



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: S07-0022/Placerville S.D.A Multi-purpose Building

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

Contact Person: Aaron Mount

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Northern California Conference Association of Seventh Day Adventists, 6831 Mother Load Drive, Placerville, CA 95682
John C. Mackay, PO Box 6314, Auburn, CA 95604

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Northern California Conference Association of Seventh Day Adventists, 6831 Mother Load Drive, Placerville, CA 95682

Project Agent's Name and Address: Lebeck Young Engineering, Inc., 3430 Robin Lane Bldg. #2, Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Lebeck Young Engineering, Inc., 3430 Robin Lane Bldg. #2, Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Location: North side of Mother Load Drive approximately 400 feet south west of the intersection with Missouri Flat Road in the Placerville area.

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 327-140-52 & 327-140-53 (18.13 total acres)

Zoning: One-Acre Residential (R1A)

Section: 23 **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Description of Project: Special use permit request for an expansion of an existing church. Proposed are a 12,900 square foot multi-purpose building, additional parking, and relocation of the secondary access. The site currently utilizes a septic system for sewage disposal but is requesting a connection to a public sewer system in lieu of a 300 percent replacement area. Two alternatives have been given for off-site access to existing sewer lines. The site is supplied by public water and the applicant proposes to increase the size of the line which is accessed on the subject site. The project parcels contain an approximately five acre pond and development will occur within 15 feet of the high water mark. Tree removal and grading is proposed for a future parking area.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	R1A	MDR	Church, single family residences associated with the church
North:	TC/C	C	U.S. Highway 50, Regional Shopping Center
East:	R1A	MDR	Single family residences
South:	R1A	MDR	Single family residences
West:	R1A	MDR	Single family residences

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The subject site is approximately 1,800 feet above mean sea level in the Placerville, Ca area. The subject site is directly adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 on the northern boundary. Physical features include an approximately five acre pond and the four communities exist on the site; ruderal

grassland, remnant foothill woodland, pond, and urban landscape. The five acre pond is the headwaters of Mount Springs Creek. Improvements include two residences, a 6,000 square foot sanctuary, 11,376 square feet of meeting, classrooms, and offices, and 2,400 square foot storage shed. Most of the native oaks exist on the southern and western portions of the site and include the following species; blue oak, interior live oak, and valley oak.

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

El Dorado County Department of Transportation
El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management
El Dorado County Department of Development Services
California Department of Fish and Game
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
X	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	X	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: Aaron Mount For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

(a & b)

The project is not located within a designated scenic vista. Development of the 12,900 square foot multi-purpose building would be visible from U.S. Highway 50, however the proposed development would be characteristic of the surrounding developments and would not be located on a portion of U.S. Highway 50 which is designated as a scenic highway. There would a less than significant impact.

c) The proposed project would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The surrounding area has been substantially developed with residential and commercial uses. The project would not introduce residential or commercial development that is out of character with the surrounding existing development. The proposed development is consistent with other structures on the site which has been a church sine the 1970's. There would be a less than significant impact.

d) Some limited light and glare may result from the additional structure and parking. All outdoor lighting shall conform to Section 17.14.170 of the County Code and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) full cut-off designation so as to minimize impacts from glare to less than significant. The lighting would have no impact on nighttime views in the area as it has been determined that no scenic views exist from the site that would affect the views at night. The project would include outdoor parking lighting which would be required to be downward facing and shielded to prevent additional sources of glare. The project would be conditioned to demonstrate that all proposed lighting conforms to the Zoning Ordinance standards for outdoor lighting. Therefore, the impacts of light and glare from this proposed project would be less than significant.

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

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

a) El Dorado County has established the Agricultural District (-A) General Plan land use overlay designation and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural District (-A) General Plan land use overlay designation adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. There would be no impacts.

b & c) The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed request. There would be no impacts.

Finding: No impacts to agricultural land would occur and no mitigation is required. For this “Agriculture” category, there would be no impacts.

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	

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b, c) Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone. Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM10) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to meet the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

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

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

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

Mobile emission sources such as automobiles, trucks, buses, and other internal combustion vehicles are responsible for more than 70 percent of the air pollution within the County, and more than one-half of California’s air pollution. In addition to pollution generated by mobile emissions sources, additional vehicle emission pollutants are carried into the western slope portion of El Dorado County from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area by prevailing winds.

A *Final Air Quality Analysis for the 7th Day Adventist Church Project* (EN2 Resources, May 16, 2007) concluded that there would be no significant impacts related to air quality with incorporation of standard conditions of approval from responsible agencies. Further, the analysis stated that Project impacts would not be cumulatively significant, since the proposed project would comply with Air Quality Management District rules and regulations, and is consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan. In addition, the proposed project construction and operation activities would be consistent with the Sacramento Regional Ozone Air Quality Attainment Plan for ROG and NOx emissions, and would not have significant cumulative impact with respect to ozone. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, daycare centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. General Plan Policy 6.7.6.1 requires that the County ensure that new facilities in which sensitive receptors are located (e.g., schools, child care centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, and hospitals) are sited away from significant sources of air pollution. It has been determined that impacts from the project would be less than significant.
- e) The existing and proposed church uses do not, under normal circumstances, create any excessive objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, no significant impacts on air quality would occur and no mitigation is required. For this “Air Quality” category, impacts would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <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			X	

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X	
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?		X	

Discussion:

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

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

a) A biological site assessment was performed by North Fork Associates, dated September 5, 2007 that included the results of a survey of the parcel for the special status and locally significant flora and fauna and suitable habitat for the same. Site visits were performed and no special-status species were found on the site however potential habitat at the project site exists for several special status species. The development of the multi-purpose building and associated parking would have a potential impact on the habitat of the California red-legged frog, northwestern pond turtle, tricolored blackbird, and nesting raptors

1. *[MM Bio1]. Previous focused surveys for California red-legged frog (CRLF) conducted both on and off-site, in association with other proposed development projects, yielded no sightings of CRLF within the project region. Although occurrence of CRLF within the project site is considered to be highly unlikely due to the absence of sightings within the project region, the pond may provide marginal-quality habitat for the species. All disturbance of potential habitat for CRLF, including the pond and adjacent vegetation should therefore be avoided to the extent feasible. In the event that disturbance of aquatic habitat of the project site cannot be avoided, a California Red-legged Frog Habitat Assessment (USFWS 2005) should be prepared and submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Sacramento Field Office. The applicant should then contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine if follow-up surveys and avoidance measures are required.*

Monitoring: *The California Red-legged Frog Habitat Assessment shall be submitted to Planning Services staff with recommendations prior to issuance of the grading permit*

2. *[MM Bio 2]. Potential habitat for northwestern pond turtle occurs in association with the large pond located in the central portion of the site. All disturbance of suitable habitat for northwestern pond turtle, including the pond and adjacent upland vegetation, should be avoided to the extent feasible. If it is determined that some disturbance of on-site aquatic habitats or adjacent vegetation will be required as*

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

part of the project, a preconstruction survey should be conducted to determine if areas proposed for disturbance are occupied by turtles at that time. In the event that turtles are found, the applicant should immediately contact CDFG to determine appropriate protective measures for pond turtles and mitigation responsibilities.

Monitoring: The Northwestern pond turtle survey shall be submitted to Planning Services staff with recommendations prior to issuance of the grading permit

3. **[MM Bio3].** The project site provides some limited nesting and foraging opportunities for Cooper’s hawk. Implementation of the proposed project could therefore result in disturbance of breeding and nesting of Cooper’s hawk if construction occurs at any time during the typical breeding season for the species (approximately March 1 through August 31). Nesting of other raptors known from the region, including red-shouldered hawk and great horned owl, could also be adversely affected if construction takes place during the identified breeding/nesting season. Take of any active raptor nest is prohibited under Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5. To avoid take of active raptor nests, preconstruction surveys should be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of proposed development activities. Survey results should then be submitted to CDFG. If active raptor nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the site, consultation should be initiated with CDFG to determine appropriate avoidance measures.

Monitoring: The nesting survey shall be submitted to Planning Services staff with recommendations prior to issuance of the grading permit.

4. **[MM Bio4.** Potential nesting habitat for tri-colored blackbird occurs within the project site, and consists primarily of blackberry thickets, and other dense vegetation located in the vicinity of the pond. Depending on the timing of construction, site disturbance could result in disturbance of breeding and nesting activity of this species. According to the California Department of Fish and Game Code 3503, “take” of the nest or eggs of any bird is prohibited, except upon approval from CDFG. Disturbance of active nests can be avoided during construction through appropriate measures. To the extent feasible avoid ground disturbance and removal of vegetation in the vicinity of the pond during the typical breeding and nesting period for this species (approximately April through July). If construction activities cannot be avoided during the typical breeding season, retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey (approximately 1 week prior to construction) to determine presence/absence of active nesting colonies. If no nesting activities are detected within proposed work areas, construction activities may proceed. If, however, active nests are found, construction should be avoided until after the young have fledged from the nest and achieved independence, or upon approval from CDFG.

Monitoring: The nesting survey shall be submitted to Planning Services staff with recommendations prior to issuance of the grading permit.

- b, c) **Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.** The site supports potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. These areas are likely regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), California Department of Fish and Game, and the El Dorado County General Plan. As stated in Policy 7.3.3.4 of the General Plan, El Dorado County requires a 100-foot setback from all perennial streams, rivers, and lakes and a 50-foot setback from all intermittent streams and wetlands (El Dorado County 2004). The subject site is in the South Fork American river watershed. The pond on the property, approximately 5 acres, is in the upper headwaters of Mound Springs creek. Water from the site eventually reaches Weber Creek, which is a tributary of the South Fork American River just upstream from Folsom Lake. The project is proposing a reduction in the 50-foot setback from all intermittent streams and wetlands to 15 feet. Retaining walls would be within

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

15 feet of the high water mark and the proposed multi-purpose building would be 52 feet from the high water mark. The proposed project is consistent in that implementation of the mitigation measures provided would reduce or eliminate indirect impacts resulting from an alternative setback. However, the authorized buffer from development activities would ultimately be decided during CEQA review and any wetland permitting that may be necessary for the project.

The applicants submitted as part of the biological report a wetland delineation following guidelines in the El Dorado County General Plan. A wetland delineation has been submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Corps has responded that waters of the United States may potentially be impacted. Proposed development has the potential impacting the approximately 5 acre pond and two ephemeral streams. The required adherence to Best Management Practices by the grading permit requirements would cover potential erosion issues during the grading permit outside of the wetland features. However, in order to assure that wetland impacts are mitigated to a level that is less than significant, the following mitigation measures are recommended in order to bring potential impacts to wetland features to a less than significant level for all potential infrastructure improvements that would occur with this proposal:

5. *[MM Bio 5]. Prior to disturbance of any waters of the United States including any wetland features, a wetland delineation study for the project site shall be submitted to the Corps for their verification and approval. If fill of any potential waters of the U.S are anticipated, the appropriate Corps 404 permit must be obtained prior to the fill activity occurring. The appropriate terms of mitigation including the wetland acreage to be mitigated for would be defined in the issued Corps permit. Any waters of the U.S. that would be lost or disturbed should be replaced or rehabilitated at a “no-net-loss” basis in accordance with the Corps’ mitigation guidelines. Habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement should be at a location and by methods agreeable to the Corps. A total of 4.22 acres of waters of the United States, including wetlands, are present within the survey area. Wetland mitigation for this project shall be required. Mitigation may include the purchase of mitigation credits from an approved wetland mitigation bank at an appropriate ratio for each acre of wetland /waters proposed to be impacted as determined by the Corps of Engineers.*

Monitoring: *The applicant shall provide a copy of the approved 404 permit and Corps of Engineer’s approved mitigation purchase documentation of mitigation credits, if required, to Planning Services prior to issuance of the grading permit. If no permits are required by the Corps, a letter from the Corps shall be provided to Planning Services stating that no permit shall be required for this project prior to issuance of any grading permits.*

6. *[MM Bio 6]. A Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from California Department of Fish and Game, if applicable, pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code, for each stream crossing and any other activities affecting the bed, bank, or associated riparian vegetation of any stream on the site. Appropriate mitigation measures would be developed in coordination with California Department of Fish and Game in the context of the 1602 agreement process. Authorization prior to placement of any fill is required from the Corps of Engineers if any impacts are proposed to jurisdictional riparian habitat. This authorization may require mitigation as deemed necessary by the Corps of Engineers.*

Monitoring: *The applicant shall provide a copy of the approved 1602 permit, if required, to Planning Services prior to issuance of the grading permit. If no permits are required by the California Department of Fish and Game, a letter from Fish and Game shall be provided to Planning Services stating that no permit shall be required for this project prior to issuance of any grading permits.*

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

There is the potential that construction activities associated with the development of this project may indirectly impact the potential waters of the U.S. that occur onsite from runoff during construction. If indirect impacts have the potential to occur during construction activities, additional measures may be required to maintain water quality standards of the waterways. The following mitigation measures are to be implemented in order to reduce the impacts to potential waters of the U.S to a less than significant level:

7. **[MM Bio 7]. Water Quality:** *The applicant shall determine if a 404 permit is required for the proposed project, water quality concerns during construction would be addressed in a required Section 401 water quality certification by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) would be required during construction activities in conjunction with the 401 water quality certification. SWPPPs are required in issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction discharge permit by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction is standard in most SWPPPs and water quality certifications. Examples of BMPs include stockpiling of debris away from regulated wetlands and waterways; immediate removal of debris piles from the site during the rainy season; use of silt fencing and construction fencing around regulated waterways; use of drip pans under work vehicles; and containment of fuel waste throughout the site during construction.*

Monitoring: *The applicant shall provide a copy of the approved 401 permit, if required, to Planning Services prior to issuance of the grading permit. If no permits are required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, a letter from Regional Water Quality Control Board shall be provided to Planning Services stating that no permit shall be required for this project prior to issuance of any grading permits.*

In addition to the mitigations, the County requires that pre- and post construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) be implemented into the design of grading and improvement plans to reduce or eliminate run-off. Such BMPs would be required to meet the County’s Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SWMP), the state’s Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Program (SWPPP) criteria, and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) standards. As conditioned, mitigated and with strict adherence to applicable County Code, impacts in this category would be reduced below a level of significant.

- d. Review of the Department of Fish and Game’s *Migratory Deer Herd Maps* indicate the project site does not lie within the range of a deer herd. Based on that fact, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on deer migration patterns.
- e) The subject parcel is within the blue oak – foothill pine habitat types. (El Dorado County General Plan EIR, 5.12-7, May 2003). Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes the native oak tree canopy retention and replacement standards and requires that 85 percent of the existing oak tree canopy coverage for the 18 acre project area be retained as a result of the Tree Canopy Exhibit map, dated September 5, 2007 which reported 29 percent oak canopy coverage. The report estimated that approximately 0.8 acres of oak canopy would potentially be removed as part of this project proposal which is approximately 15 percent of the canopy and thus would meet the General Plan retention standards.

The applicants have the choice of Options A or B of Policy 7.4.4.4 at a one to one ratio to mitigate the impacts of the tree canopy removed. With the adoption of a condition of approval for this replacement of canopy or payment of fees the project would be compliant with Policy 7.4.4.4. As conditioned and with strict adherence to applicable County Code and the Oak woodland Management Plan, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

- f) The project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted or approved habitat conservation plan. There would be a less than significant impact.

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

Finding: As discussed above, as conditioned, mitigated and with strict adherence to applicable County Code, the impacts to biological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-d) A *Cultural Resources Assessment of the Seventh Day Adventist Church Property* was completed for the project site, (Peak and Associates, Inc., Robert A. Gerry, May 17, 2007) which reported there were no significant prehistoric and historic-period cultural resources sites, artifacts, historic buildings, structures or objects found. Because of the possibility in the future that ground disturbances could turn up significant cultural resources anywhere in the County, the following would be added as conditions to address any potential future discovery:

During all grading and construction activities in the project area on the proposed parcels, an archaeologist or Historian approved by the Development Services Director shall be on-call. In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent and/or future parcel owner shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until the on-call archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. If the find is determined to be significant and authenticated, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item. Grading and construction activities may resume after appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance

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

In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit, to ensure that this notation has been placed on the grading plans.

There is no known unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features on the site or in the vicinity. There would be a less than significant impact.

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			
iv) Landslides?			
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 groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
 - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive. (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001). There would be no impacts.
- b, c) Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil: All grading activities exceeding 50 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During the proposed site grading and construction of foundations and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions and that is addressed by grading permits. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) Expansive soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the project site contains the following soil types: Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD) (28%) – 2 to 30 percent slopes, Boomer gravelly loam (BhC) (32%) – 3 to 15 percent slopes, Boomer very rocky loam (BkE) (32%) – 30 to 50 percent slopes, Boomer very rocky loam (BkD) (8%) – 3 to 30 percent slopes. All soil types on the project site have low shrink swell potential. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high and each building permit would include engineered plans addressing the soil capabilities. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) *A REPORT OF PERCOLATION TEST FOR 7TH DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH* was performed by Wheeldon Geology dated May 21, 2007. The onsite sewage disposal feasibility report was reviewed by El Dorado County Environmental Health Division staff and they determined that the information submitted is acceptable for a septic system construction permit. The septic system design designates EID public sewer for the 300 percent replacement area. In the event of a septic system failure all structures with plumbing on this property shall connect to a public

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

sewer system. The agent has submitted two proposals for off-site public sewer connection which are discussed in the utilities section. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;

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

- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
 - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a, b) **Hazardous Substances:** The project being considered is for a church expansion and would not directly involve introducing a scenario that would introduce the routine use, transport, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Hazardous Emissions:** The proposed applications would not directly allow any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. Any future development proposal would be evaluated through a revision to this special use permit. There would be no direct impact.
- d) **Hazardous Materials Sites:** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List). No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the subject site are known to have occurred. There would be no impact.
- e) **Public Airport Hazards:** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.
- f) **Private Airstrip Hazards:** There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impact.
- g) **Emergency Response Plan:** The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and provided comments and conditions. Compliance with the provided comments incorporated into the approved plan would possible impacts to a less than significant level.
- h) **Fire Hazards:** The subject site is not in an area that meets the CEQA definition of urban, but in context of the county would be considered an urban or built up area. As the project site was previously developed there would be no impact from development within an urban and wild land interface area. The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and provided comments and conditions related to consistency with fire safe regulations. There would be a less than significant impact.

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or

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

- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

a&c-f) The applicant submitted a *Preliminary Drainage Report for 7th Day Adventist Church* dated January 17, 2007 and was completed by the project engineer. The report states the following:

The site contains an existing church building, office, storage building, storage sheds, parking areas, driveway to the west, and existing care-takers residences. The church is proposed to add a new 12,900 square foot footprint multi-purpose building adjacent to the existing church building and make minor revisions to their existing parking lots. The proposed multi-purpose building would be constructed over a portion of the existing parking area, so there should be little increase in impervious surfaces for this addition to the site and little or no increase in peak flows are anticipated. Drainage originates on or above the project site and drains from the east, south, and northeast, through the site, and into an existing large pond (4.3 acres surface area at 100 year water surface elevation) located on the subject property. Once the drainage exits the pond, it flows into an existing ditch, then crosses U.S. Highway 50, then flows in a northwest direction into Mound Springs Creek.

The drainage for the site was analyzed using methodology as discussed in the El Dorado County Drainage Manual, adopted March 15, 1995. The report concludes that the proposed multi-purpose building and parking area revisions will cause a minimal increase in impervious surface areas, 0.5 acres. However, this number is so small that it produces no increase in the peak discharge into the pond. Further, the large existing pond on the property acts as a detention pond and would reduce any peak flows that would be produced on this site from future development.

As discussed in the ‘Biological Resources’ category above, the project would require Mitigation Measures to obtain appropriate permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Fish and Game for the filling of any wetlands or altering of the drainages. Additionally, all project related construction activities would be required to adhere to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would require Best Management Practices (BMP’s) to minimize degradation of water quality during construction. Impacts would be less than significant. There would be a less than significant impact

- b) Groundwater: Potable water is currently supplied by connection to a public water supply. El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are defined within El Dorado County. There would be no impact.
- g, h, i) Flooding: No portion of the project is within the limits of the floodplain, as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate map. Therefore, no flooding impacts are expected. There would be no impacts.
- j) Inundation: A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a water body. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. There would be no potential impact from mudflow because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a dam or other water body.

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

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

IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Physically divide an established community?	[Grey]	[White]	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?	[Grey]	[White]	X
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	[Grey]	[White]	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. **Established Community.** The project site is located within the El Dorado/ Diamond Springs Community Region. The project site is located an area developed with residential and commercial uses. The proposed church expansion development would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and existing development in the area. There would be no impact.
- b. **Land Use Plan.** The project Land Use Designation is medium Density Residential (MDR). The existing and proposed uses are specifically allowed by Special Use Permit in the R1A zone district which is consistent with the MDR land use designation. The proposed use would not conflict with the adopted General Plan land use designation. The applicant has designed the project in compliance with County regulations, addressing aesthetics and health and safety concerns. There would be no impact.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plans. There would be no impact.

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & b. Mineral Resources. The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present. There are no MRZ-2-classified areas within or adjacent to the project site, and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect proposed uses or be affected by project development. There would be no impact.

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-c) The project is 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 provided as part of the project application submittal. An *Environmental Noise Analysis, 7th Day Adventist Church* was prepared by Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc. and is dated April 24, 2007.

The dominant ambient noise sources at the project site are traffic on US50 and traffic on Mother Lode Drive. The noise environment at the project site varies as a function of proximity to US 50 and Mother Lode Drive. At the north side of the project site, noise from traffic on US50 is dominant. On the south side of the project site, noise from traffic on US50 is ever-present, but truck traffic on Mother Lode Drive makes a significant contribution during daytime hours. BBA performed continuous noise measurements over a 5-day period on the project site on April 17-21, 2007, at the site shown by Figure 1. This site was about 800 feet from the centerline of US50.

Traffic Noise: The project includes a multi-purpose building located about 500 feet from the centerline of US50. Based upon the long-term noise measurement data, and accounting for the decreased distance to the highway centerline, the existing US50 traffic noise level at the proposed building is about 55 to 57 dB Ldn. This traffic noise exposure is below the El Dorado County 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level criterion for churches. As a result, no noise mitigation measures would be required for the multi-purpose building.

Parking Lot Noise: At the nearest residences, the noise environment will continue to be dominated by traffic on US50 and Mother Lode Drive. Parking lot noise issues could arise before and after well attended church services, or when events occur at the multi-purpose building that involve large numbers of guests. Assuming that the parking lot noise measurement results cited above could be applied directly to the proposed parking lot, the predicted hourly average noise level when the parking lot would be used would be about 51 dB Leq at the nearest residence. This noise level would satisfy the County daytime noise standard, but would exceed the evening standard by 1 dB. In reality, the average noise level measured on April 21, 2007 was due to traffic on US50 and Mother Lode Drive, rather than parking lot movements. Assuming about 180 parking places in the proposed parking lot, and assuming that as many as 50% of all cars using the lot passed by the south property boundary in one hour, the predicted hourly average noise level at the property boundary during that one hour would be about 54 dB Leq. This could occur twice per event or twice per day at times when the church is heavily attended. Assuming that an event occurred so that the parking lot traffic arrived and departed over a 4-hour period, the average hourly noise level over the entire period would be 48 dB Leq. The anticipated use of the proposed parking lot is likely to be in the range of once per week for church services, and once or twice a week for multi-purpose building events, such as meetings or wedding receptions. Not all of those events would require use of the proposed parking lot. Given the likely frequency of use of the proposed parking lot, the noise impact at the nearest residence is expected to be less than significant.

Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- d) Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the parcel vicinity. For this project, most of the construction activity would occur about 200 feet from the nearest residences. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. Noises associated with residential uses are not anticipated to increase ambient noise levels. The creation of the four lots would require road improvements which would have a less than significant impact.
- e) General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including churches, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a County owned/operated airport facility. There would be no impacts.
- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. There would be no impact.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
 - Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
 - Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.
- a) The proposed church expansion project would not induce growth directly or indirectly by providing infrastructure that would create development beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. The development area is designated on the 2004 General Plan Land Use Map for Medium Density Residential development. The impacts would be less than significant.
 - b, c) The proposed church expansion would not displace people or existing housing, which would prevent the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There would be no impact.

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

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

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. <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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other government services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

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

a) Fire Protection. The El Dorado/Diamond Springs Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. However, it has been determined by the Fire Department that the level of service would not fall below the minimum requirements, as a result of the project. The Fire Department would review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards including but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking lots, fire sprinklers within buildings, and building identification. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. Further, the project site would be conditioned to annex into a Community Facilities District established by the Fire District under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District. Impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant.

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

- b) Police Protection. The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time of 8 minutes to 80% of the population located in the Community Regions. For the rural areas, there is no standard minimum level of service or response time. The project site is located within the El Dorado/Diamond Springs Community Region. The addition of the proposed development would not significantly impact current responses times to the project area.
- c) Schools. The state allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/ industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project site is located within the Mother Load Union School District. No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d) Parks. The commercial development would not be required to pay park in-lieu fees. There would be no impact.
- e) Public Facilities. No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. Adequate emergency services and public utility services are available to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a&b) Capacity and Level of Service. An *Initial Traffic Assessment for 7th Day Adventist Church Expansion on Mother Lode Drive, El Dorado County* was prepared by KD Anderson and Associates, dated March 19, 2007. The assessment concluded that because the daily trip generation estimate exceeds the adopted minimum, a traffic study could be required by the County. However, because the amount of traffic generated by the church is so small, a conclusion of no significant impact could be drawn from review of available traffic data from other studies.

El Dorado County Department of Transportation concluded that the existing church is expanding the accessory uses with the proposed development. The seating capacity of the main sanctuary would not be increased. Additionally, existing uses within the existing structures would be relocated into the proposed development. Therefore, this project will not trip the threshold of the General Plan requirement for completion of a Traffic Study. Mother Lode Drive is a county roadway. Upon construction of the required road improvements and payment of TIM fees, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- c) Air Traffic Patterns. The project is not located within the one-mile of any public or private airports. There would be no impact.
- d) Hazards. The project is proposing to realign an encroachment and access driveway to the subject site. The proposed roadway improvements would be consistent with the County Design and Improvement Manual. The proposed access roadways and on-site improvements would not result in any hazards to traffic circulation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Emergency Access. The project would include two points of access onto Mother Lode Drive. The El Dorado/Diamond Springs Fire Department reviewed the proposed circulation plan and determined that adequate emergency access would be provided. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) Parking. Parking requirements for a church are based on the seats within the main assembly area at a ratio of one parking space per four seats. The main assembly area contains approximately 350 seats so 88 parking spaces would be required. The site currently contains 127 parking spaces and proposes to add an additional 64 spaces. The project would comply with local parking requirements. There would be no impact.
- g) Alternative Transportation. The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The El Dorado County Transit Authority reviewed the proposal and had no comments. No bus turnouts would be required for this tentative map. The project would not result in the removal of a bikeway/bike lane or prohibition of implantation of the facilities identified in the plan. There would be no impact.

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

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

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

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
project's solid waste disposal needs?			
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		X	

Discussion:

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
 - Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
 - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
 - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a) The preliminary drainage study prepared for this project identifies that this project would have a minor increase in discharge of water runoff to the Weber Creek watershed north of the project site. The study did not identify any downstream effects based on these results. By implementing pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) and tying into existing drainage points there will be a less than significant impact within this category.
- b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required because of the project based on a letter received from the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) dated April 5, 2007. There is an existing 21-inch water line in the south west portion of the project site which the project will tie into. The project proposes to use an on-site septic system for the proposed expansion however, in lieu of a 300 percent replacement are the project proposes to connect to a public sewer system. EID has also indicated that there is adequate sewer capacity to serve the project, and the project can tie into an 8-inch sewer line located on the north side of Highway 50 or a 6-inch sewer line located in Missouri Flat road. EID stated in their letter that at this time, the District has concerns about owning and maintaining a sewer line under Highway 50 that will serve only one customer. All of the improvements necessary to connect the water line and those that are necessary to connect the project to the sewer system have been accounted for in the environmental review of this project. There would be no significant impacts related to implementation of these improvements, as biological impacts associated with grading and tree removal have already been discussed in the Biological Resources Section IV.
- c) On-site storm water drainage facilities will be installed and maintained on this property in order to control, reduce, and/or eliminate run-off from this development. All storm water drainage facilities shall be designed to meet the County of El Dorado Drainage Manual standards and will be installed to reduce discharge levels to County, state, and federal standards. There will be a less than significant level of impact in this category.
- d) El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) identified that there are 2285 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of water available in the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region. The EID has determined that the project would require two additional EDUs, and that there is adequate water capacity to serve the project. The project will connect to the 21-inch water line in the project site. The fire flow will provide the minimum 2500 gallons per minute for a period of two hours at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) to meet fire flow requirements. This water line extension would be able to provide the necessary water

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

pressure for the fire suppression system and hydrants that will be installed for this development. This project would draw potable water from that water line, as well. All related improvements, impacts, and mitigation have been considered within this study. There will be a less than significant level of impact with this project.

- e) The project proposes to use an on-site septic system for the proposed expansion however, in lieu of a 300 percent replacement are the project proposes to connect to a public sewer system. The El Dorado Irrigation District has identified available capacity for wastewater disposal and treatment and the project can tie into an 8-inch sewer line located on the north side of Highway 50 or a 6-inch sewer line located in Missouri Flat road. EID stated in their letter that at this time, the District has concerns about owning and maintaining a sewer line under Highway 50 that will serve only one customer. All of the improvements necessary to connect the water line and those that are necessary to connect the project to the sewer system have been accounted for in the environmental review of this project. There would be no significant impacts related to implementation of these improvements, as biological impacts associated with grading and tree removal have already been discussed in the Biological Resources Section IV
- f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

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

- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the project site would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Solid waste collection and disposal within California is subject to the provisions of the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This legislation mandates a 50 percent diversion from the solid waste stream going to landfills by 2000. According to the most recent information available from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (2005), unincorporated El Dorado County currently meets the 50 percent diversion rate. The solid waste collection service provided to the project site includes a recycling program, which would ensure continued compliance with state diversion requirements. The impacts would be less than significant.

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.

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

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

Discussion:

- a) Without mitigation, there is a potential that this project will degrade the quality of the environment by impacting biological resources such as wetlands and species of concern. This also accounts for the impacts that would be required for improvements on and off- the project site, to include improvements that are necessary for road, drainage, water and sewer connections. Based on the mitigation outlined for this project, there is protection of wetlands and species of concern that may have suitable habitat on the project site. Refer to Biological Resources Category IV for specific mitigation. Other environmental elements referenced within this section will not be affected and the impacts within this category will remain below a level of significance, as a result.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the 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, as conditioned and mitigated, would not result in cumulative impacts.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts in this category will be less than significant.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

Project Specific Documents

Biological Resource Assessment for the 18-Acre Seventh Day Adventist Church, North Fork Associates, September 5, 2007.

Cultural Resources Assessment of the Seventh Day Adventist Church Property, Peak and Associates, May 17, 2007.

Environmental Noise Analysis, Seventh Day Adventist Church, Brown-Buntin Associates, April 24, 2007.

Final Air Quality Analysis for the Seventh Day Adventist Church Project, EN2 Resources, May 16, 2007.

Initial Traffic Assessment For Seventh Day Adventist Church Expansion on Mother Lode Drive, KD Anderson and Associates, March 19, 2007.

Preliminary Drainage Report for Seventh Day Adventist Church, Lebeck Young, January 17, 2007.

Report of Percolation Test for Seventh Day Adventist Church, Wheeldon Geology, May 21, 2007.

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

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

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.)