributing municipal solid waste to Forward Landfill in Stockton and Kiefer Landfill in Sacramento. Pursuant to El Dorado County Environmental Management Solid Waste Division staff, both facilities have sufficient capacity to serve the County. Recyclable materials are distributed to a facility in Benicia and green wastes are sent to a processing facility in Sacramento. Impacts would be less than significant.

- g) Solid Waste: County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. Solid waste pickup is currently available in the neighborhood on a weekly basis for the subject parcel and would be initiated should a residential structure be constructed on the newly created lots. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant utility and service system impacts would occur with the subject applications. Any new development application would have the potential project specific impacts analyzed at that time with a building or grading permit. For this "Utilities and Service Systems" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

- a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the project record that would indicate that his proposal split the 21-7-acre parcel into a four-lot subdivision has the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment. As conditioned and mitigated, and with strict adherence to County permit requirements, this tentative subdivision map and the typical residential uses expected to follow, would not appear to have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project would be less than significant due to the design of the project and required standards that would be implemented with the process of the final subdivision map and/or any required project specific improvements on or off the property. Both short-term and long-term environmental effects directly associated with this project would be less than significant.
- b) Due to the existing site specific conditions and type of project proposed and types of activities proposed, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, land use/planning, mineral resources, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) Any future development plan that attempts to expand the current uses and that subject of this application request would require the submittal of a development application and the potential project specific impacts would be analyzed at that time in relation to all applicable laws. No foreseeable environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly have been anticipated. Impacts would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Arborist Report for Eldridge Tentative Map, Phillip Mosbacher, Certified Arborist WE-7351A, dated January 14, 2008

Botanical Reconnaissance and Rare Plant Survey of the Eldridge Property, Michael Baad, Ph.D. dated August 10, 2006

Cultural Resources Study of APN 070-210-37, (Historic Resource Associates, Dana Supernowitz, February 2006).

Site soil mantle test was done by Ron Duncan dated August 22, 2007

Wildfire Fire Safe Plan, William Draper, dated January of 2006