



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: A08-0007/Z08-0016/PD08-0011/TM08-1471 / Placer Oaks Subdivision

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

Contact Person: Jason R. Hade, AICP, Senior Planner **Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

Project Owner's Name and Address: Said Karkouti, 765 Raymundo Avenue, Los Altos, CA 94024

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Carlton Engineering, Inc., 3883 Ponderosa Road, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Location: The subject property is located on the west side of Forni Road 500 feet south of the intersection with Lindberg Avenue in the Diamond Springs area.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 329-181-13; 14; and 15 **Parcel Size:** 20.01 acres

Zoning: One-Half Acre Residential (R20K) & Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5)

Section: 26 **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential (MDR) & High Density Residential (HDR)

Description of Project: General Plan amendment from MDR to HDR, zone change from R20K/RE-5 to R20K-Planned Development (PD), and a development plan and tentative subdivision map to create 31 lots ranging in size from 12,000 square feet to 20,619 square feet on a 20.01 acre site. The project would also include the abandonment of the on site existing East Road easement and the construction of proposed Road "A" off-site to the end of County maintained East Road to a width of 28 feet. The following design waiver requests have been submitted: (1) allow the construction of roads labeled "C" and "D" on the proposed tentative subdivision map to a width of 24 feet with no sidewalks rather than 28-foot wide with sidewalks as required by Standard Plan 101B; and (2) allow a reduced right of way width of 40 feet rather than 50 feet for roads labeled "A" and "B."

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

| | <u>Zoning</u> | <u>General Plan</u> | <u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School) |
|--------|---------------|---------------------|---|
| North: | R1 | HDR | Single-Family Residences |
| East: | R1A | MDR | Single-Family Residences |
| South: | R1A/RE-5 | MDR/HDR | Single-Family Residences |
| West: | R20K | HDR | Undeveloped |

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is bound by residential housing to the north and south, Forni Road to the east, and oak forest to the west. Elevation of the project site ranges from approximately 1,680 feet to 1,776 feet above sea level. Topography at the subject site ranges from gentle to moderate slopes of a mostly northern aspect. The project site includes 13.975 acres of mixed oak forest, 4.327 acres of foothill pine – oak woodland, and 1.536 acres of valley oak forest. Indian Creek flows east to west along the northern boundary of the site. The subject site also includes two ephemeral channels, a seasonal wetland, and two existing residences. Proposed project access to the east would be via Forni Road while an extension of proposed Road "A" to East Road would provide access to the northwest and an extension of proposed Road "B" would provide a connection to Marci Lane to the southwest. The project would be served by public sewer and water provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District.

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

El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading/Encroachment Permit

El Dorado County Environmental Management Department: Fugitive Dust Plan
 Department of Fish and Game: Streambed Alteration Agreement

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. The environmental factors checked below contain mitigation measures which reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | 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: Jason R. Hade, AICP For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas 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) No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway would be affected by this project. No impacts would occur.
- b) The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on existing scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources as the project is not located within a corridor defined as a State scenic highway.
- c) The proposed project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. All proposed oak tree canopy removal would be consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) The proposed 31 lots would not have a significant effect or adversely affect day or nighttime views adjacent to the project site. All outdoor lighting would conform to Section 17.14.170 of County Code. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: It has been determined that there would be no impacts to aesthetic or visual resources. Identified thresholds of significance for the “Aesthetics” category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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) Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that no areas of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected by the project. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use map for the project and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- b) The proposed project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning in the project vicinity and would not adversely impact any properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

FINDING: It has been determined that the project would not result in any impacts to agricultural lands or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is developed with residential development. For this “Agriculture” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

| 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 | | X | |

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

| III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| projected air quality violation? | | | |
| 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)? | | 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) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). The applicant provided “Air Quality Assessment for Placer Oaks Subdivision Tentative Subdivision Map El Dorado County, California,” prepared by Carlton Engineering, Inc. According to the study, “Carlton concludes that the air emission thresholds for the project as currently planned appears to be below the APCD emission thresholds and therefore, no additional mitigative measures beyond dust control will be required for the project.” (*Air Quality Assessment for Placer Oaks Subdivision Tentative Subdivision Map El Dorado County, California, Carlton Engineering, Inc., January 2008*). Therefore, the potential impacts of the project would be less than significant.
- b) The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of six standard conditions of approval, the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality. As part of the conditions, a fugitive dust plan application must be prepared and submitted to the AQMD prior to the beginning of project construction. These measures are included as conditions of project approval and would reduce any impacts in this category to a level of less than significant.
- c) As stated above under section “a,” construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in cumulative impacts to the air basin. This conclusion was reached in the submitted air quality analysis and reviewed and confirmed by the AQMD.

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

- d) The El Dorado County AQMD reviewed the project and identified that no sensitive receptors exist in the area and would not be affected by this project. As such, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District CEQA Guide. The proposed subdivision map would not result in significant impacts resulting from odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project in that no sensitive receptors would be adversely impacted, no objectionable odors would be created and the project would not obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan. Based on the inclusion of standard conditions of approval, no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

| 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;

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

- 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) According to the submitted biological report, “the project study area provides potential habitat for special-status animals and plants. No special-status animals or plants were observed.” (*Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for the Placer Oaks Subdivision El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., March 17, 2008*) Additionally, based on 17.71.200.C.1 of the Zoning Ordinance, payment of mitigation area 2 fees would reduce the impact to less than significant. Although the project study area also provides potential nesting habitat for birds of prey and birds listed under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, no nest of birds of prey or migratory birds were observed in the project study area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The project proposes no impacts to 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. The site includes a total of 0.174 acres of wetlands and waters including 0.046 acres of seasonal wetlands, 0.092 acres of Indian Creek, an intermittent stream, and two ephemeral channels. (*Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for Placer Oaks Subdivision El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., March 17, 2008*) However, the tentative subdivision map includes a 50-foot setback from Indian Creek as well as a proposed crossing for Road “A,” reducing potential impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, impacts to the identified wetlands would be avoided by inclusion within open space lots “A” through “E” as shown on the submitted tentative subdivision map. While the applicant intends to avoid any impacts to the identified wetlands and waters at the subject site, as discussed above, it may still be necessary to obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the Department of Fish and Game. Obtaining such a permit would reduce any potential impacts to a level of less than significant.
- c) The project does not propose impacts to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. According to a submitted wetland delineation report, the site includes a total of 0.174 acres of wetlands and waters including 0.046 acres of seasonal wetlands, 0.092 acres of Indian Creek, an intermittent stream, and two ephemeral channels. (*Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for Placer Oaks Subdivision El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., March 17, 2008*) However, the tentative subdivision map includes a 50-foot setback from Indian Creek as well as a proposed crossing for Road “A,” reducing potential impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, impacts to the identified wetlands would be avoided by inclusion within open space lots “A” through “E” as shown on the submitted tentative subdivision map. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) Review of the Planning Services GIS *Deer Ranges Map* (January 2002) indicates that there are no mapped deer migration corridors within the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Existing project oak tree canopy coverage is estimated at 86.5 percent. (*Oak Canopy Retention Analysis for the Placer Oaks Subdivision Project, El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., March 17, 2008*) Under General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, Option A, 60 percent of the existing canopy must be retained. After road and driveway construction and lot development (4,650 square foot lot and driveway building envelope), the project would retain 62.5 percent of the oak tree canopy at the site consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, Option A. Future development of the proposed lots would have the option of complying with either Option A or Option B of Policy 7.4.4.4. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- f) The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: There would be no significant impacts to biological resources, oak trees and/or oak woodland tree canopy because of the 50-foot Indian Creek setback and wetland open spaces lots shown on the tentative subdivision map as well as 62.5 percent oak tree canopy retention. As such, the impacts in the ‘Biological Resources’ category would be less than significant for this project.

| 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 & b)

The applicant submitted a “Cultural Resources Study of Assessors Parcel No. 329:181:13, 14, and 15 Proposed East Road Subdivision, El Dorado County, California 95619” prepared by Historic Resource Associates in May 2007. According to the study, “no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts were found, nor were any buildings, structures, or objects discovered.” (*Cultural Resources Study of Assessors Parcel No. 329:181:13, 14, and 15 Proposed East Road Subdivision, El Dorado County, California 95619, Historic Resource Associates, May 2007*). No further cultural resource study is recommended. In the event sub-surface historical, cultural or archeological sites or materials are disturbed during earth disturbances and grading activities on the site, standard conditions are included within Attachment 1 of the staff report to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or know fossil locales. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

d) Due to the size and scope of the project, there is a potential to discover human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the standard conditions within Attachment 1 would be implemented immediately.

FINDING: Although the project has the potential to impact sub-surface cultural or historic resources, or disturb human remains located outside of a designated cemetery, the application of the standard conditions identified in Attachment 1 of the staff report address such impacts. Established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category.

| 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: | | | X |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | | | X |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | X |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | X |
| 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;

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

- 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) According to the Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas (Jennings, 1994) and the Peak Acceleration from Maximum Credible Earthquakes in California (CDMG, 1992), no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones (Special Studies Zones) are located on the project site. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating structures in the project area would be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.
 - b) According to the submitted drainage report, “the effects of this proposed construction will moderately increase water runoff amounts, but will not change times of concentration, and will have only a minimal effect on the natural drainage patterns of the surrounding areas. The proposed project will increase the peak runoff for the project site, therefore, detention will be required to restore peak runoff to pre-development levels.” (*Preliminary Drainage Report for the Proposed Placer Oaks Subdivision Placerville, El Dorado County, CA, Carlton Engineering, Inc., April 2008*) All proposed grading for individual lot and road development, as shown on the preliminary grading and drainage plan, must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
 - c) As stated in the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*, the soils on the project site are primarily comprised of Auburn, AwD, Auburn, AxD, Boomer, BkD, and Placer, PrD. Auburn silt loam (AwD) is predominant on the northern side of project. This well drained soil is developed on slopes ranging from two percent to 30 percent and underlain by arkosic metasediments, slates, and graywackes. Auburn very rocky silt loam covers a minor portion along the southwestern corner of the project site. The soil is well drained, developed on slopes ranging from two percent to 30 percent, and underlain by graywackes and conglomerates of the metasedimentary unit. Boomer very rocky loam is the predominant soil type for the project, encompassing the central part of the property. The soil is well drained, developed on slopes ranging from three percent to 30 percent, and underlain by basic schists. The Placer Diggings soil unit is limited to the southeast and northeast corner. The soil is composed of a mixture of stony, cobbly, and gravelly material associated with historical placer mining upstream. (*Land Capability Report for the Proposed Placer Oaks Subdivision Placerville, El Dorado County, CA, Carlton Engineering, Inc., April 2008*) All grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
 - d) According to the geotechnical feasibility study, “laboratory results of a sample of near surface material revealed a plasticity index of 10. Highly plastic (fat) material is characterized by a plasticity index of greater than 25.” (*Geotechnical Feasibility Study for the Proposed Placer Oaks Subdivision Placerville, California, Carlton Engineering, Inc., February 2008*) Based upon this information, the impact from expansive soils would be less than significant.
 - e) Public sewer service will be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District as stated in a Facility Improvement Letter dated March 28, 2008. (*Facility Improvement Letter East Road Subdivision, El Dorado Irrigation District, March 28, 2008*) Impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: No significant impacts would result from geological or seismological anomalies on the project site. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that would result in significant impacts. For the “Geology and Soils” category, established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

| 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 |

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

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

- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be transported, used, or disposed of for the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - b) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be utilized for the project. Current County records indicate the subject site is not located within the Asbestos Review Area. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - c) As proposed, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
 - d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there would be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.
 - e) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project would not be subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There would be no impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations and the over-flight of aircraft in the vicinity of the project.
 - f) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights in the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would occur.
 - g) The proposed project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. This is based upon the location of the nearest fire station, site access, availability of water for fire suppression, and provisions within the County emergency response plan. The County emergency response plan is located within the County Office of Emergency Services in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - h) The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and concluded that the project would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area with the implementation of the conditions of approval included in Attachment 1 of the staff report. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of the Fire District requirements included as conditions of approval within Attachment 1 of the staff report.

FINDING: The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wild land fires. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed project with the implementation of standard conditions of approval from the Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District.

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

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

- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) Public sewer service will be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District as stated in a Facility Improvement Letter dated March 28, 2008. (*Facility Improvement Letter East Road Subdivision, El Dorado Irrigation District, March 28, 2008*) Impacts would be less than significant.
 - b) There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The proposed project would be required to connect to public water. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - c) Proposed grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply to this project. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- d & e)
- According to the submitted drainage report, “the effects of this proposed construction will moderately increase water runoff amounts, but will not change times of concentration, and will have only a minimal effect on the natural drainage patterns of the surrounding areas. The proposed project will increase the peak runoff for the project site, therefore, detention will be required to restore peak runoff to pre-development levels.” (*Preliminary Drainage Report for the Proposed Placer Oaks Subdivision Placerville, El Dorado County, CA, Carlton Engineering, Inc., April 2008*) Therefore, substantial drainage pattern alteration or runoff would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site. The project would be required to connect to public water. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- g & h)
- The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0750B) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.
- i) The subject property within the Diamond Springs area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - j) The proposed project is not located near a coastal area, and therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to tsunamis. No volcanoes or other active volcanic features are near the project site and, therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to mudflows. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: No significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

| IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

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

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

- a) The project would not result in the physical division of an established community. As proposed, the project is compatible with the surrounding residential land uses and would not create land use conflicts with surrounding properties. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) As proposed, the project is consistent with specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use goals, objectives, and policies of the 2004 General Plan. The proposed General Plan Amendment from MDR to HDR is consistent with all other applicable policies of the General Plan including 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.5.21 concerning the project’s location within an established Community Region boundary, land use compatibility with adjacent residential development lot sizes, and overall project density. The General Plan Amendment would change 10 acres at the subject site from MDR to HDR. The HDR General Plan land use designation permits one to five units per acre while the MDR General Plan land use designation permits a maximum of one unit per acre. The current General Plan land use designations will permit a maximum density of 60 units at the subject site. A 20 acre site with an HDR General Plan land use designation permits a maximum density of 100 units. However, in an effort to better match the surrounding residential densities, the applicant has proposed 31 residential units

The subdivision map would be consistent with the development standards contained within the proposed development plan and local subdivision policies. Future lot development would need to meet the standards established by the approved development plan for the subject site. This project meets the land use objectives established for the property. As no conflict exists between the project and applicable land use policies, potential environmental impacts would be considered to be less than significant.

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

- c) The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other conservation plan. This condition precludes the possibility of the proposed project conflicting with an adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

FINDING: For the “Land Use Planning” section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|
| 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) The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan. No impact would occur.
- b) The Western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value. No impact would occur.

FINDING: No impacts to any known mineral resources would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. In the “Mineral Resources” section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

| | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|
| 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 | |

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

| XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i> | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|
| 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 & c)

The project would not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan as it involves the creation of 31 lots and related residential noise. Other than temporary noise generated from construction equipment, no significant noise would be expected from the development of the project. Temporary noise impacts would be addressed by standard conditions of approval regarding construction hours within Attachment 1 of the staff report. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

b & d)

Persons adjacent to the project vicinity would not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of minor grading and improvement activities or upon completion of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards contained within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport. No impacts would occur.

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

FINDING: For the “Noise” category, there are no significant effects that would be created with the approval of the tentative subdivision map and the impacts within this category would remain at a less than significant level.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
 - Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
 - Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.
- a) The proposed project has been determined to have a minimal growth-inducing impact as the project includes the creation of 31 lots where three currently exists. Any future development must meet comprehensive County policies and regulations before building permits can be issued. The project does not include any school or large scale employment centers that would lead to indirect growth. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. No existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project. No impacts would occur.
- c) No persons would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: The project would not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project would not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or expanding infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

| 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 | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | 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> | | | |
| e. Other government services? | | | X |

Discussion:

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

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

- a) **Fire Protection:** The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Fire District from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District would review the project improvement plans and final map filing submittal for condition conformance prior to approval. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Police Protection:** The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. No specific minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The addition of 31 residential lots would not significantly impact current response times to the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Mother Lode Union School District. The affected school district was contacted as part of the initial consultation process and expressed concern about a lack of sidewalks and school bus drop-off areas in the project area. As part of the project’s standard conditions of approval, the main proposed roads within the subdivision, Roads “A” and “B,” would be required to install a four-foot wide sidewalk on one side of the street. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) **Parks:** The proposed project would not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. In this case, the tentative subdivision map would be conditioned to require the payment of a parkland dedication in-lieu park fee consistent with the procedures outlined within Section 16.12.090. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

e) No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the creation of 31 additional residential lots at the subject site, either directly or indirectly. No significant public service impacts are expected. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of five 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) Because the project would only include the creation of 31 additional residential lots, it would not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project does not propose any on-site recreation facilities and would not be required to construct any new facilities or expand any existing recreation facilities with the scope of this project. However, approximately seven acres of open space would be provided as part of the project. No impacts would occur.

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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)

A traffic study was completed and reviewed by the Department of Transportation (DOT) which concluded that the project’s impacts would be less than significant at all study intersections. A cumulative analysis is not required since the trip generation for the proposed project is below 2025 year thresholds assumed in the General Plan. Study recommendations are included as standard conditions of approval in Attachment 1 and include payment of traffic impact mitigation (TIM) fees and the construction of onsite roadways to DOT standards. (*Traffic Impact Analysis Placer Oaks El Dorado County, California, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., April 18, 2008*) Proposed project access to the east would be via Forni Road while an extension of proposed Road “A” to East Road would provide access to the northwest and an extension of proposed Road “B” would provide a connection to Marci Lane to the southwest. Impacts would be less than significant.

The 2004 General Plan Policies TC-Xe and TX-Xf (which reflect Measure Y) require that projects that “worsen” traffic by 2%, or 10 peak hour trips, or 100 average daily trips must construct (or ensure funding and programming) of any

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

improvements required to meet Level of Service standards in the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. DOT has conditioned the project to address this General Plan consistency issue by requiring payment of traffic impact mitigation fees with each building permit.

- c) The project would not result in a change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity. No impacts would occur.
- d) The project would be required to make on-site road improvements consistent with the provisions of the County’s Design Improvement Standards Manual. As such, the proposed project would not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards. No traffic hazards would result from the project design. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and concluded that the project would not result in inadequate emergency access to any potential residential structure with the implementation of the conditions of approval included in Attachment 1 of the staff report. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) Future development would be required to meet on-site parking requirements identified by use within the Zoning Ordinance. Future requests for building permits would be reviewed for conformance with parking standards during the review process. Parking requirements for conventional single-family detached homes are two spaces not in tandem. Sufficient space is available on each proposed lot to accommodate this parking requirement. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g) 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 subdivision map. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: No significant traffic impacts are expected for the project and mitigation is not required. For the “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| 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 | |

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

| XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | X |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | X |

Discussion:

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
 - Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
 - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
 - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a) The El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 28, 2008 stating that a six-inch gravity sewer line abutting the northern property line in East Road has adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. (*Facility Improvement Letter East Road Subdivision, El Dorado Irrigation District, March 28, 2008*) Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed water quality standards. Proposed sewer line extension impacts would be less than significant.
 - b) El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 28, 2008 indicating that it has adequate water supplies and sewer facilities to serve the project. Therefore, no new or expanded off-site water or wastewater facilities would be necessary to serve the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - c) According to the submitted drainage report, “the effects of this proposed construction will moderately increase water runoff amounts, but will not change times of concentration, and will have only a minimal effect on the natural drainage patterns of the surrounding areas. The proposed project will increase the peak runoff for the project site, therefore, detention will be required to restore peak runoff to pre-development levels.” (*Preliminary Drainage Report for the Proposed Placer Oaks Subdivision Placerville, El Dorado County, CA, Carlton Engineering, Inc., April 2008*) Therefore, substantial drainage pattern alteration or runoff would not occur. Construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities is addressed within the standard conditions of approval in Attachment 1. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - d) El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 28, 2008 indicating that it has adequate water supplies to serve the project. Potential impacts from connecting to an existing water line within Forni Road or Hill Road would be less than significant.
 - e) The El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 28, 2008 stating that a six-inch gravity sewer line abutting the northern property line in East Road has adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. (*Facility*

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

Improvement Letter East Road Subdivision, El Dorado Irrigation District, March 28, 2008) Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed water quality standards. Proposed sewer line extension impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- g) 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.

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

| XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project: | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| 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) Subsurface earthwork activities may expose previously undiscovered buried resources. Standard construction cultural resource conditions of approval are incorporated into the project as conditions of approval within Attachment 1 of the staff report. This would ensure that impacts on cultural resources are less than significant. In summary, all potentially significant effects on cultural resources can be reduced to a level of less than significant.

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

- b) All cumulative impacts related to air quality, biological resources, and transportation/traffic are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts on these areas. Impacts are less than significant.
- c) All impacts identified in this Negative Declaration are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Development Services Department, Planning Services in Placerville:

2004 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.

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, 4719)

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 REPORTS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Air Quality Assessment for Placer Oaks Subdivision Tentative Subdivision Map El Dorado County, California, Carlton Engineering, Inc., January 2008.

Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for the Placer Oaks Subdivision El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., March 17, 2008.

Cultural Resources Study of Assessors Parcel No. 329:181:13, 14, and 15 Proposed East Road Subdivision, El Dorado County, California 95619, Historic Resource Associates, May 2007.

Facility Improvement Letter East Road Subdivision, El Dorado Irrigation District, March 28, 2008.

Land Capability Report for the Placer Oaks Subdivision Placerville, El Dorado County, CA, Carlton Engineering, Inc., April 2008.

Oak Canopy Retention Analysis for the Placer Oaks Subdivision Project, El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., March 17, 2008.

Preliminary Drainage Report for the Proposed Placer Oaks Subdivision Placerville, El Dorado County, CA, Carlton Engineering, Inc., April 2008.

Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for Placer Oaks Subdivision El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., March 17, 2008.

Traffic Impact Analysis Placer Oaks El Dorado County, California, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., April 18, 2008.