



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** Z07-0028/ P07-0030/ PD07-0027 Clarksville Professional Business Park

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

<b>Contact Person:</b> Jonathan Fong, Planning Services	<b>Phone Number:</b> (530) 621-5355
---	-------------------------------------

**Property Owner’s Name and Address:** Clarksville Professional Business Park, LLC. 13405 Folsom Blvd #501. Folsom, CA 95630

**Project Applicant’s Name and Address:** Clarksville Professional Business Park, LLC.406 Sutter Street, Folsom CA, 95630.

**Project Agent’s Name and Address:** Clarksville Professional Business Park, LLC. 13405 Folsom Blvd #501. Folsom, CA 95630

**Project Engineer’s / Architect’s Name and Address:** RFE Engineering, Inc. 8680 Greenback Lane, Suite 107, Orangevale CA, 95662.

**Project Location:** The project site is located on the north side of White Rock Road 1,400 feet west of the intersection with White Rock Road/ Joerger Cutoff Road in the El Dorado Hills Area.

**Assessor’s Parcel No:** 121-280-03

**Zoning:** One-acre Residential (R1A)

**Section:** 1/2/11/12      **T:** 9N   **R:** 8E

**General Plan Designation:** Commercial (C)

**Description of Project:** The project would include a Rezone, Planned Development, and Parcel Map. The Rezone would change the parcel zoning from One-Acre Residential (R1A) to Commercial- Planned Development (C-PD). The Planned Development would allow the construction of ten commercial buildings totaling 98,992 square feet. The buildings would range in size from 5,100 to 44,992 square feet. The Parcel Map would create ten parcels ranging in size from 0.37 to 2.26 acres. Each of the proposed buildings would be located on a separate parcel. One Design Waiver has been requested to allow the following: 1) to allow sidewalk on one side of Road 1.

**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:	R1A	C	Single-family residence
North:	R1A/ TC	AP	PG&E station/ U.S. Highway 50
East:	AE	R&D	Undeveloped
South:	CG	AP	Clarksville Cemetery/ Lakehills Church
West:	CG	AP	Undeveloped

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is located directly adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 and has been previously developed with an existing residence and accessory buildings. Vegetation on-site is comprised of native grasslands and non-native trees. The terrain is varying with a relative high point near the southwest of the site and general slopes to the east.

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

1. El Dorado County Building Department: building permits
2. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: grading permits, encroachment permits
3. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District: Fugitive Dust Plan
4. El Dorado County Planning Services Department: Payment of Oak Conservation In-Lieu Fee.
5. California Department of Fish and Game: Streambed Alteration Agreement
6. US Army Corps of Engineers: 404 permit

7. State Regional Quality Control Board: 401 permit
8. LAFCO: Approval for EID annexation

**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
<b>X</b>	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		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** would be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there would 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** would 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: Jonathan Fong For: El Dorado County

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

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from construction of a commercial project to be located at 1250 Joerger Cutoff Road in the community of El Dorado Hills (proposed project).

### Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project is located directly south of U.S. Highway 50. The project site is bounded to the south and west by undeveloped lands within the El Dorado Hills Community Region. To the south and east is an existing cemetery and church. The site is bordered to the north and west by an existing PG&E sub-station. The surrounding lands are all designated Commercial by the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan.

### Project Characteristics

#### 1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The project site would be accessed from White Rock Road via a new access road and improvements to the existing Joerger Cutoff Road. Parking would be limited to on-site parking areas which would be constructed as part of the development. The proposed parking would be compliant with the parking requirements for the proposed commercial and medical uses as established by the Zoning Ordinance.

#### 2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project requires public water and sewer. The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) would provide water and sewer facilities. The project site is currently located outside of the District boundaries and would require LAFCO discretionary approval for annexation into the service district prior to receiving services. The District has indicated that adequate water and sewer services would be available to serve the project upon annexation into the District.

#### 3. Visual Elements and Landscaping

The project site is located directly adjacent to U.S. Highway 50. The existing land uses on the project site are primarily residential. The project would construct a commercial business project which would include substantial landscaping along the project boundaries and throughout the development. The project would not result in the removal or degradation of any existing visual elements. Landscaping elements include water features and design elements that would improve the visual impacts of the project.

#### 4. Population

The project would require the demolition of the existing residence on the project site. The removal of the single-family residence would not substantially alter the population or the housing stock in the project area.

#### 5. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would involve the completion of grading under an approved grading permit, construction of the remaining buildings, and improvement of access encroachments.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**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. The project is for a new approximately 100,000 square foot commercial development within the El Dorado Hills Community Region.

- a. **Scenic Vista.** The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.<sup>1</sup> There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is located adjacent to U.S. Highway 50; however the area is not designated as 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.<sup>2</sup> There would be no impact to scenic resources as a result of development of the proposed project.
- c. **Visual Character.** The proposed project is proposed in a developed portion of the County. The project site is currently developed with residential uses. The proposed commercial development would not substantially alter the visual character of the site. The impact to the visual character of the area would be less than significant.
- d. **Light and Glare.** All outdoor lighting shall conform to Section 17.14.170 of the County Code and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) full cut-off designation so as to minimize impacts from glare to less than significant. The lighting would have no impact on nighttime views in the area as it has been determined that no scenic views exist from the site that would affect the views at night. The project would include outdoor parking lighting which would be required to be downward facing and shielded to prevent additional sources of glare. The project would be conditioned to demonstrate that all proposed lighting conforms to the Zoning Ordinance standards for outdoor lighting. Therefore, the impacts of light and glare from this proposed project would be less than significant.

**Finding:** No impacts to views and viewsheds are expected with the development of project either directly or indirectly. Potential impacts due to outdoor lighting would be addressed through compliance with County outdoor lighting policies. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. For this “Aesthetics” category, impacts would be less than significant.

<sup>1</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1.

<sup>2</sup> 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>).

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> <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?				<b>X</b>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
  - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
  - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not considered to be “Prime Farmland” nor is there properties designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses and there would be no loss of productive agricultural land or conflict with agricultural uses. There would be no impact.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract because the site is not designated for residential or agricultural use. There would be no impact.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The project site is located adjacent to Exclusive Agriculture (AE) zoned land to the east. The agriculture-zoned parcel is currently undeveloped. Due to the location adjacent to agriculture-zoned lands, the project was reviewed the by the Agricultural Commission. At the October 19, 2007 Agriculture Commission, the Commission recommended approval of the project subject to application of the 200 foot setback pursuant the General Plan. However, Interpretative Guidelines for General Plan Policies related to agriculture compatibility exempts the project from adherence to these setbacks. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. For this “Agriculture” category, there would be no impact.

<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				<b>X</b>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			<b>X</b>	

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, 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 toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

a. **Air Quality Plan.** 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. There would be no impact.

b-c. **Air Quality Standards.** Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (O3). 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 minor grading and excavation activities associated with the construction of the building and parking lot could result in wind erosion and the introduction of particulate matter (dust) into the atmosphere and adjacent surface water resources. Odors from the construction activities may impact adjacent parcels but would be temporary in nature and therefore, less than significant. The applicant would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District's permitting process requiring adherence to District Rule #223 for fugitive dust emissions. Additionally, a Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control Plan shall be submitted prior to any grading.

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. Adherence to the District rules and the Fugitive Dust Plan during project construction would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

d-e. **Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors.** The proposed project would not include any features that would be a source of substantial pollutant emissions that could affect sensitive receptors or generate objectionable odors. Prior to approval of any use that could potentially impact sensitive receptors, a Special

Use Permit would be required which would include mitigation measures to reduce the potentially significant impact. There would be no impact.

**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, inclusion of standard conditions of approval would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. For this “Air Quality” category, impacts would be less than significant.

<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
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.

a. **Special Status Species.** The project would consist of development of a commercial business park. Off-site improvements would include the construction of a new access road on the parcel to the east and the improvement the existing access from Joerger Cutoff Road to provide for secondary access to the site.

The biological survey prepared for the project site did not identify any special status plant or animal species on the project site (Miriam Green & Associates June 2007). There would be no impact to special status species as a result of the development on the site.

A separate biological resources analysis was prepared for the require off-site improvements to Joerger Cutoff Road. The biological survey identified the presence of elderberry shrubs which are suitable habitat for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle which is a protected animal species. The potential of

construction impacts to affect these shrubs would be a potentially significant impact unless the following Mitigation Measure is implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level:

***Mitigation Measure BIO-1:*** *Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following Mitigation Measures shall be implemented to protect Valley Longhorn Beetle Habitat on-site:*

- a. *Fence and flag all areas to be avoided. Provide a minimum setback of twenty (20) feet from the drip line of each elderberry plant, surrounded by a 100-foot buffer.*
- b. *The contractors for the project shall be advised by the applicant on the need to avoid damaging the elderberry plants and the penalties for not complying with these regulations.*
- c. *The applicant shall require the contractors to put up signs every 50 feet along the edge of the avoidance areas with the following information: "This area is habitat of the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle, a threatened species and must not be disturbed. Violators are subject to prosecution, fines, and imprisonment." The signs shall be clearly visible from a distance of 20 feet during duration of construction.*
- d. *Applicant is to instruct construction crews about the status of the beetle and the need to protect its elderberry host plant.*
- e. *Transplant elderberry plants that cannot be avoided. Planning Services shall inspect the project site for the location of elderberry plants which will be impacted due to construction.*
- f. *Plant additional elderberry plant seedlings or cuttings, adjacent to the native species; outside the proposed development areas.*

**MONITORING:** The project biologist shall provide to Planning Services written verification that all protection measures including replanting and transplantation have been satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Foothill Associates performed a field study to determine the presence of special status animal species on the project site. The study determined that the onsite woodland habit and existing vegetation would provide a suitable habitat for nesting raptors and other birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The project construction impacts to suitable habitat onsite would be a potentially significant impact unless the following Mitigation Measure is implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level:

***Mitigation Measure BIO-2:*** *Prior to any construction activities during the nesting season (February 1- August 31), a pre-construction survey is required to determine if active nests are present on-site. The survey shall be completed no more than 30 days prior to the commencement of construction activities. If nests are found and considered active, construction activities shall not occur within 500 feet of the active nest until the young have fledged or until a biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. The survey result shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game and Planning Services prior to issuance of a grading permit.*

**MONITORING:** The applicant shall provide Planning Services with a letter from the project biologist verifying compliance prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above would avoid construction-related impacts to special status species within the project site area. These mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of insignificance.

- b. **Riparian habitat.** The Biological Resource Assessment prepared for the project identified 0.05-acres of potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. comprised of Riverine Riparian Wetlands, Riverine Seasonal Marshes, and Intermittent Drainage (Foothill Associates, February 2008). The project would require the modification of these riparian habitats as part of road improvements required for the project. This would be

a potentially significant impact unless the following Mitigation Measure is implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level:

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3:** *The applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game for each stream crossing or any activities affecting the onsite riparian vegetation. The agreement shall be submitted to Planning Services for review prior to issuance of a grading permit.*

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify the agreement has been obtained and necessary mitigation measures incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

- c. **Wetlands.** As discussed in Section (c) above, the Biological Assessment and Jurisdictional Evaluation prepared for the project site identified wetlands subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project would fill portions of the wetlands as part of the project. This would be a potentially significant impact unless the following Mitigation Measure is implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level:

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4:** *Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall obtain a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and a 401 Water Quality Certification from the Central Valley RWQCB. The project applicant shall incorporate all conditions attached to the permit and certification into the project.*

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify the required permit and certification has been obtained prior to issuance of a grading permit.

- d. **Migration Corridors.** The Biological Resource Assessment performed for the project site determined that the habitat onsite would not be suitable for a migration corridor. The ability of wildlife to move across the site would not be unique to the other undeveloped areas in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. **Local Policies.** The project would require development on the project site for the construction of the proposed buildings, parking areas, and infrastructure improvements. As determined by the Tree Evaluation Report prepared by Props Tree Care June 2007, 28 trees would be removed on the project site as part of development. One of the trees proposed to be removed is a Valley Oak. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes retention and replacement requirements for oak canopy impacted as a result of development. Due to the limited extent of oak canopy on the project site, the removal of the Valley Oak would be exempted from any mitigation required from Policy 7.4.4.4. There would be no impact to local policies related to the on-site impacts of the project.

The project would require off-site impacts in order to improve the existing Joerger Cutoff Road. The presence of oak canopy along Joerger Cutoff Road was determined through a separate biological resources evaluation prepared by Foothill Associates February 2008. The analysis determined that oak canopy is present along Joerger Cutoff Road and would potentially be impacted as a result of road improvements in the area. This would be a potentially significant impact unless the following Mitigation Measure is implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level:

**Mitigation Measure BIO-5:** *The applicant shall pay the Option B fee for all oak canopy removed as part of road and infrastructure improvements. The mitigation fee shall be paid at a 2:1 ratio as required by General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and the Oak Woodland Conservation Ordinance and shall be based on the fee established by the Board of Supervisors. The applicant shall provide to Planning Services a final arborist report and proof of payment of the mitigation in-lieu fee prior to issuance of a grading permit or removal of any oak trees.*

MONITORING: Planning Services shall receive proof of payment of the mitigation in-lieu fee prior to issuance of a grading permit.

- f. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** The project would not conflict with any established HCP's within the County. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** Potentially significant impacts relating to Biological Resources include impacts to riparian areas, impacts to protected animal species, and removal of oak woodland habitat. Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** would require protective measures to avoid impacts to suitable habitat for special status animal species. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-2** would require pre-construction surveys to reduce impacts to protected animal species. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-3** and **BIO-4** would require the project to obtain permits for the filling onsite wetlands and modification to the existing drainage channels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-5** would reduce impacts to oak canopy consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. For this 'Biological Resources' category, the above Mitigation Measures would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

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

**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.

**Discussion:**

**a-b. Historic or Archeological Resources.** A Cultural Resource Study was performed on the project site which did not identify the presence of historic or cultural resources on the project site. The project site is located adjacent to the Clarksville Cemetery which is an active, operating cemetery. A geophysical survey was performed to identify the presence of any remains located outside the cemetery boundaries. The survey did not identify any remains on the project site. The project would include standard conditions of approval requiring protective measures to be implemented that would address discovery of historic or archeological resources during project construction. Adherence to these standard conditions of approval would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

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

**d. Human Remains.** Due to the project location directly adjacent to Clarksville Cemetery there would be a potential to discover human remains on the project site. As discussed in (a-b) above, a geophysical survey was conducted on the project site which concluded that no human remains are present on the project site. Standard conditions of approval would be required which would address the discovery of any human remains during project construction. Adherence to these standards would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

**Finding:** Based upon the cultural resource study prepared for the site and the geophysical survey prepared, it is determined that standard conditions have been incorporated in the project to reduce impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance. For this “Cultural Resources” category, standard conditions would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.<sup>3</sup> No other

<sup>3</sup> *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, p.5.9-29.*

active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.<sup>4</sup> There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated west of the Melones fault zone and east of the East Bear Mountains fault zone. The East Bear Mountains fault zone is associated with the Foothills fault system, previously considered inactive but re-classified to potentially active after a Richter magnitude earthquake measuring 5.7 occurred near Oroville in 1975. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.<sup>5</sup>

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 50 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 50 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey.<sup>6</sup> While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located.<sup>7</sup> The project site is flat. There would be no risk of landslide. There would be no impact.

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

- b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** The site has been disturbed under a previously approved grading permit. Adherence to the approved grading permit would reduce impacts to 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 site has Argonaut gravelly loam (AkC) soils. These soils are listed as having low to moderate shrink-swell potential. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The applicant has submitted a site-specific geotechnical study and would be subject to review and approval prior to obtaining a building permits for the commercial units. The results of the site-specific geotechnical study would be used to ensure that any site-specific conditions related to shrink-swell potential are identified and reflected in project design to minimize the risk to property and people. Impacts would be less than significant.

---

<sup>4</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

<sup>5</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, p.5.9-5.*

<sup>6</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002.*  
(<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha>)

<sup>7</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.*

- e. **Septic Systems:** There would be no impact related to septic systems because no septic system use is necessary for the project. The project is to be served public water and sewer. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Geology and Soils” category, impacts would be less than significant.

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a. **Hazardous Substances.** No hazardous substances would be involved with the project. Temporary use of heavy equipment for onsite construct may 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 grading required and the duration of heavy equipment on site and off site to complete the required improvements, and 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.
- b. **Creation of Hazards.** The project would result in a mixture of office and medical uses which would not likely involve the use of hazardous materials. Prior to storage or use of any hazardous materials, A hazardous materials plan would be subject to review and approval by the Environmental Management Department. Because uses of hazardous materials is remote, impacts would be less than significant.
  - c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within the project area. The proposed project would not be likely to include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. Any potential sources of hazardous emissions would be subject to a hazardous materials plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
  - d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>8</sup> No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the proposed project site are known to have occurred. There would be no impact.
  - e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project is not located near or within any Safety Zones of a public airport. There would be no impact.
  - f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** The project is not within the vicinity of any private airstrips. There would be no impact.
  - g. **Emergency Response Plan.** Construction and occupation of the proposed commercial facilities would involve negligible or no disruption of emergency access to and from occupied uses along White Rock Road. There would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.
  - h. **Fire Hazards.** The map of El Dorado County Fire Hazard Zones (V-4-2, El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report December 1994) identifies the project site as being located in an area of “Moderate Fire Hazard”. Any potential development activity would be subject to SRA Fire Safe Regulations, which provide standards for basic emergency access and perimeter wildfire protection. The proposed development has been designed in compliance with state and local fire district regulations would reduce the risks associated with wildland fires to a less than significant level. Electrical equipment would be enclosed, and the project would not include any operations (e.g., use of hazardous materials or processes) that would substantially increase fire hazard risk. Emergency response access to the site and surrounding development would not be adversely affected, as discussed above. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

**Finding:** No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, impacts would be less than significant.

---

<sup>8</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List, <http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/>.

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

**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 & f. **Water Quality Standards.** There are drainage features off-site which may impacted as part of the project. As discussed in the 'Biological Resources' category above, the project would require Mitigation Measures to obtain appropriate permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Fish and Game for the filling of any wetlands or altering of the drainages. Additionally, all project related construction activities would be required to adhere to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would require Best Management Practices (BMP's) to minimize degradation of water quality during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would not involve any uses that would generate a significant increase in wastewater. Control Board. Therefore, no water quality standards would be violated, and no impact would occur.

- b. **Groundwater.** El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are defined in El Dorado County. There would be no impact.
- c. **Siltation and Run-Off.** The project would result in additional run-off that would be directed to an existing drainage system via a new underground drainage system constructed on-site. The project would not substantially increase the existing siltation or run-off in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** The parcel on which the proposed project is to be situated is 9.53 acres. The project site is developed with an existing residence and accessory buildings. Stormwater is naturally discharged from the site. With the implementation of approved Drainage, Erosion Control and Grading Plans, as required by the Department of Transportation, the rate of surface runoff from the project site would be minimized. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Stormwater Run-off.** The project site is located approximately 400 feet west of Carson Creek. The Land Capability Report prepared for the project determined that the project would result in an increase of run-off from the site. The project would include a new underground drainage system to divert increased run-off into an existing drainage pipe to the east of the site. With the implementation of approved Drainage, Erosion Control and Grading Plans, as required by the Department of Transportation, the rate of stormwater runoff from the project site would be minimized. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. **Water quality.** The project site is located within the vicinity of Screech Owl Creek. The project would be served by public water and would be subject to the implementation of approved Drainage, Erosion Control and Grading Plans, as required by the Department of Transportation. Adherence to the approved plans would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.
- g.-j. **Flooding.** The level project site is situated in an area of undulating terrain at an elevation of approximately 700 feet above sea level. There are no 100-year flood hazard areas at or adjacent to the site. The site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is not in an area subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. There would be no impact.

**FIRM.** The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 06004007D) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

**Finding:** The proposed project would require a site improvement and grading permit through the El Dorado County Building Department that would address erosion and sediment control. No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Hydrology” category, impacts would be less than significant.

<b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Physically divide an established community?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
- Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
- Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
- Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.

- a. **Established Community.** The project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Region. The project site is located adjacent to an existing church and undeveloped land. The proposed commercial development would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and existing development in the area. There would be no impact.
- b. **Land Use Plan.** The project Land Use Designation is Commercial (C). The proposed rezone from One-Acre Residential (R1A) to Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD) would be consistent with the existing (C) land use designation. The proposed use would not conflict with the adopted General Plan land use designation. The applicant has designed the project in compliance with County regulations, addressing aesthetics and health and safety concerns. There would be no impact.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plans. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property. No significant impacts are expected. For this “Land Use” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present.<sup>9</sup> There are no MRZ-2-classified areas within or adjacent to the project site<sup>10</sup>, and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a

<sup>9</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.

<sup>10</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.

locally important mineral resource recovery site.<sup>11</sup> There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect proposed uses or be affected by project development. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Mineral Resources” category, there would be no impact.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

**a-b. Noise Standards.** The project would not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project site is located directly adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 and is not located near any existing sensitive receptors. The project would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2. Uses associated with the project would be office and medical uses.

Potential short-term noise impacts would be generated through project construction. Project construction would be limited to 7:00am- 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am- 5:00pm on weekends and holidays as established by the General Plan. Adherence to these limitations would ensure that noise impacts would not exceed established thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

**c-d. Ambient Noise:** Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the project vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and function mufflers. All construction and grading

<sup>11</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.

operations are required to comply with noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

**e. Airport noise exposure.** The project is not located in the vicinity of any public airports, there would be no impact.

**f. Private airstrip.** The project is not within the vicinity of any private airstrip. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** No impacts to excessive noise are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
- Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
- Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.

a-c. **Population Growth.** The project would construct a commercial development designated for office and medical uses. The existing single-family residence would be demolished. The removal of the residence would not significantly alter the existing residential patterns in the project area. No residential development would occur as a result of the project. 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 project either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, there would be no impact.

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

**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 El Dorado Hills Fire Department currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. However, it has been determined by the Fire Department that the level of service would not fall below the minimum requirements, as a result of the project. The Fire Department would review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards including but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking lots, fire sprinklers within buildings, building identification and project phasing. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. Impacts on fire protection services 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% of the population located in the Community Regions. For the rural areas, there is no standard minimum level of service or response time. The project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Region. The addition of the proposed development would not significantly impact current responses times to the project area.
- 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 site is located within the Buckeye School District. The affected school districts were contacted as part of the initial consultation and no specific comments or mitigation measures were provided. No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Parks.** The commercial development would not be required to pay park in-lieu fees. There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Facilities.** No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. Adequate emergency services and public utility services are available to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

<b>XIV. RECREATION.</b>				
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?			<b>X</b>
b.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or			<b>X</b>

<b>XIV. RECREATION.</b>				
expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				

**Discussion:**

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

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

**a. Parks.** The project would not require the increase in need for parks in the project area. The commercial project would not require the payment of park fees. There would be no impact.

**b. Recreational Facilities.** The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Recreation” category, there would be no impact.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a&b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** The traffic study prepared for the project indicated that the proposed road improvements and payment of the Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) fees would ensure that the access roads would operate below acceptable Levels of Service. Upon construction of the required road improvements and payment of TIM fees, impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Air Traffic Patterns.** The project is not located within the one-mile of any public or private airports. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazards.** The project would be required to construct a new access road onto White Rock Road and widen the existing Joerger Cutoff Road. The proposed roadway improvements would be consistent with the County Design and Improvement Manual. The proposed access roadways and on-site improvements would not result in any hazards to traffic circulation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Emergency Access.** The project would include two points of access onto White Rock Road. The El Dorado Hills Fire Department reviewed the proposed circulation plan and determined that adequate emergency access would be provided. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. **Parking.** The proposed development would construct approximately 100,000 square feet of commercial buildings providing for office and medical uses. The proposed development would require 475 parking spaces based on the EL Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. The project would include 485 parking spaces on-site. The project would comply with local parking requirements. There would be no impact.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The El Dorado County Transit Authority reviewed the proposal and had no comments. No bus turnouts would be required for this tentative map. The project would not result in the removal of a bikeway/bike lane or prohibition of implantation of the facilities identified in the plan. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.			<b>X</b>	

**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. **Wastewater Treatment:** The project would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. The project would be required to connect to EID public water and wastewater systems. The project site is currently located outside of the EID service boundaries and would require LAFCO discretionary approval for annexation prior to receiving services. EID is within the jurisdictional boundaries of the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Region 5, Central Valley (RWQCB) and operates under Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R5-2001-0135 regarding treatment processes and water quality standards that are specific to the El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant. Extension of wastewater service to the project site would not exceed current wastewater quality requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Water and Wastewater Facilities:** According to EID’s *Facility Improvement Letter FIL0207-137* (FIL), an 18-inch water line exists in White Rock Road and a 12-inch water line exists in Post Street. The El Dorado Hills Fire Department has determined that the minimum fire flow for this project is 2250 GPM for a two-hour duration while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. In order to provide this fire flow and receive service, a water line extension connecting to either the 18-inch or 12-inch water line. The hydraulic grade line for the 18-inch water line in White Rock Road is 840 feet above mean sea level at static conditions and 828 feet above mean sea level during fire flow and maximum day demands. The hydraulic grade line for the 12-inch water line in Post Street is 820 feet above mean sea level at static conditions and 810 feet above mean sea level during fire flow and maximum day demands.

According to the FIL, there is a 21-inch sewer line located at the intersection of White Rock Road and Joerger Cutoff Road with adequate capacity to serve the project. In order to receive service from these lines, an extension of facilities of adequate size must be constructed.

c. **Stormwater Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. The project would be conditioned to comply with the County requirements. The Land Capability Report submitted with the project did not identify additional off-site improvements that would be necessary for the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. **Water Supply:** The subject parcel is within EID’s El Dorado Hills Supply Area, which pumps water from Folsom Reservoir through US Bureau of Reclamation service contracts and State water right Permit No. 21112. According to EID’s *2007 Water Resources and Service Reliability Report*, there are 933 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of water available in this region, based on the following calculations:

The El Dorado Hills supply area has a supply-based yield of 24,550 acre feet; however the amount of water that can currently be supplied and treated is limited because of infrastructure limitations in the El Dorado Hills Water Treatment Plant (EDHWTP). The 2007 infrastructure-based firm yield for the El Dorado Hills Supply Area is 11,500 acre-feet (AF). The total potential demand as of December 31, 2006 included 8,572 AF of active demand, 331 AF of latent demand, and 1,851 AF of other system demand, for a total of 10,754 AF. The resulting unallocated water supply for the year 2007 is therefore 746 AF.

To convert the available water supply to meter availability, EID projected demand out for three years. This per EDU demand was based on a 10-year historical trend (1996-2005) in the El Dorado Hills Supply Area. The trend was extended out to 2009, resulting in 0.80 AF per EDU. The water meter availability for the El Dorado Hills Supply Area is thus a total of 933 EDUs for 2007.

However, this estimate does not take into account the 2,893 EDUs of contractual commitments for existing and future water supplies, nor does it reflect recent annexations approved by LAFCO that have not yet purchased water meters. The water meter availability based on the infrastructure-based yield is not currently sufficient to serve the existing contractual commitments or additional annexations; however, meter availability is expected increase once the EDHWTP undergoes planned expansions. The current capacity of the EDHWTP is 19.5 million gallons per day (MGD); the expansion will increase the capacity to 24.4 MGD. This will increase the unallocated EDUs to 1,165, assuming the same number of contractual commitments as 2007 (24.4 MGD is approximately 14,000 acre-feet, minus the same 10,754 acre-feet of total potential demand, divided by the conversion factor of 0.80 = 4,058 EDUs – 2,893 EDUs of 2007 contractual commitments leaves 1,165 EDUs available). After the EDHWTP expansion occurs, additional meters will become available for purchase on a first-come first-serve basis. According to the FIL, the project as proposed would require 28 EDUs of water supply.

The County General Plan requires the applicant demonstrate a guaranteed supply of water is available at the time final subdivision and parcel maps are approved before building permits are issued. In addition, EID service to the proposed project would be contingent upon the future availability of water supply, approval of the Facility Plan Report, construction of all water facilities, and acceptance of the facilities by EID. These procedures would provide assurances that expansion of water supply to the project site is sufficient and reliable.

- e. **Wastewater:** Upon annexation, the subject parcel would be served by EID's El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant (EDHWWTP), which is located approximately two miles south of Highway 50 on Latrobe Road in the El Dorado Hills business park area. The plant serves a 30 square mile area that extends from the El Dorado County line east to Bass Lake Road, north to Folsom Lake, and three miles south of Highway 50. EDHWWTP produces Title 22 full body contact recycled water and treated water that is not used for recycled water is discharged to Carson Creek. During the summer, there is sufficient recycled water demand that no flow is discharged to Carson Creek.

The proposed project would require an extension of EID's wastewater collection system and increase the demand on EID's wastewater treatment facilities. According to EID's *2001 Wastewater Master Plan*, the plant has a design capacity of 3.0 million gallons per day average dry weather flow (ADWF); the current ADWF is 2.67 MGD. EID is planning to expand the capacity to 5.4 MGD ADWF in two phases in the next few years. The Facility Plan Report prepared for the project by RFE Engineering estimated that the project would result in an additional 6,720 gallons per day. The existing wastewater treatment facilities would have adequate capacity to serve the project.

The FIL stated that to date, the EDHWWTP has sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. Similar to domestic water supply, wastewater capacity is allocated and sold on a first come, first serve basis; when capacity of the plant is reached, no more connections will be sold until plant capacity is expanded. EID's El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

- f & g. **Solid Waste:** 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.

County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the proposed lots would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space would be available at the site for solid waste collection. Impacts would be less than significant.

- h. **Power:** Power and telecommunication facilities are available at the project site. The power demands of the project would be accommodated through connection to existing lines, which are available at the parcel. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding:** No significant utility and service system impacts are expected with the commercial project either directly or indirectly. The project would require annexation into the EID service area prior to receiving services. This would not result in significant impacts. For this "Utilities and Service Systems" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Discussion:**

- a. The project would have the potential to significantly impact fish or wildlife species as part of the project. The project would require oak woodland habitat removal and the modifications of onsite riparian features. The project would include Mitigation Measures requiring the replanting of impacted oak canopy, acquisition of permits for the modifications to the riparian areas, and surveys to reduce impacts to protected animal species during project construction. Implementation of these Mitigation Measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.
- b. The project would not result in significant cumulative impacts. The project would connect to existing public water and sewer services and would not require the extension infrastructure or utilities outside of the Community Region. The project would be consistent with the existing General Plan Land Use Designation and the surrounding land use pattern. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Based on the discussion contained in this document, potentially significant impacts to human beings would occur with respect to Air Quality and Noise. The project would include standard conditions of approval required by the Air Quality Management District which would apply to project construction. Adherence to

these standard conditions would reduce potential impacts to less than significant. The adherence to limitations on hours of construction would limit the potential of noise impacts to exceed the thresholds established by the General Plan. Implementation of standard conditions of approval and would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report  
Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report  
Volume II - Response to Comment on DEIR  
Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR  
Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR  
Volume V - Appendices

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

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.)

### **PROJECT SPECIFIC REFERENCE MATERIAL**

*Biological Resources Assessment for the +/- 0.5-Acre Joerger Cutoff Road Site, El Dorado County, California. Foothill Associates, February 2008.*

*Cultural Resource Assessment for the Clarksville Professional Business Park, El Dorado Hills, El Dorado County, California. Peak Associates, Inc. June 2007.*

*Delineation of Waters of the United States and Rapanos Analysis +/- 0.5-Acre Joerger Cutoff Road. El Dorado County, California. Foothill Associated February 2008.*

*Facilities Improvement Letter, Joerger Cutoff. El Dorado Irrigation District. February 2007.*

*Geophysical Survey Findings at the Proposed Clarksville Professional Business Park for Potential Unmarked Graves Adjacent to the Clarksville Cemetery, El Dorado Hills, California., Earth Imaging Geologic Services. June 2007.*

*Land Capability Report. RFE Engineering, Inc. May 2007.*

*Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Clarksville Professional Business Park APN 107-130-07 1250 Joerger Cutoff Road El Dorado Hills, El Dorado County, California. Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. May 2007.*

*Preliminary Drainage Study for Clarksville Professional Business Park, El Dorado Hills, El Dorado County, California. RFE Engineering, Inc. June 2007.*

*Results of Biological Surveys, Clarksville Business Park (APN 121-280-03), El Dorado County, California. Miriam Green Associates. June 2007.*

*Silva Valley Interchange Wetland Delineation. Foothill Associates. September 2006.*

*Tree Evaluation Report, Clarksville Professional Business Park. El Dorado Hills, CA APN 121-280-03. Props Tree Care. June 2007.*

*UREBEMIS Run for Clarksville APN 121-280-03. HDR, The Hoyt Company. June 2007.*