



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** TM07-1438/Z07-0010/PD07-0006

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

**Contact Person:** Pat Kelly

**Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Gregory Porter

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** 1700 Dove Tail Lane, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

**Project Agent's Name and Address:** Gregory Porter, 1700 Dove Tail Lane, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:** CTA Engineering & Surveying, 3233 Monier Circle,  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95742

**Project Location:** South side of Marble Valley Road one mile west of the intersection with Flying C Road in the Cameron Park area.

**Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 119-020-35

**Zoning:** Estate Residential Ten acre (RE-10)

**Section:** 8      **T:** 9      **R:** 9

**General Plan Designation:** High Density Residential (HDR)

**Description of Project:** The project request includes a Zone Change from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD) and a Planned Development and Tentative Map to create 54 residential lots including seven open space lots, landscaping, lift station, and future right-of-way on an existing 32.82-acre parcel. The residential lots would range in size from 7,965 to 72,208 square feet. The project includes seven open space lots, landscaping, lift station and future right-of-way. The open space lots would consist of 9.84 acres. The project site would be accessed from Beasley Drive and Marble Valley Road. The Planned Development request includes modification to the Development Standards of the One-Family Residential (R1) Zone District. Approximately 30% of the site would be set aside within dedicated open space lots.

Design Waiver(s) have been requested for the following:

- a. Request to reduce the right-of-way width along portions of A Drive and Drive B to a 35-foot minimum.
- b. Request for a 50-foot radius at the knuckle of A Drive.
- c. Request for the narrow access portion of Flag Lots No. 53 and No. 54 to exceed 100-feet.
- d. Allow a driveway within twenty-five (25) feet of a radius return, a minimum standard as required by DISM Standard Plan 103A-1.
- e. To reduce the minimum sixteen (16) foot driveway width as defined in DISM 103A-1 to a ten (10) foot driveway width for a single car garage and allow for a sixteen (16) foot driveway width for a double car garage.
- f. Request for a 100-foot radius at secondary entrance on A Drive.

The project would include two new Marble Valley Road segments, one between the project site and Beasley Road and the other between the easterly boundary of the project site and Flying C Road. The extension of Marble Valley Road from the easterly boundary of the project site to Flying C Road would provide primary access for the project to Highway 50 and Cambridge Road. These improvements have been included as part of the Capital Improvements Project (CIP) for the Department of Transportation.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RE-10	HDR	Undeveloped
North:	R20K	HDR	Undeveloped
East:	MV-TM (Marble Valley – Tentative Map)	LDR	Undeveloped
South:	MV-TM (Marble Valley – Tentative Map)	LDR	Undeveloped
West:	MV-TM (Marble Valley – Tentative Map)	LDR	Undeveloped

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is an undeveloped parcel within the Cameron Park Community Region. The site lies within an elevation range of 900-1080 feet above sea level. Slopes on-site are moderate with portions exceeding 30 percent. Vegetation communities on the project site include mixed oak woodland and riparian woodland with wetland features within the oak woodland community. Approximately .05 acre of jurisdictional wetlands is present on-site.

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

1. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Commercial grading permit for off-site access road improvements
2. El Dorado County Building Services: Grading permit for on-site road improvements
3. Regional Water Quality Control Board: Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of Clean Water Act
4. Cameron Park Community Service District: In-lieu fees and park impact fees
5. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District requires compliance to Rule 223-1 and 223-2.
6. Local Agency Formation Commission: Approval for annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
<b>X</b>	Biological Resources	<b>X</b>	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: Patricia Kelly For: El Dorado County

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

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed residential project. The project would allow the creation of fifty-four (54) residential parcels.

### Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

### Project Characteristics

The project would create 54 residential lots including two open space lots on an existing 32.82-acre parcel. The residential lots would range in size from 7,965 to 72,208 square feet. The project includes seven open space lots, landscaping, lift station and future right-of-way. The open space lots would consist of 9.84 acres. Approximately 30% of the site would be set aside within a dedicated open space lots. The project site would be accessed from Beasley Drive and Marble Valley Road.

#### 1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The project would include two new Marble Valley Road segments, one between the project site and Beasley Road and the other between the easterly boundary of the project site and Flying C Road. The extension of Marble Valley Road from the easterly boundary of the project site to Flying C Road provides primary access for the project to Highway 50 and Cambridge Road. These improvements have been included as part of the Capital Improvements Project (CIP) for the Department of Transportation.

#### 2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project would be required to receive the discretionary approval of the El Dorado Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District in order to receive public water and wastewater services. The new residential parcels proposed would be served by public water and sewer. The El Dorado Irrigation district (EID) would provide water and sewer facilities. The project applicant would be required to construct a water line extension connecting to an existing twelve (12) inch water line in Beasley Drive and construct a water line extension under Highway 50, connecting the eight (8) inch water line in County Club Drive to the twelve (12) inch water line in Beasley Drive. There is an eight (8) inch sewer in Voltaire Drive which has adequate capacity at this time. The project applicant would be required to construct an extension of facilities of adequate size connecting to the existing eight (8) inch sewer line.

#### 3. Population

The project would create fifty-four (54) residential lots which would not result in the increase of population in the area.

#### 4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project site would consist of off-site and on-site road improvements including grading for on-site and off-site roadways, driveways and building pads; trenching for utility connections, landscaping and finish work. Construction access to the site would be from Cambridge Road. All equipment and materials staging would occur on-site.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from the Development Services.

The project applicant would be required to comply with County Air Quality Management District Rule 223-1 designed to control emissions and Rule 223-2 designed to control asbestos emissions during construction activities.

### Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**Discussion:**

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

- a) The project would be approximately one mile west from a scenic vista, Marble Valley, as identified in the El Dorado County General Plan. The scenic vista is visible primarily from the south, where topography and elevations allow for clear visual access. Since the project would be west of the scenic viewpoint, and not in the direction of the south facing scenic view, the project would not adversely affect the scenic vista or impair views of the vista. The impact would be less than significant.
- b) The nearest scenic highway, as designated and listed by the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), is Highway 49, about seven miles east of the project site. Because of the layout and slopes of the surrounding lands, the project site would not be visible from any state scenic highway. The impact would be less than significant.
- c) The project includes substantial grading and the removal of trees. The project shall comply with General Plan policies, zoning codes, and ordinances that regulate visual character, including policies to protect biological resources, height limitations to protect views, and other miscellaneous policies. The scale and type of development proposed would be consistent with existing residential development north of the site. The project would not substantially affect the visual character of its surroundings. The visual character of the site would change from undeveloped land to residential housing, consistent with the character of surrounding areas. The overall impacts would be less than significant.
- d) The project would result in the development of 54 residential lots, and six (6) lettered lots consisting of 10.3-acres designated as open space and landscaping lots. New sources of light and glare would result from sources such as street lighting, security lighting, landscape lighting, automobile headlights, and other typical lighting associated with residential uses. Significant light sources exist in the vicinity of the project site, along Highway 50. Lighting would be similar to the residential development north of the project. This project would not create a significant change in the visual environment of either daytime or nighttime conditions, and would not adversely affect views in the area. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
  - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
  - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a) The project would not result in any conversion of any farmland classified by the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use. The project site and adjacent lands contain auburn silt loam and auburn very rocky silt loam soil types, which are rated as not prime farmland. There would be no impact.
- b) The project area and adjacent lands are zoned for residential uses. The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural uses. The project site and adjacent lands are not under any current Williamson Act contracts. This project would not affect any Williamson Act lands. There would be no impact.
- c) The project would not involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Refer to discussion a) and b) above. There would be no impact.

**Findings:** The project does not include conversion of prime farmland or impact any Williamson Act lands. Impacts would be less than significant. For this “Agricultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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:**

The project would result in the creation of parcels allowing the construction of fifty-four (54) new single-family units. Additional construction would be done to provide supporting infrastructure, including extension of utility lines, expansion of roads, construction of driveways, and related improvements. The potential impacts of these activities are discussed below.

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, 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 PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, 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.

The project involves the rezoning from Estate Residential 10-acre District (RE10) to One-Family Residential District /Planned Development (R1/PD) and subdivision of the property into 54 residential lots and 6 additional lots designated for open space and landscaping consisting of 10.3-acres. Additional improvements such as roadway improvement and grading would require the use of construction vehicles. Construction and operational emissions from potential home development on the site could produce minor amounts of air pollutants, including particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>), although not at levels near the thresholds listed above. Vehicles serving residential structures would also contribute carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) to the atmosphere.

- a) The approval and construction of the project would not affect the implementation of any regional air quality attainment plan or program. The project would be required to follow the standard rules of the El Dorado Air Quality Management District (AQMD), which provide for basic and reasonable mitigation of air quality impacts generated by the project, as discussed below. The impact would be less than significant.



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

b) The project could create air quality impacts which may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction. Construction activities associated with the project include grading and site improvements, for roadway expansion, utilities, driveway, home, and building pad construction, and associated on-site activities. Construction related activities would generate  $PM_{10}$  dust emissions that could exceed the state or federal ambient air quality standards for  $PM_{10}$ . This would be a temporary but potentially significant effect. The applicant must comply with the existing requirements of the El Dorado AQMD, Rule 223-1 and 223-2, designed to reduce overall impacts to air quality by controlling emissions and dust generation associated with construction activities. Existing regulations require the applicant to submit and obtain an approved Fugitive Dust Plan Application from the El Dorado Air Quality Management District.

Operational air quality impacts would be minor, and would cause an insignificant contribution to existing or projected air quality violations. Source emissions would be from vehicle trip emissions, natural gas and wood combustion for space and water heating, landscape equipment, and consumer products. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

The use of construction equipment emitting diesel exhaust could result in the generation of reactive organic gases (ROG),  $NO_x$ , CO, and  $PM_{10}$  that would contribute to air quality impacts. This impact is addressed in current regulations of the District. Existing standard conditions from the El Dorado AQMD sufficiently mitigate these potential air quality impacts. The existing standard conditions limit significant diesel emission by requiring, off-road construction equipment to be equipped with engines of 1996 or later model years. Construction drawings are required to specify this condition, and compliance would be checked as part of the building inspection process for new construction.

Complying with existing El Dorado AQMD regulations would be sufficient to ensure that the project-related impacts to local and regional air quality are less than significant.

c) The El Dorado AQMD has noted that there are existing cumulative air quality problems within El Dorado County which can be exacerbated by construction activities. The scale of construction required for this project would contribute to increases in pollutant levels. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation provided earlier in this section is sufficient to ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

d) The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No schools, hospitals, parks, or other land uses with high usage levels by children and those with adverse health impacts are located within the immediate vicinity. The significant pollutants generated by the project would be completed during construction, prior to occupancy of the site. Thus, impacts to future residents would not be substantial. The impact would be less than significant.

e) The project can result in the creation of objectionable odors for residents in the area. Odors caused by construction, such as exhaust fumes from construction equipment, and the use of landscape maintenance equipment can be considered objectionable by some residents in the area. These odors would be sporadic and temporary, and occur intermittently throughout the workday. Exhaust odors would dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity. Because of the temporary infrequent and sporadic nature of the odors, their potential to impact residents or visitors to the area would be limited and unlikely. The impact would be less than significant.

**Findings:** A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant

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

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

<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <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.

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

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

The El Dorado County General Plan does not designate this site as an Important Biological Corridor (IBC), and the site is not located within a Rare Plant Mitigation area. The El Dorado County General Plan EIR has analyzed the potential impacts to biological resources within the County, and has not determined that the area is of significance to broader-scale biological conservation areas in the County.

- a) Foothill Associates prepared a Biological Resources Assessment on the project site and determined that potential habitat for special-status plant species, habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle, nesting sites and foraging habitat for raptors and bat roosting habitat exist on the project site. The Evaluation defined “special status” species as those listed as endangered or threatened under both federal and state Endangered Species Act, designated a Species of Special Concern by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and listed on California Native Plant Society (CNPS) plant inventory lists.

The Biological Resources Assessment determined the following:

The Cooper’s hawk, and the Sharp-shinned hawk are California Species of Special Concern, but were not observed on the project site during the field surveys, however, appropriate nesting and foraging habitats were found to be present within the project site;

Other raptor species forage and nest in a variety of habitats throughout El Dorado County. Raptor nests are protected under the MBTA and Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code makes it illegal to destroy any active raptor nest. The oak and riparian woodlands on-site provide potential foraging and nesting habitat for various raptor species. Consequently, raptors and other migratory birds are likely to forage and nest on the site, and have a high potential to occur within the site.

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

**MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-1**

*If construction activities are scheduled to occur within the typical breeding season for raptors (March 1 through August 31), on-site pre-construction surveys for raptors and their nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of the proposed development activities. The survey results shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and Planning Services prior to issuance of a grading permit. If active raptor nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the site, consultation must be initiated with CDFG to determine appropriate avoidance measures. The applicant shall follow the appropriate avoidance measures issued by CDFG, and no construction activities shall occur on the project site until the avoidance measures are issued and implemented. If no active nests are found, then no further action is required, and construction activities may proceed upon approval by Planning Services (MM BIO-1).*

**MONITORING:** Planning Services shall verify that the above mitigation measure has been incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a grading permit. Development Services shall coordinate with the applicant and/or biologist, assess the pertinent surveys/studies, and conduct on-site verification for conformance with this measure.

The Biological Resources Assessment determined the following:

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

The Fringed myotis, oak woodlands, rock crevices, outcroppings, and overhangs and one structure occur within the project site provide suitable bat roost habitat for: the Greater Western mastiff bat; the Long-eared myotis; the Pacific western big-eared bat; the Silvered-haired bat; the Spotted bat; the Small-footed myotis; and the Yuma myotis.

**MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-2**

*Prior to any project grading or tree removal or structure removal occurs, an on-site pre-construction surveys for bat roost signs shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to initiation of the proposed development activities. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist familiar with the identification of bat species and bat roost signs. If roosting bats are found during the pre-construction survey CDFG or USFWS should be consulted regarding measures to minimize impacts to roosting bats during construction. No trees or structures should be removed that are utilized by roosting bats. If bats are not found during the pre-construction survey, no mitigation measures would be necessary for special-status bats. CD The survey results shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and Planning Services prior to issuance of a grading permit. If active raptor nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the site, consultation must be initiated with CDFG to determine appropriate avoidance measures. The applicant shall follow the appropriate avoidance measures issued by CDFG, and no construction activities shall occur on the project site until the avoidance measures are issued and implemented. If no active nests are found, then no further action is required, and construction activities may proceed upon approval by Planning Services (MM BIO-2).*

**MONITORING:** Planning Services shall verify that the above mitigation measure has been incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a grading permit. Development Services shall coordinate with the applicant and/or biologist, assess the pertinent surveys/studies, and conduct on-site verification for conformance with this measure.

Although no valley elderberry longhorn beetles (VELB), a Federal threatened species that occurs in association of elderberry shrubs were observed during the biological assessment performed by Foothill Associates in July, 2006, there is potential for elderberry shrubs to occur in the extensive riparian woodland. In order to ensure compliance with the General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4, a one-hundred (100) foot buffer on each side of the riparian woodland and stream has been shown on the tentative subdivision map. Therefore, it is assumed all potential elderberry shrub and VELB habitat would be avoided during construction. The impact would be less than significant.

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

- b) The Biological Resources Assessment prepared for the project identified potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. comprised of an excavated ditch, depressional seasonal wetland, ephemeral drainage, riverine seasonal wetland, and sloped seep. These findings were confirmed in the Jurisdictional Delineation Report performed on the project site by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., January, 2008. The Jurisdictional Delineation Report identified 0.5071-acres of water features comprised of five (5) seeps on the project site, totaling 0.1104-acres; eight (8) channels on the project site totaling 0.3564-acres; and one (1) seasonal wetland swale on the project site totaling 0.1104-acre. Three (3) of the channels, two (2) of the seeps and one (1) wetland seasonal swale totaling 0.1955-acres were identified as being jurisdictional waters to be potentially regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project would require the filling and relocation of the wetlands in various locations throughout the project site and would require a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game. This would be a significant impact unless mitigated.

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

**MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-3**

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

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

- c) As discussed in b) above, the Biological Resources Assessment and Jurisdictional Delineation report performed for the project site identified 0.516-acres of wetlands subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project would fill and relocate portions of the wetlands as part of the project. This would be a significant impact unless mitigated.

**MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-4**

*Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall obtain a Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and a water quality certification from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project applicant shall incorporate all conditions attached to the permit and certification into the project (MM BIO-4).*

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

- d) Wildlife species and nursery habitat can be potentially impacted due to the proposed project. The issue and mitigation measures are discussed above in a). Compliance with the above-stated mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- e) The proposed project would impact oak woodland habitat, which pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires retention and replacement of the affected habitat. The project would remove 7.4-acres of oak woodland habitat from the project site. As established in the Interim Interpretive Guidelines for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, dead and diseased or dying oak canopy may be excluded from the retention requirements of Policy 7.4.4.4. As determined by the arborist report prepared by Sierra Nevada Arborist, dated August 2006 for the project, 2.9-acres of on-site canopy is determined to be dead, diseased, or dying. The project site contains approximately 19.71-acres of oak canopy which would require sixty percent (60%) retention. The project would be removing 4.5-acres of healthy canopy which would require replacement. This would be a significant impact unless mitigated. A total of 3.9 acres would be removed for lot development and .6 acres would be removed for road improvements. The 3.9 acres of oak canopy removal would be required to be either replaced or the applicant would be required to pay into the conservation fund as required by the Oak Woodland Management Plan (OWMP) and would be based on the fee established by the County Board of Supervisors. The Tree Preservation Plan (Exhibit H) prepared by CTA Engineering dated October 23, 2007, confirms that the project would be consistent with the General Plan tree canopy retention and replacement policies.

**Findings:** Potentially significant impacts relating to Biological resources include impacts to riparian areas, impacts to protected animal species, and removal of oak woodland habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** and **BIO-2** would require the project pre-construction surveys to reduce impacts to protected animal species. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-3** and **Bio-4** would require the project to obtain permits for the filling and relocation of on-site wetlands and modification to the existing drainage channels. The project would comply with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4

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

percentage canopy retention requirements. For this “Biological Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a) A Cultural Resource Study was performed on the project site by Historic resources Associates, November, 2005, which identified three archaeological properties recorded by Peak & Associates, Inc. on the site, PA-88-80, PA-88-81 and PA-88-32. The features were recorded with the California Department of Parks and Recreation as part of the Cultural Resources Study. Site PA-88-80 reflects a homestead believed to have been established in the 1860s. The superstructure of a modest sized ranch house is long gone, but the field stone foundation and cellar remain largely intact, as does the foundation for an outbuilding of the main house and several dry laid rock walls. Site PA-88-32 consists of a dry laid fieldstone wall. The wall runs east to west along a moderately steep slope that seems to once have delineated an old property boundary. The fieldstone wall likely dates to the late 1850s or 1960s, when the property was being homestead and boundaries were being determined, as well as livestock grazing. The wall is likely associated with the Smith homestead and appears to be a contributing element to the homestead’s historic content and land use history.

The proposed project includes site grading and development of houses, which could destroy the remaining foundations of the main house and outbuildings, cellar, dry laid rock walls. Removal of the structures and surroundings would be considered a significant impact. This would be a significant impact unless mitigated.

**MITIGATION MEASURE CUL-1**

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

*The applicant shall provide a building setback of ten (10) meters to be established along the southern boundary of Site PA88-80 which shall be shown on the final subdivision map. A qualified archaeologist shall accurately locate PA-88--80 so as to precisely represent the building setback (MM CULT-1).*

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the applicant has provided a building setback of ten (10) meters along the southern boundary of Site PA88-80 prior filing the final subdivision map.

**MITIGATION MEASURE CULT-2**

*The rock wall identified as Site PA88-32 shall be shown as open space or landscape feature on the final subdivision map prior to filing by the applicant. A qualified archaeologist shall accurately locate PA-88--32 so as to precisely represent the building setback (MM CULT-2).*

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the above mitigation measure has been incorporated on the final subdivision map prior to filing.

**MITIGATION MEASURE CULT-3**

*The applicant shall protect Site PA-88-80 and Site PA-88-32 from all construction activities by installing a drip-line fence along the southern boundary of Site PA88-80 and around Site PA-88-32 to avoid inadvertent damage to either site or feature. A qualified archaeologist shall accurately locate PA-88-80 PA-88--32 to assure the protection of the sites or features (MM CULT-3).*

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the above mitigation measure has been incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a building and/or grading permit. Development Services shall coordinate with the applicant and/or archaeologist, assess the pertinent surveys, and conduct on-site verification for conformance with this measure.

**MITIGATION MEASURE CULT-4**

*A plaque or monument should be placed in a conspicuous location with a brief description of the site's original owner (MM CULT-4).*

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the above mitigation measure has been incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a building and/or grading permit.

- b) No significant archeological resources were identified during a site investigation. Existing regulations are sufficient to ensure that any unknown artifacts identified in construction of improvements to the site would be mitigated. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

- c) No paleontological resources or unique geological features were identified in a cultural records search of the property. Existing regulations are sufficient to ensure that any unknown paleontological resources or unique geological features identified in construction of improvements to the site would be mitigated. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d) No human burial sites were identified in a cultural records search of the property, nor during an investigation of the site. It is possible that human remains may be on the property, as there were human activities in the area, as evidenced by the cultural resources in the area and farm directly located on the site. Because there is a possibility of human burials on site, any human remains identified in construction of improvements to the site must be mitigated. Existing regulations require that if human remains are discovered, the project must halt excavation and disturbances of the site and the applicant must contact the coroner to investigate. If the human remains are Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted to identify the most likely descendant so that they can appropriately handle the body and associated grave goods. The impact would be less than significant.

**Findings:** The project could have potentially significant impacts on surface and subsurface historic resources that exist or may exist on the project site. The incorporation of **Mitigation Measure CULT-1, CULT-2, CULT-3 and CULT-4** would reduce the impacts on such resources to a less-than-significant level.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</b>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		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:



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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as ground shaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
  - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
  - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) i) According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, there are no earthquake fault zones within El Dorado County. The nearest faults are located in Alpine and Butte County. Because of the fault’s distance from the project site, impacts would be less than significant.
- ii) The project site is located within Seismic Risk Zone 3, and based on subsurface interpretations, is classified as Soil Profile Type S<sub>B</sub>, which may increase risks for seismic shaking. Existing regulations within the locally adopted building code are sufficient to ensure that structures and improvements on the site are safe from impacts related to seismic shaking. The impact would be less than significant.
- iii) The geological characteristics on site are of a relatively shallow depth to bedrock and of a general lack of water table. These characteristics are generally not susceptible to liquefaction, and the risk is negligible. The impact would be less than significant.
- iv) The project site is moderately sloped with seventy-eight percent (78%) of the project site being less than thirty percent (30%) slope. The project site contains slopes in the range of thirty percent (30%) and above located primarily on Lot B, Open Space, lands located primarily on the western edge of the site, however, the disturbance of such areas is not planned, so the chance of a land slide would be remote. The potential for landslides on the site would be limited by the planned grading associated with the project, and the type of soils existing on site. Existing regulations are sufficient to ensure that landslides would not pose a significant risk to persons and structures on the site. The impact would be less than significant.
- (b. & c.) The proposed project could result in substantial soil erosion and substantial loss of topsoil through construction, earthmoving, grading, and typical residential uses. This typically occurs during rainy seasons and over-watering of landscaping by homeowners. In addition, exposed bare soil is more likely to be susceptible to erosion. Existing County regulations, along with those of the Resource Conservation District and the California Water Quality Control Board, are sufficient to ensure that Best Management Practices are utilized and grading plans are consistent with County policies. The impact would be less than significant.
- The potential impacts are discussed in a) through c) above. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d) Expansive clay soils have been discovered in areas in the project site during test drills. Expansive soils in concentrated amounts could cause distress to concrete slab-on-grade floors and foundations, affecting the structural stability of homes on the site. Standard grading conditions require areas with high concentrations of expansive soils

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

to be called out on final soils reports filed with the County Building Services. Areas with expansive soils where residential construction is proposed are required to be sufficiently over-excavated and blended or replaced. In addition it is recommended, for these areas to be observed by the Geotechnical Engineer prior to placement of the structural materials, to verify that no concentrated pockets of expansive clays are present. Standard Grading conditions would reduce impacts to a less than-significant level.

- (e) Sewers are available for wastewater disposal and the project would be connected to the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). The project does not involve the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. There would be no impact.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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) The project may involve transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as construction materials, paints, fuels, landscaping materials, and household cleaning supplies. The use of these hazardous materials would only occur during construction, and household use of hazardous materials would be sporadic, temporary, and their potential for impact would be limited and unlikely. Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials. With existing regulations, the impact would be less than significant.
- b) Hazardous materials may be used during construction, as discussed above in a). Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials, including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (CalOHS) requirements. With existing regulations, the impact would be less than significant.
- Soil samples from the project site did not detect asbestos on the project site (Youngdahl and Associates, 2006). However, as a precaution, Youngdahl and Associates specified mitigation that should be used if NOA is discovered during construction. The mitigation requires the applicant to comply with the Air Quality Management District’s Rule 223-2, designated to control emissions associated with construction activities. Earthwork can result in the reasonable upset of soils containing NOA and can expose people to asbestos. Inhalation of dust containing asbestos fibers can cause lung damage, and is considered a hazardous substance. Construction on sites known to contain NOA must adhere to California Air Resources Board ATCM, Title 17, Section 93105 and the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District Rule 223-2. A site specific Asbestos Dust Hazard Mitigation Plan must be developed and followed. All grading must be designed to control and mitigate potential exposure during and after construction, along with geologic monitoring for asbestos. Earthwork contractors must be made aware of OSHA rules and local ordinances about working in soils containing asbestos. These existing regulations ensure that the impact from release of NOA would be less than significant.
- c) The project would not emit any hazardous materials within 0.25 miles of schools. The nearest schools are Holy Trinity, Blue Oak Elementary, which are between 0.6 and 0.8 miles north of the project site. There are no schools within 0.25 miles of the project site. There would be no impact.
- d) The project site is not listed on a list of hazardous material sites. The nearest site with hazardous waste as listed on the US EPA’s environmental mapping program is the Chemedent Transit Company site, approximately two (2) miles to the east of the project site. There would be no impact.
- e) The nearest airport would be the Cameron Airpark, located approximately two and one-half (2.5) miles to the northeast of the project site. The project would be not located within the airport’s land use plan, nor would it be within two miles of the airport. There would be no impact.

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

- f) The project would not be within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There would be no impact.
- g) The project would not be expected to interfere or negatively affect any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Plans for the proposed project indicate that it would not block access or significantly decrease access to any roadways or evacuation routes. Instead, the project could improve emergency response as the project would upgrade some existing roadways to the property, thus improving circulation. Improved circulation can improve emergency response times and facilitate evacuations. The impact would be less than significant.
- h) The project would be located in an area classified as “high fire hazard”, according to the General Plan. The project could expose people or structures to significant risk of wildland fires, through the construction of homes next to wooded areas. Existing building regulations related to fire safety, such as building practices and materials, and setbacks would be insufficient alone to mitigate potential risks at this site. Existing regulations in the General Plan require the applicant to obtain a fire safe plan approved by CalFire and the El Dorado County Fire District sufficient to mitigate potential fire hazards. Approved fire safe plans are standard requirements in El Dorado County to mitigate for fire hazard risks. The impacts would be less than significant.

**Findings:** The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials. The project site would be located in an area where risk of wildland fires is high. Implementation of a fire safe plan as described above would reduce this impact to less than significant. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed project.

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

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

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
delineation map?			
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
  - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
  - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
  - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
  - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) The project would require the filling and relocation of the wetlands in various locates throughout the project site. The wetlands are comprised of an excavated ditch, depression seasonal wetland, ephemeral drainage, riverine seasonal wetland, and sloped seeps. Existing El Dorado County regulations requires all construction activities and improvements to be set back at least 50 feet from such waterways, in addition to the utilization of Best Management Practices (BMPs) on site to minimize potential impacts from construction-related runoff. This includes the utilization of vegetated swales or similar materials to catch runoff prior to entry into these waterways. The project would be able to comply with all requirements for setbacks and BMPs, thus all potential impacts can be offset through existing regulations. The impact would be less than significant.
- b) The project would not withdraw any groundwater from the site, and would not be expected to substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. Site grading, paving, and construction of homes can have a negative, but minor effect on groundwater recharge, as structures and soil compactions may make the ground less permeable to water. The impact would be less than significant.
- c) The project would have an impact on normal drainage patterns through site grading and the creation of additional impervious surfaces. Substantial erosion or siltation can occur without use of appropriate revegetation and erosion control measures. The majority of the lots would drain to the rear into existing natural channels. Project implementation includes construction of Marble Valley Road along the northern boundary. A ditch on the north side of the road would intercept runoff from development north and east of the Porter site that currently contributes to the secondary on-site drainageway that crosses the northeast corner of the parcel. Runoff originating west of the project, intercepted by the north-south channel, would be unaffected by the development. As part of the standard conditions, the applicant would be required to submit an erosion control plan to the El Dorado County Resource Conservation

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

District for review and approval. The erosion control plan includes appropriate practices and techniques to ensure that erosion and siltation resulting from construction would be reduced to levels deemed acceptable to the District. Standard grading conditions would reduce the impact to be less than significant.

- d) The project would have a minor effect on normal drainage patterns, through site grading and the creation of impervious surfaces. Substantial flooding would not be expected to occur. The proposed development would increase flows in the downstream channel by as much as seven percent (7%) during a 10-year storm, and six percent (6%) during a 100-year event. The sump area at the existing culvert is effective in reducing post-development runoff. Existing design characteristics of the project are appropriate to reduce potential flooding impacts. The impacts are less than significant.
- e) The project would contribute runoff water into existing natural channels, consisting of residential runoff, mainly associated with landscaping, and would not exceed the capacity of existing systems nor would it provide substantial sources of polluted runoff.

Construction activities would also contribute to runoff, as earthwork would disturb soils and vegetation on site, resulting in the land being more susceptible to runoff. The scale of the project requires the applicant to obtain a Storm Water Discharge General Permit from the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Conditions contained within the General Permit would ensure that runoff created by the project would be sufficiently filtered prior to entry into the regional drainage system or area waterways. The impacts would be less than significant.

- f) All impacts to water quality are discussed within the sections above, as well as the Geology and Soils section contained earlier in this Initial Study. The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All storm-water and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site. The impact would be less than significant.
- g) The project site would not be located within a 100-year floodplain (Flood Zone C; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel 060040 0700 C; areas of minimal flooding). There would be no impact.
- h) According to the General Plan, the project would not be located within a 100-year flood zone. There would be no impact.
- i) The closest dams and levees to the project site are Cameron Park dam and dams and levees on Folsom Lake. This project site would be approximately three (3) miles from Cameron Park Lake dam. Additionally, failure of Folsom Dam would be considered remote. There would be no impact.
- j) The project area would not be near a body of water large enough to generate a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The nearest large bodies of water are Lake Tahoe and Folsom Lake. Neither is close enough or large enough to predict seiche risk. Mudflow on this type of soil is unlikely, see geology and soils section. There would be no impact.

**Findings:** No significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. Implementation of standard conditions would reduce impacts due to erosion and siltation to less than significant. 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
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a) The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. The site is within the Cameron Park community area, and this project would add housing adjacent to existing development. There would be no impact.
- b) The project proposes rezoning the site from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD) consistent with the existing General Plan designation on the site. There is no General Plan Important Biological Overlay (IBC) zone covering the site, nor are there any additional designations which require treatment for known environmental impacts. The project must comply with all existing regulations adopted for the purposes of mitigating an environmental impact. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.
- (c) Protected and sensitive natural areas within El Dorado County include: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database and shown in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR. However, the project site does not include, nor would it be adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. This impact would be less than significant. .

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

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

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			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) There are no known mineral resources of value on the site, according to the General Plan. Unknown mineral resources could exist beneath the ground on the site, although the potential for such an occurrence would be low. Residential development of this scale is not likely to inhibit the extraction of most subterranean resources, including oil, natural gas, or other liquid or gaseous resources. The impact would be less than significant.
- b) According to the General Plan, there are no known mineral resources that are of local importance for resource recovery on the property site. The mineral resource overlay zone does not cover the site. There would be no impact.

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

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



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

<b>XI. NOISE.</b> <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL;
  - Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
  - Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- a) The project is not listed under Table 6-1 of the General Plan as being a use subject to maximum allowable noise exposures from transportation source. As such, an acoustical analysis was not provided as part of the project application submittal. The creation of the fifty-four (54) residential lots for single-family use would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (b,-d) Short-term noise impacts would be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the parcel vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. Noises associated with residential uses are not anticipated to increase ambient noise levels. The creation of the subdivision would require road improvements which would have a less than significant impact.
- e) The project would not be located with an airport land use plan, nor it within two miles of an airport, and would not expose people to excessive noise levels from airports. The nearest airport would be the Cameron Airpark, located approximately two and one-half (2.5) miles northeast of the project site. The project would be outside the CNEL 55 dB area, as shown on the General Plan. There would be no impact.
- f) The project is not near a private airstrip. There would be no impact.

**Findings:** For the “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would occur from the proposed development with the incorporation of the short-term construction mitigation measures.

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

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
  - Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
  - Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.
- a) The project would induce some population growth in the area directly by proposing new homes and indirectly through extension and improvement of roads and infrastructure. However, construction of fifty-four (54) single-family residential homes would not induce substantial population growth to the area. The population growth to the area is minor and the impacts would be less than significant.
- b) There is no existing housing on the site and the project would not displace any existing housing. No replacement housing is needed. The proposed project would add more housing. There would be no impact.
- c) The project would not displace any people, as discussed above, but would allow people to live there. No replacement housing is needed. There would be no impact.

**Findings:** 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.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department’s/District’s goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;
  - Substantially increase or expand the demand for public law enforcement protection without increasing staffing and equipment to maintain the Sheriff’s Department goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents;
  - Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services;
  - Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources;
  - Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
  - Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.
- a) The site and project would continue to be served by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District. In addition, the El Dorado County FPD maintains an agreement in which the Cameron Park CSD serves as the first responder to the site in case of emergency fire and medical request. The proposed project would not be expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for fire services. The property has already been designated for residential uses and would be consistent with the General Plan; thus the impacts to public services have already been considered. Requirements of the El Dorado County FPD have been incorporated as conditions of project approval, and are therefore considered part of the project. These include the installation of a hydrant within five-hundred feet (500’) (by road) of all parcels, submittal and approval of a Fire Safe Plan, acceptable to the District and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and access roads serving the project site would be required to comply with, at a minimum, Fire Safety Standards for width, surface, grade, radius, turnarounds, and turnouts, one-way and dead-end roads. The impacts to fire services are less than significant.
- b) Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department. Because of the size and scope of the proposed project, it is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for police services. The property has already been designated for residential uses and would be consistent with the General Plan; thus the impacts to public services have already been considered. The impact would be less than significant.
- c) School services would continue to be provided by the Buckeye Union School District. The student increase resulting from construction of fifty-four (54) new single-family units would be minor. The proposed homes are required to pay the impact fees adopted by the District to offset potential impacts resulting from the development. The impact would be less than significant.
- d) Parks services would continue to be provided by El Dorado County. Although the proposed project would not be expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for parks, it can have a minor increase in service and usage for parks. Although the subdivision is not within the service boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Services District and no property tax increment would be allotted to the District, future residents would likely use the District’s parks and recreation facilities, creating a “free-rider” situation. In addition, the construction of homes on the project site can reduce open space opportunities for residents and neighbors. Payment of parkland in-lieu fees would be sufficient to ensure that the impacts generated by the project are fully mitigated. The impact would be less than significant.

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

- e) There are no other services that are anticipated which can be adversely impacted by the proposed project. The impacts are less than significant.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

(a & b)

The proposed Tentative Map would increase population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. 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. Although the subdivision is not within the service boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Services District and no property tax increment would be allotted to the District, future residents would likely use the District’s parks and recreation facilities, creating a “free-rider” situation. Quimby fees for the acquisition of parklands would be assessed during the process of the final Subdivision Map. The impact would be less than significant.

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

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

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> <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) As required by County policy, a traffic study was prepared to analyze the potential traffic impacts resulting from the project. The Porter Property Traffic Impact Analysis, dated November 13, 2006, prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., provides analysis and conclusions relative to traffic impacts generated by the project. According to the report, the project would cause an increase in traffic on area roadways and intersections. The traffic study concluded that the project would be expected to generate fifty-nine (59) AM and seventy-eight (78) PM peak hour trips, with 749 total average daily trips (ADT). The addition of the proposed project to the existing road network does not result in substandard operations at study intersections. The intersection at Cambridge Road and the US 50 WB Ramps/Merrychase Drive currently operates at LOS F and E, respectively, during peak hours. This intersection is proposed to be signalized in the near future, with funding to be provided through the County’s Capital Improvements Program (CIP). Signalization of the intersections would improve the operation of the intersection to LOS A. Payment of Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) fees required would ensure that the project contributes to the improvements called out in the CIP, thus reducing the impact to a level of less than significant.

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

- b) The Porter Property *Traffic Impact Analysis* indicated that the project would cumulatively impact the level of service at the intersection at Cambridge Road and the US 50 EB Ramps. The Cambridge Road intersection with the US 50 EB Ramps is projected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak-hour without the proposed project and at LOS F with the proposed project. As defined by General Plan Policy TC-Xd, because the intersection satisfies County standards without the proposed project (LOS E) and the proposed project results in unacceptable operation (LOS F), the proposed project is considered to significantly worsen the conditions at this intersection. The traffic study requires the applicant to improve the Cambridge Road and the US 50 EB Ramps by providing an all way stop. In addition, the Department of Transportation would require the applicant to obtain an approved encroachment permit from CalTrans for the required improvement. The Department of Transportation would require, as a condition of approval, to extend Marble Valley Road between Voltaire Drive and Flying C Road and between the project site and Beasley road. The addition of these two roadway segments improves access to the site from US-50 and Cambridge Road. These conditions would be included in the conditions of approval within Attachment 1 of the staff report. Implementation of these conditions of approval would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- c) The project would not change air traffic patterns that results in safety risks, as this would be a residential project. The site would not be within the approach path of any area runway. There would be no impact.
- d) The project does not have any substantial design hazards. The Porter Property Traffic Impact Analysis indicated that there would be no dangerous intersections or roadway conditions. Proposed land uses would be compatible with adjacent existing and proposed land uses. The impacts are less than significant.
- e) The project, as proposed and conditioned by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District, would have adequate emergency access. The impacts are less than significant.
- f) Single family residences would be required to provide two parking spaces that are not in tandem. The proposed parcels would provide adequate space to comply with all parking requirements. There would be no impact.
- g) The project does not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs regarding alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

**Findings:** Environmental impacts due to traffic would be reduced by providing an all way stop at Cambridge Road and the US 50 EB Ramps; payment of TIM fees; and the road improvements which would be conditions of approval, as discussed above, would reduce potential traffic impacts to a less than significant level. For the “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>	

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

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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?			<b>X</b>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			<b>X</b>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

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

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

a) Wastewater treatment would be provided for the site by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), upon receiving LAFCO's discretionary approval for annexation into the District. The Regional Water Quality Control Board sets treatment requirements for the collection, processing, and disposal of waste, which must be complied with by EID. Specifically, EID operates under Waste Discharge Requirement Order No. R5-2002-0210 regarding treatment processes and water quality standards that are specific to the Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. EID has indicated that it would be willing and able serve the proposed project, consistent with the requirements of the RWQCB. The impacts are less than significant.

b) The El Dorado County Fire Protection District has determined that the minimum fire flow for this project is 1500 GPM for a two-hour duration while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. According to EID's *Facility Improvement Letter FIL1106-110* (FIL), in order to receive water service and provide this fire flow, the applicant must construct a water line extension connecting to the existing 12-inch water line in Beasley Drive and a water line extension under Highway 50, connecting the 8-inch water line in Country Club Drive to the 12-inch water line in Beasley Drive. However, the proposed Marble Valley subdivision to the south will be required to build

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

infrastructure from the existing Bass Lake Tanks water line in Bass Lake Road to the existing water line in Flying C Road. If this infrastructure is installed before the proposed subdivision is developed, connections to these water lines may be utilized instead of the connection to Country Club Drive.

According to the FIL, there is an 8-inch sewer line located in Voltaire Drive with adequate capacity to serve the project. In order to receive service from these lines, an extension of facilities of adequate size must be constructed.

The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. EID has indicated that it would be willing and able to serve the proposed project. The addition of fifty-four (54) single-family residential units would not result in a substantial increase in demand for services. The project would contribute to the demand on the existing regional wastewater treatment facilities, which may need to be expanded or upgraded at some point in the future. The impact to this expansion is minimal. The impacts are less than significant.

c) The proposed project would not require construction of new or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities, of which could cause significant environmental effects. The majority of the lots would drain to the rear into existing natural channels. Project implementation includes construction of Marble Valley Road along the northern boundary. A ditch on the north side of the road would intercept runoff from development north and east of the Porter site that currently contributes to the secondary on-site drainageway that crosses the northeast corner of the parcel. Runoff originating west of the project, intercepted by the north-south channel, would be unaffected by the development. The project would be required to comply with the stormwater requirements of the Design and Improvement Standards Manual. The impacts are less than significant.

d) The subject parcel is within EID’s Western/Eastern Supply Area, which receives gravity water supply from FERC Project 184 and Jenkinson Lake. According to EID’s *2007 Water Resources and Service Reliability Report*, there are 2,426 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of water available in this region, based on the following calculations:

The 2007 supply-based firm yield for the Western/Eastern Supply Area is 36,000 acre-feet (AF); 15,080 AF from Project 184 and 20,920 AF from Jenkinson Lake. The total potential demand as of December 31, 2006 included 27,899 AF of active demand, 667 AF of latent demand, and 6,027 AF of other system demand, for a total of 34,593 AF. The resulting unallocated water supply for the year 2007 is therefore 1,407 AF.

To convert the available water supply to meter availability, EID projected demand out for three years. This per EDU demand was based on a 10-year historical trend (1996-2005) in the Western/Eastern Supply Area. The trend was extended out to 2009, resulting in 0.58 AF per EDU. The water meter availability for the Western/Eastern Supply Area is thus a total of 2,426 EDUs for 2007.

It should be noted, however, that this number does not take into account the existing 907 EID contractual commitments in the region, nor does it reflect recent annexations approved by LAFCO that have not yet purchased water meters, which amount to an additional 451-458 EDU commitments.

After taking into account both of these additional factors, it is reasonable to assume that EID’s Western/Eastern Water Supply Region has approximately 1,061-1,068 EDUs that are available for purchase and not yet implicitly committed to other prospective customers. According to EID’s FIL to the applicant, the project as proposed would require 58 EDUs of water supply. The current available supply is sufficient to accommodate the estimated 58 EDUs of service that will be required for the Porter project.

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



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

assurances that expansion of water supply to the project site is sufficient and reliable.

The proposed project would be served by EID, which has indicated the ability to adequately serve the project. This fifty-four (54) single-family residential development would not be expected to need new or expanded entitlements, as EID would be able to serve the project from existing resources. The impacts would be less than significant.

- e) Upon annexation, the subject parcel would be served by EID’s Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (DCWWTP), which is located approximately two miles south of US Highway 50 in Cameron Park area and receives flows from a 24 square mile area that includes Diamond Springs, El Dorado, Shingle Springs, and Cameron Park. DCWWTP discharges treated wastewater to Deer Creek, a tributary to the Cosumnes River, with a portion of the flow recycled for irrigation and dust control under Title 22. EID’s discharge permit requires that a minimum of one million gallons per day be discharged to Deer Creek year round.

The proposed project would require an extension of EID’s wastewater collection system and increase the demand on EID’s wastewater treatment facilities. According to EID’s *2001 Wastewater Master Plan*, the plant has a permitted capacity of 3.6 million gallons per day (MGD) average dry weather flow; the current average dry weather flows are 2.7 MGD. According to the project engineer, CTA Engineering and Surveying, Inc., the project would require an average dry weather flow of 13,000 gallons per day. The design flow is based on an average wet weather flow which would be 51,840 gallons per day.

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

EID has determined that it can serve the proposed project, and that it has adequate capacity to handle the proposed development. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. The project would generate waste similar to other single-family residential uses. No local, state, or federal statutes related to the generation, treatment, or disposal of solid waste would be violated by the project. The impact would be less than significant.

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

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

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

**Discussion:**

- (a) The proposed project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to biological and cultural resources. Potential impacts to biological resources include the alteration of habitat and or direct impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species. This impact would be mitigated by **MM BIO-1** which would require on-site pre-construction surveys for raptors and their nests conducted by a qualified biologist; **MM BIO-2** would require prior to any project grading or tree removal or structure removal occurs, an on-site pre-construction surveys for bat roost signs shall be conducted; **MM BIO-3** would require the developer to obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game for each stream crossing or any activities affecting the on-site riparian vegetation; **MM BIO-4** would require the developer to obtain a Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and a water quality certification from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Additional impacts to biological resources would be less than significant. Impacts to cultural resources are potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated due to the existing historical-period cultural resources which occur within the project site. This impact is mitigated by **MM CULT-1**, which would require the developer to provide a building setback of ten (10) meters to be established along the southern boundary of a historic-period site identified as PA 88-80 in this study; **MM CULT-2** requires the developer to preserve the rock wall identified as Site PA88-32 in this study by showing the wall as open space or as a landscape feature on the final subdivision map prior to filing the final map. A qualified archaeologist would accurately locate PA-88--32 so as to precisely represent the building setback; **MM CULT-3** would require the developer to protect Site PA-88-80 and Site PA-88-32 from all construction activities by installing a drip-line fence along the southern boundary of Site PA88-80 and around Site PA-88-32 to avoid inadvertent damage to either site or feature. A qualified archaeologist would accurately locate PA-88-80 PA-88--32 to assure the protect of the sites or features; and **MM-CULT-4** requires the developer to place a plaque or monument in a conspicuous location with a brief description of the site’s original owner.

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

- (b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as “two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project would not result in cumulative impacts.
- (c) The project would not result in significant environmental effects on humans in the project vicinity. As discussed in the Air Quality, Noise, and Hazardous Materials Sections above, no significant effects would occur. It has been determined that the impact would be less than significant.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

#### **Additional References:**

Air Quality Analysis for the Porter Property Residential Development Proposed for Cameron Park  
Rimpo and Associates, (February 10, 2007)

Traffic Impact Analysis – The Porter Property  
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (November 13, 2006)

Cultural resources Study of the Proposed Porter Subdivision  
Historic Resource Associates (November 2005)

Jurisdictional Delineation Report Porter Property  
Gibson & Skordall, LLC (January 2008)

Drainage Study for Porter Property  
CTA Engineering & Surveying (November 2006)

Gregory E. Porter Property Project Site Initial Arborist Report  
Sierra Nevada Arborist (August 2006)

Biological Resources Assessment 32.82-Acre Porter Property  
Foothills Associate (August 2006)