



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 Amendment A08-0002 Agricultural Buffers

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

Contact Person: Monique Wilber

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Unincorporated El Dorado County, 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Applicant's Name and Address: County of El Dorado, 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Agent's Name and Address: County of El Dorado, 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: N/A

Project Location: Unincorporated Area, El Dorado County

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): N/A

Zoning: N/A

Section: N/A **T:** N/A **R:** N/A

General Plan Designation:

Description of Project: Policy 8.1.3.1 of the 2004 General Plan is one of several policies designed to protect agricultural uses by preventing incompatible development from being established adjacent to agriculturally zoned property. Policy 8.1.3.1 establishes a 10-acre minimum parcel size for residential lots being created adjacent to agricultural land. The proposed general plan amendment would provide flexibility for the decision makers on a subdivision to determine if buffers limiting the parcel size to something larger than otherwise permitted by the land use designation are necessary.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Unincorporated Area of El Dorado County

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project will affect parcels within the Community Regions and Rural Centers designated for residential development of less than ten acres when adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands.

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

None

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Monique Wilber For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Peter N. Maurer For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

a - c. Scenic Vistas, Scenic Resources, and Visual Character. Future project sites may be identified by the County as a scenic view, resource, or as having visual character. However, without specific details regarding future developments, it is impossible to determine potential impacts to scenic vistas within the county with any precision. Future development will be reviewed to determine compliance with the County’s development standards as well as to determine impacts to scenic vistas and resources and visual character. The proposed amendment will not have an impact and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this General Plan amendment.

d. Light and Glare. The proposed amendment has the potential to add an unknown number of new parcels by providing a level of flexibility to minimum parcel sizes adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands. This could lead to minor increases in light and glare; however, it is not expected to be significant as prior to approval of any development, Planning Services would review the proposed project to determine adherence to the County’s lighting standards.

Finding:

No significant impacts are proposed to aesthetic or visual resources as part of the proposed general plan amendment. Impacts would not occur or would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to 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 - c. Farmland Conversion and Zoning or Williamson Act Conflicts. While the proposed General Plan amendment has the potential to result in conversion of agriculturally-zoned land, this will typically affect land that has only marginal agricultural productivity and is not considered choice. The proposed amendment would only apply to those lands identified for future urban development on the General Plan land use map but are presently zoned for agricultural uses. The policy will also still provide the ability for the Agricultural Commission to recommend sufficient buffers if the adjacent agriculturally-zoned land is productive and is important to the agricultural industry in the county. The proposed amendment only has the potential to create new conflicts between agriculture and non-agricultural uses if there is a remnant agricultural operation within the urban boundary of the Community Regions or within a Rural Center. An example of this is a relict strawberry patch surrounded by Residential land use. However, remnant agricultural operations are predominantly considered interim uses, and the land use designations for these sites are for future higher intensity residential or commercial uses. The proposed amendment would not affect other existing policies in the Land Use and Agriculture Elements of the General Plan established to protect agricultural land and operations. Any land subdivision is a discretionary action and subject to individual CEQA review. Therefore, adequate protections will still exist to preserve the County’s agricultural resources. This would be a less than significant impact on agricultural resources as a result of the proposed amendment.

Finding:

No significant impacts are proposed to agriculture resources as part of the proposed general plan amendment. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

a, b, d, e. Air Quality Plan Conflicts, Air Quality Standards Violation, Sensitive Receptor Exposure, and Objectionable Odors. The proposed general plan amendment has the potential to create an unknown number of new residential parcels, which must be reviewed through individual discretionary development applications. Any potential additional development would result in a temporary generation of emissions resulting from site grading, excavation and other development related activities. Future development would be required to comply with Air Quality Management District (AQMD) rules during project construction. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for onsite and offsite improvements, a Fugitive Dust Plan would be required. No new impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this general plan amendment.

c. Cumulative Increase. The proposed amendment has the potential to create an unknown number of new residential parcels, which must be reviewed through individual discretionary development applications. This could result in an incremental increase in air pollutants from additional vehicles, but is not expected to be different from the number of parcels that the market would demand at 2025, the expected life of the plan. At build-out there is a potential for a very small percentage of additional parcels, but not significantly greater than the number reviewed and analyzed in the 2004 General Plan EIR. The impact to air resources would be less than significant.

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

Finding:

No new impacts to air quality plan conflicts, air quality standards violation, sensitive receptor exposure, and objectionable odors would occur as a result of this general plan amendment. Projects resulting from this amendment would have standard County conditions of approval included as part of the project permit to maintain a less than significant level of impact in the “Cumulative” category. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

a - f. Substantial Adverse Effect to Identified Species, Riparian Habitat, or Federally Protected Wetlands, Substantial Interference with Native Species Movement, Local Policy Conflicts, and HCP/NCCP Conflicts. Although the proposed amendment would result in the potential for additional parcels, each application (as a discretionary action) would be analyzed separately for impacts on biological resources, and appropriate mitigation measures established as needed to prevent adverse impacts. All existing policies and mitigation measures identified in the 2004 General Plan EIR would still apply to subsequent projects benefiting from the proposed amendment. There would be no impact to biological resources.

Finding:

Any new discretionary projects would be required to identify biological impacts and apply mitigation measures from the 2004 General Plan EIR. Therefore, there would be no impact to biological resources.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a - d. Historical Resource, Archaeological Resource, Paleontological Resource, and Human Remains. There would be no direct impacts to cultural resources as a result of the proposed amendment. The creation of any new parcels would still require a cultural resources survey, and appropriate avoidance or mitigation would be applied to any identified resource.

Finding:

Any new discretionary projects would be required to identify cultural resources and apply mitigation measures from the 2004 General Plan EIR. Therefore, there would be no impacts to cultural resources.

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Geologic Resources 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.

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

a. Adverse Effects due to Earthquakes, Ground Shaking, Ground Failure, and Landslides. Projects proposed as a result of this general plan amendment will still be subject to discretionary review. The proposed amendment will not have an impact.

b – e. Soil Erosion, Unstable Soils, Expansive Soils, and Septic Tanks. While the proposed amendment would result in the potential for a slight increase in the number of parcels that could be created under the 2004 General Plan, all such new parcels would require a parcel or tentative map at which time issues of soils stability and geological impacts would be addressed. Adequate design criteria and application of existing development standards will result in less than significant impacts to geology and soils.

Finding:

Review of grading, building, and/or construction plans would include grading design and would address BMPs and UBC Seismic IV construction standards in order to address any potential impacts in the Geology and Soils category for any proposed projects that would result from this general plan amendment. The impacts are less than significant.

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

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

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 - d, g. Hazardous Materials Transport/Use, Hazardous Materials Accident, Hazardous Materials near School, Hazardous Materials Site, and Emergency Response Plan. Projects proposed as a result of this general plan amendment will still be subject to discretionary review. The proposed amendment will not have an impact.

e, f, h. The proposed amendment would not directly increase the public’s exposure to hazards and hazardous materials. While there would be a potential for additional parcels that could be created, each parcel would be created by means of a parcel map or tentative map, and be subject to site specific review of the potential hazards. Standard measures would be applied with regard to proximity to airports and the potential for wildfire, with site specific conditions added to minimize wildfire risks. Review of known hazardous waste sites is a standard procedure for all maps, and standard handling requirements for use of hazardous materials would apply. There would be no or a less than significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Finding:

Discretionary review of potential additional parcels created as a result of this general plan amendment would require projects to comply with the 2004 General Plan EIR mitigation measures if impacts would occur. Therefore, there would be no impacts or a less than significant impact.

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- 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 – h, j. Water Quality Standards/Water Discharge, Flood Hazard, and Seiche/Tsunami/Mudflow Inundation. Projects proposed as a result of this general plan amendment will still be subject to discretionary review. The proposed amendment will not have an impact.

b – e, i. Groundwater Depletion, Drainage Alteration, Erosion or Flooding, Runoff Water, and Levee/Dam Failure Flooding. The proposed amendment would have the potential to create an unknown number of new parcels, each of which would be created through the discretionary review of a parcel or tentative map. During that review, site specific impacts associated with hydrology and water quality would be addressed in the subsequent CEQA document for that map. Septic capability and ground water would have to be assured prior to map approval and any increases in runoff or changes to drainage patterns would also be addressed. Impacts of the proposed amendment would be less than significant for water quality and hydrology.

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

Finding:

Discretionary review would address any potential impacts to hydrology and water quality for any proposed projects that would result from this general plan amendment. Therefore, there are no impacts or the impacts are less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a – c. Community Division, Plan/Policy/Regulations Conflicts, and HCP/NCCP Conflicts. The proposed amendment would allow for a slight increase in the total number of parcels that could be created, but each would be consistent with the land use designation. The proposed policy would only provide flexibility for the decision makers on a subdivision to determine if buffers limiting the parcel size to something larger than otherwise permitted by the land use designation are necessary. This would not result in conflicts with any plan or policy, nor would it result in dividing an established community. There would be no impacts to land use planning.

Finding:

No impacts would occur to land use planning as a result of this general plan amendment.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a, b. Mineral Resource Availability. The proposed amendment would not result in any additional impacts to mineral resources. The mining related policies of the Conservation and Open Space Element intended to protect mineral resources would still apply to any land division.

Finding:

The proposed general plan amendment would not result in impacts to mineral resources that were not previously addressed in the 2004 General Plan EIR. There would be no impacts.

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

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

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 - c. Noise Exposure, Groundbourne Vibration Exposure, and Permanent Ambient Noise Level Increase. The potential new parcels resulting from the proposed amendment would not result in exposure of persons to excessive noise, groundbourne vibration, or permanent ambient noise level increase due to application of existing noise standards and policies of the Health, Safety, and Noise Element. The proposed amendment will not have an impact.

d – f. Temporary Ambient Noise Level Increase, Public Airport Noise, and Private Airstrip Noise. The potential new parcels resulting from the proposed amendment would not result in exposure of persons to excessive noise due to application of existing noise standards and policies of the Health, Safety, and Noise Element. Potential new parcels could be located in the vicinity of an airport or airstrip, but standard noise attenuation requirements would apply to any new construction. Temporary construction noise could increase due to additional lots that could be created, but this impact would be less than significant with the application of restrictions that currently apply to such noise generating uses. The impact would be less than significant.

Finding:

Potential short- and long-term noise sources that are a result of a slight increase in development will be required to comply with established noise standards and policies. There would be no impacts as a result of this general plan amendment, or the impacts would be less than significant with application of mitigation measures addressed in the 2004 General Plan EIR.

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

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

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, Displacement of Housing, Displacement of People. Because the effect of the agricultural buffer policies was not included in the absorption analysis at 2025 or at buildout, the proposed amendment would not result in an increase in the number of parcels on which the analysis was based. The resulting potential parcels would not displace any people or existing housing. There would be no impact to population and housing.

Finding:

The slight increase in the number of potential parcels would not cause a significant increase in overall density and resulting potential parcels would not cause displacement of housing or people. There would be no impact.

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

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.

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

a – e. Fire Protection, Police Protection, Schools, Parks, and Government Services. The resultant minor increase in potential parcels would result in incremental impacts to government services. It is unknown how many new parcels would result from the proposed amendment, but it is expected to be minimal. The minor increase in the demand for services would be offset by impact fees and increased property tax revenues to pay for the increase in public services. The impact would be less than significant.

Finding:

Established mitigation measures in the form of impact fees, as well as increased property tax revenues to offset for the resultant slight increase in potential parcels due to this general plan amendment make the impact less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a. Increased Use of Recreational Facilities. The minor increase in the potential number of parcels resulting from the proposed amendment would have an incremental impact on recreational facilities. Each new parcel would be subject to park in-lieu fees or dedication of parkland. The impact would be less than significant.

b. Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities. The very slight increase in the potential number of new parcels resulting from the proposed amendment would be unlikely to require construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The proposed amendment will not have an impact.

Finding:

Any creation of new parcels from the proposed general plan amendment would be required to comply with mitigation measures addressed in the 2004 General Plan EIR. There would be no impact or a less than significant impact.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
- 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. Traffic Increase and Exceeds LOS Standards. A minor increase in traffic (10 ADT per each potential unit) would result from the new parcels that could be created by the proposed amendment. Each land division would be subject to traffic impact fees and road improvements to offset those increases. The impact would be less than significant.

c - g. Air Traffic Patterns Change, Increase Hazards, Inadequate Emergency Access, Inadequate Parking Capacity, and Conflicts with Policies/Plans/Programs. The potential new parcels resulting from the proposed amendment would not result in change in patterns of air traffic, an increase in hazards, inadequate emergency access or parking capacity, nor would there be conflicts with existing policies, plans, or programs, due to application of existing transportation and traffic standards and policies of the Transportation and Circulation Element. The proposed amendment will not have an impact.

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

Finding:

The potential increase in traffic would be subject to the standards, policies, and mitigation measures of the 2004 General Plan EIR. There would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

a – f. Wastewater Treatment Requirements, Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Treatment Facilities, Construction or Expansion of Stormwater Drainage Facilities, Water Supply, Wastewater Treatment Capacity, and Landfill Capacity. The potential additional parcels that could result from the proposed amendment would have an incremental demand on public utilities. Each subsequent parcel or tentative map would be required to analyze the availability of such utilities prior to map approval to ensure their adequacy. The minor increase in parcels would not exceed established thresholds and the impact would be less than significant.

g. Federal/State/Local Solid Waste Regulations. The potential new parcels resulting from the proposed amendment would be required to comply with federal, state, and local solid waste regulations. The proposed amendment will not have an impact.

Finding:

The potential increase in the use of utilities and service systems would be subject to the standards, policies, and mitigation measures of the 2004 General Plan EIR and subject to federal and state regulations. There would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

a, b. Environmental Degradation and Cumulative Impacts. While the proposed general plan amendment would result in the potential to create a minor, but unknown increase in the potential number of lots, it would not alter the land use patterns established in the land use element of the 2004 General Plan. No new lots could be created without subsequent, site specific environmental evaluation, and any impacts would have to be analyzed and mitigated if necessary prior to map approval. The proposed amendment would not adversely impact any of the identified in sections a or b, above, nor would there be a significant cumulative effect.

c. Environmental Effects on Human Beings. The proposed general plan amendment and the resulting potential increased number of lots that could result would be subject to discretionary review and the protective standards of federal, state, and 2004 General Plan policies and regulations. The proposed amendment will not have an impact.

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

Finding:

The potential increase in the number of parcels resulting from this general plan amendment would be subject to the standards, policies, and mitigation measures of the 2004 General Plan EIR and subject to federal and state regulations. There would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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