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

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

**Project Title:** Indian Creek Ranch Subdivision (Rezone Z08-0021, Planned Development PD 08-0012, Tract Map TM 08-1472)

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

**Contact Person:** Gordon Bell | **Phone Number:** (530) 647-1932

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Echo Lane Investors LLC, P.O. Box 630, El Dorado, CA 95623

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** Cynthia Shaffer, Echo Lane Investors, P.O. Box 630, El Dorado, CA 95623

**Project Agent's Name and Address:** Carlton Engineering, 3883 Ponderosa Road, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Carlton Engineering (see above address)**

**Project Location:** North side of Echo Lane approximately 2000 feet west of its intersection with El Dorado Road, Placerville area, Third & Fourth Supervisorial Districts

**Assessor's Parcel Number(s):** 327-050-02, 327-060-03, -04, -07 & -08, 327-070-55 & -56, 327-080-04, and 327-020-10 (182.83 acres)

**Zoning:** R3A (Residential 3-acre minimum) & A (Agriculture)

**Section:** 22 **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

**General Plan Designation:** LDR (Low Density Residential) & MDR (Medium Density Residential)

**Description of Project:** The proposed project consists of the following requests:

1. Rezone from R3-A (Residential 3-acre minimum) and A (Agriculture) to RE-5-PD (Estate Residential 5-acre planned development) and R3-A-PD (Single-family 3-acre planned development)
2. Request for Tentative Subdivision Map to create seventy-five (75) single family residential lots ranging in size from 1.00 to 5.02 acres, eleven (11) open space lots and one (1) remainder lot. The Tentative Subdivision Map would be phased, occurring in seven (7) phases.
3. Request for a Design Waiver to allow proposed Road "A" to conform to modified standard 101B, 28' wide pavement with 2' shoulders on either side and a 20' wide pavement with 2' shoulders across the dam width.
4. Request for a Design Waiver to allow for Echo Lane to conform to modified standard 101B, 28' wide pavement with 2' shoulders on either side where such improvements are feasible. Where such improvements are not feasible the applicant requests that the road remain the same as existing width 24'-28'.
5. Request for a Design Waiver to change the conditioned right-of-way requirement to a 40' wide right-of-way from the standard 50' wide right-of-way, for all onsite roads except Road "A" and Road "B".

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

| | Zoning | General Plan | Land Use (e.g., Single Family Residences) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Site: | R3A, A | LDR & MDR | Horse ranch, rural residences |
| North: | RE-5 | LDR | Rural residence |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| East: | R3A, R1A | MDR | Rural residence |
| South: | RE-5, R1A, TC | LDR, MDR, C | Rural residence, vacant land |
| West: | A, RE-5 | LDR | Rural residences |

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: Indian Creek Ranch is located just west of the City of Placerville on the north side of Echo Lane approximately 2,000 feet west of its intersection with El Dorado Road, north of Highway 50 in El Dorado County. The physical majority of the project is located north of Echo Lane, with a remainder parcel located on the south side. The southwest portion of the project contains extensive existing improvements, including a single family residence, guest residence, caretaker's residence, two mobile homes and detached garage, several large barns and storage buildings, fenced pastures, a riding arena, a tennis court, paved driveways and landscape areas. The project site has been historically utilized as a Quarter Horse Ranch operation. The remainder of the parcel is undeveloped.

Project terrain consists of gentle to moderate slopes divided by ephemeral swales, with elevations ranging from approximately 1,465 feet to 1,690 feet. Indian Creek bisects the site from southeast to northwest, with a single pond approximately 11 acres in size at elevation 1501 feet near the center of the main parcel. The pond is retained by a dam with a broad crested spillway which outlets into the continuation of Indian Creek.

There is a multitude of biological communities/areas on the 182.83-acre project site as identified by the biological report. These include the following: mixed oak woodland, California annual grassland, reservoirs, structures and landscaping, mixed willow riparian forest, Chamise chaparral, seasonal wetlands, creek channels, Indian Creek, reservoir spillway, broad-leafed cattail wetland, and a seep.

Soils onsite are developed upon weathered rock formations which are part of the mother lode belt Logtown Ridge Formation rocks. Logtown Ridge Formation rocks comprise the mother lode belt unit, including metamorphosed, pyroclastic, volcaniclastic, and basic schist rocks. These rocks range in color from dark red to reddish brown and yellowish red, and can range from weak blocky, soft material to massive, dense material. There are five separate soil units which are mapped on the project area. These include Auburn silt loam (AwD), Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD), Auburn cobbly clay loam (AzE), Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam (DfC), Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam (DgE), and Placer Diggings (PrD).

Two cultural resource features have been identified onsite, one prehistoric feature and one historical feature.

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

1. El Dorado County Building Services: Grading permit and on site road improvements
2. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District: require an approved Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan for air quality impacts during project construction.
3. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Encroachment Permits for off-site road improvements
4. Diamond Springs -El Dorado County Fire Protection District: Approval of Fire Safe Plan

## 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 | **X** | Air Quality |
| **X** | Biological Resources | **X** | Cultural Resources | | Geology / Soils |
| | Hazards & Hazardous Materials | | Hydrology / Water Quality | **X** | Land Use / Planning |
| | Mineral Resources | **X** | Noise | | Population / Housing |
| | Public Services | | Recreation | **X** | 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.

**X** 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: November 6, 2008

Printed Name: Gordon Bell For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: November 6, 2008

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.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

| I. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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. **Scenic Vista.** The proposed project has the potential to result in the construction of additional residences, outbuildings and appurtenant structures on each of the proposed parcels. Development associated with the project would be located away from existing public roadways such as Echo Lane and El Dorado Road and shielded from surrounding parcels by existing tall trees. As such, the project would not have an impact on any scenic vistas in the area.

b. **Scenic Highways.** The closest designated scenic highway is Highway 50 from Placerville east to South Lake Tahoe. The project site is located approximately 5.75 miles west of the beginning of this scenic highway and would not be visible from any portion of Highway 50. As such, there would be no impact.

c. **Visual Character.** As discussed in (a), the project has the potential to introduce residences, and appurtenant structures on each of the proposed parcels. However, the type of development proposed, single-family dwellings nestled amongst the trees on low to medium density lots, is completely consistent with the character of surrounding development. Development which could occur along Sundance Trail, on existing parcel 327-020-10, would be consistent with development on other parcels along Sundance Trail, as this parcel would remain a 5-acre parcel similar to surrounding 5-acre parcels with single family residences. There would be no impact.

d. **Light and Glare.** Lighting associated with residential development on this site would create new sources of light and glare in an area that is currently undeveloped. However, roadways are not proposed to be illuminated by street lights, and lighting associated with rural residences on medium density lots would be consistent with lighting patterns in the surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, all outdoor lighting for future development would be required conform to Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding:** The proposed project has the potential to result in the construction of future residences and other structures on one to five-acre residential parcels. This development is entirely consistent with the character of surrounding low and medium density development and provides a transition between commercially-zoned property and medium-density residentially zoned property to the south and low-density residential to the north. Future building is not expected to impinge upon existing

scenic vistas, and no scenic resources exist within the project vicinity. Light and glare associated with construction of new residences in previously undeveloped areas is not expected to be significant and would be required to conform to zoning ordinance requirements. For this "Aesthetics" category, impacts would be less than significant.

| **II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.** *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** The proposed project would not convert any prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or locally important farmland to non-agricultural use. Soils onsite are considered subprime (Class IV and below) and are not considered suitable for cultivated agriculture. The El Dorado County Conservation District has reviewed the project and did not identify important Agricultural Preserves or Districts within the project area. There would be no impact.

b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The project site is not currently under Williamson Act Contract, nor would the site qualify for a contract under the Williamson Act, as soils onsite are less than prime, there are no agricultural support facilities in the area, and overall acreage is too small to support sustainable grazing. There would be no impact.

c. **Non-agricultural Use.** This project is located in an area designated for low-density residential use, and not agriculture. The El Dorado County Agricultural Commission reviewed the project on September 10, 2008 and did not have any objections regarding the rezoning of the agriculturally zoned land to medium density residential uses. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** No impacts to agricultural land are expected and no mitigation is required. The rezone, development plan, and tentative parcel map is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. For this "Agriculture" category, there would be no impact.

| III. AIR QUALITY. *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | | | **X** |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | **X** | | |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | **X** | | |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | **X** | |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and $No_x$, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of $PM_{10}$, CO, $SO_2$ 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. **Air Quality Plan.** The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

b,c. **Air Quality Standards.** Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone ($O_3$). 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.

There will be a significant amount of grading and excavation activities associated with proposed road development and building pad excavation (building pads would be graded individually as lots are sold). This has the potential to generate significant short-term dust-related impacts during these activities. However, adherence to EDCAPCD Fugitive Dust Emissions regulations would mitigate this impact to less than significant levels, as sensitive receptors are not immediately adjacent to proposed grading activities. In order to ensure that appropriate measures are applied to the grading activities associated with the project, mitigation requiring a Fugitive Dust Plan (FDP) to be submitted to the APCD is required.

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. Future grading would potentially emit minor, temporary and intermittent criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and would be subject to El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District standards at that time. Impacts would be less than significant with adherence to APCD Rules and Regulations.

**MM AQ-1:** A Fugitive Dust Plan (FDP) Application with appropriate fees shall be submitted to and approved by the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) with appropriate fees and approved by the APCD prior to start of project construction.

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning*

d. **Sensitive Receptors.** The El Dorado County AQMD has reviewed the project and sensitive receptors were not identified in the area and thus no such receptors would be affected by this project. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Odors.** Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide. The tentative map would have no impact onto the environment from odors.

**Finding:** In addition to the mitigation measure requiring submission of a Fugitive Dust Plan (FDP), standard County conditions of approval have been included as part of the project conditions of approval to maintain a less than significant level of impact in the 'Air Quality' category. Impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of these measures.

| **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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** | |

| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | | **X** | |
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | | | **X** |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | **X** | | |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities.** The applicant submitted several biological studies by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. that evaluate impacts to onsite biological resources. These studies include the following:

- *Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for the Indian Creek Ranch Project, El Dorado County, California*, May 23, 2008, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc.
- *Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation for the Indian Creek Ranch Project, El Dorado County, California*, May 22, 2008, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc.
- *Oak Canopy Analysis for the Indian Creek Ranch Project, El Dorado County, California*, May 27, 2008, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc.

As discussed in the environmental setting section of this document, the biological report identified a multitude of habitat types on the subject property. These include the following areas: mixed oak woodland, California annual grassland, reservoirs (wetlands), structures and landscaping (urban-type habitat), mixed willow riparian forest, Chamise chaparral, seasonal wetlands, creek channels, Indian Creek (wetlands), reservoir spillway (wetlands), broad-leafed cattail wetland, and a seep (wetlands).

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

Within these communities, the biological evaluation identified the following Special-Status wildlife species, Special-Status plants, and sensitive natural communities that exist or have the potential to exist on the subject property.

Special Status Wildlife Species

- Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*) – Not observed or known to exist onsite
- California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*) –Not observed or known to exist onsite
- Foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylii*) – Not observed or known to exist onsite
- Northwestern pond turtle (*Emys marmorata marmorata*) – Not observed onsite
- California horned lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum frontale*) –Not observed or known to exist onsite
- Tricolored blackbird (Agela*ius tricolor*) – Not observed onsite
- Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) – Not observed onsite
- Heron/Egret Rookery – Nesting habitat observed on site (to be avoided)
- Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) – Observed on project site

Special-Status Plants

- Jepson's onion (*Allium jepsonii*) – Not found or known to occur onsite
- Nissenan manzanita (Arctostaphylos missenana) – Not found or known to occur onsite
- Brandegee's clarkia (*Clarkia biloba* ssp. *brandegeeae*) - Not found or known to occur onsite
- Oval-leaved viburnum (*Viburnum ellipticum*) - Not found or known to occur onsite
- Parry's horkelia (*Horkelia parryi*) - Not found or known to occur onsite

Sensitive Natural Communities

- Central Valley Drainage Hardhead/Squawfish Stream – Indian Creek comprises 0l178 of potential Central Valley drainage hardhead stream on the subject property
- Oak Woodland – There are 129.14 of oak woodland on the project site
- Sacramento-San Joaquin Foothill/Valley Ephemeral Stream – Indian Creek comprises 0.178 acres of this natural community on the project site

The biological evaluation concludes that of the special-status species and sensitive natural communities listed above, there may be potential impacts to the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle, birds of prey and birds listed under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and to Oak Woodlands. These potential impacts are discussed below:

Valley-Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB): There are two elderberry shrubs at the site. Elderberry shrubs provide potential habitat for the federal-threatened VELB. The project site is not in designated critical habitat for the VELB. VELB occurs primarily in large riparian areas along perennial rivers and creeks, and does not disperse well from such areas. The elderberry shrubs are not in riparian areas. The nearest known VELB record, near Folsom Lake, is outside the dispersal range.

Elderberry shrubs are not a special-status species. No VELB exit holes, which indicate occupation of a shrub, were observed. VELB is not know to occur in the project area, and the project design avoids the shrubs. The project will not have a significant impact on the species because the shrubs are not occupied by the VELB.

Birds of Prey and Birds Listed Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MTBA): The project site provides potential nesting habitat for birds of prey and birds listed by the MTBA. A bird could establish a nest prior to road construction. A nesting tree for herons and egrets was identified on the project site, but is avoided by design. The nesting season is generally February 1 through August 31. An active nest is one which contains eggs or unfledged young. A potentially

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

significant impact would occur if an active nest was removed during road construction or if construction disturbance caused nest abandonment prior to fledging of the young birds. With incorporation of mitigation listed below, impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant.

Oak Woodland: The project site, which includes project parcels and easements required for infrastructure, encompasses approximately 176.07 acres. The existing oak canopy covers 52.3 percent of the project site, or 92.14 acres of the site. The biological consultants have evaluated potential impacts to this oak canopy based development due to road grading, site development on individual parcels (building envelopes, driveways, and septic leach fields), and creation of defensible space. Proposed oak canopy removal is characterized in Table 1 below:

**Table 1. Oak Canopy Impact Table**

| | **Retained Oak Canopy (Acres)** | **Oak Canopy Removed (Acres)** | **Cumulative Oak Canopy Removed (Acres)** | **Cumulative Healthy Oak Canopy Removed (Acres)** | **Cumulative Retention (%)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline Aerial (1 May 2006) | 92.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100% |
| Road Grading | 86.36 | 5.78 | 5.78 | 4.87 | 93.7% |
| Building Envelopes | 81.88 | 4.48 | 10.26 | 8.65 | 88.9% |
| Driveways | 81.59 | 0.29 | 10.55 | 8.89 | 88.6% |
| Septic Leach Fields | 81.06 | 0.53 | 11.08 | 9.34 | 88.0% |
| Defensible Space | 80.21 | 0.85 | 11.93 | 10.06 | 87.1% |

The proposed oak canopy impact analysis concludes that approximately 11.93 acres of oak woodland have the potential to be removed as a result of the project. This is considered a potentially significant impact, but can be mitigated with adherence to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. and measures contained in the adopted Oak Woodland Management Plan.

Mitigation measures associated with impacts to sensitive species are discussed below. With incorporation of this measure, impacts are considered to sensitive biological resources are considered less than significant.

**MM BIO-1:** If construction activities (for either road development or lot development) are scheduled to commence within the typical breeding season for a bird of prey or Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) bird (March 1through August 31), on-site pre-construction surveys for raptors and their nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. The biologist shall adhere to the following protocol:

- The biologist shall survey for active nests in the construction footprint and in accessible areas within 250 feet of the construction footprint within 30 days prior to construction. If no active nest of a bird of prey or MBTA bird is found, then no further mitigation is necessary.
- If an active nest of a bird of prey or MBTA bird is found, then the biologist shall flag a minimum 250-foot Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) around the nest if the nest is of a bird of prey, and a minimum 100-foot ESA around the nest if the nest is of an MBTA bird other than a bird of prey.
- No construction activity shall be allowed in the buffer until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or unless monitoring determines that a smaller buffer will protect the active

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

nest. The buffer may be reduced if the biologist monitors the construction activities and determines that no disturbance to the active nest is occurring. The size of suitable buffers depends upon the species of the bird, the location of the nest relative to the project, project activities during the time the nest is active, and other project specific conditions.

- If a nest becomes active after construction has started, then the bird is considered to be acclimated to construction activity, and no further mitigation is required.

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits the applicant shall include this measure as a note on all building plans and grading plans.*

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

b. **Riparian Habitat.** The "Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation for the Indian Creek Ranch Project" noted above identifies a number of water features throughout the project site. These water features are characterized in the Table below. Some of the features are grouped together for ease of characterization.

**Table 2. Onsite Water Features**

| Water Feature | Hydrology | Description | Riparian Features Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| Indian Creek | Perennial | Segment of Indian Creek between Reservoirs 1 & 2. The channel is scoured cobble and gravel. | Yes- Hydrophytic trees such as alder and willow |
| Reservoirs 1 and 2 | Perennial | Water impoundments. One dam is located on the project site, the other is located downstream | Yes- Aquatic vegetation surrounding impoundments |
| Channels 1-5 | Ephemeral | Ephemeral channels that drain into Reservoir 1, Channel 1 drains into the spillway for Reservoir 2 | No riparian vegetation observed |
| Channel 6 | Ephemeral | Ephemeral channel that begins at a culvert outfall and drains into Reservoir 2. Channel consists of scoured gravel and soil. | No riparian vegetation observed |
| Channel 7 | Intermittent | Intermittent channel that begins at a culvert outfall on the north side of Highway 50. This channel is located entirely on the remainder parcel where no development activity is proposed. | Yes – Riparian vegetation is observed on a small portion of the channel |
| Channel 8 | Ephemeral | Ephemeral channel that begins off-site and drains into Channel 7. This channel is located entirely on the remainder parcel where no development activity is proposed. | No riparian vegetation observed |
| Channels 9-10 | Ephemeral | Ephemeral channels that drain into channel 4. The channels consist of scoured soil and cobble. | No riparian vegetation observed |
| Channel 11 | Ephemeral | Ephemeral channel that drains into Channel 7. The channel consists of scoured soil and rock and destroyed terrestrial vegetation. | No riparian vegetation observed |
| Channel 12 | Ephemeral | Ephemeral channel that drains into Seasonal Wetland 1. The channel consist of scoured soil | No riparian vegetation observed |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | and destroyed terrestrial vegetation. | |

As described above, the only water features exhibiting riparian characteristics within the footprint of the project area to be disturbed is the Indian Creek channel and riparian/aquatic vegetation surrounding the reservoirs. Other channels exhibiting riparian characteristics are located on the remainder parcel that is not proposed for development. The project has been designed to maintain appropriate setbacks from all drainage and wetland features by maintaining these areas in open space. Thus, no impacts to riparian areas are expected to occur as a result of the proposed development.

c. **Wetlands.** As mentioned above, the applicant has prepared a Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation that identifies wetland areas within the boundaries of the project site. These areas are characterized in the table below.

| Wetland Feature | Description | Area (acres) |
|---|---|---|
| Forested Wetland 1 | Abuts Indian Creek & Reservoir 2. Dominant vegetation includes willow, white alder, broad-leaved cattail, and Himalayan blackberry. The herb layer is dominated by knotweed, Baltic rush, and fireweed. | 2.463 |
| Forested Wetland 2 | Abuts Reservoir 2. Dominant vegetation is willow, broad-leaved cattail, and Himalayan blackberry. The herb layer is dominated by knotweed, Baltic rush, and colonial bent grass. | 1.212 |
| Emergent Wetland 1 | Abuts Reservoir 2. Dominant vegetation is Emergent Wetland. | 0.124 |
| Seep 1 | Abuts Reservoir 2. Dominant vegetation is arroyo willow and Himalayan blackberry. The herb layer is dominated by Baltic rush, fireweed, Klamathweed, bull thistle, and narrow-leaved cattail. | 0.033 |
| Seasonal Wetlands 1and 2 | SW1 is in the drainage of Channel 2, and SW2 is in the drainage of Channel 3. Dominant vegetation is spikerush, fiddle dock, soft chess, and yellow monkeyflower. | 0.016 |
| Seasonal Wetlands 3 and 4 | Contiguous with Forested Wetland 1 and Indian Creek. Dominant vegetation includes Baltic rush and prickly lettuce. | 0292 |
| Seasonal Wetland 5 | Abuts channel 11. Dominant vegetation includes curly dock, Italian ryegrass, and *Torlis arvensis*. | 0.040 |
| Seasonal Wetland 6 | Abuts channel 8. Dominant vegetation is Italian ryegrass, cransebill, dock, and sedge. | 0.017 |
| **Total Wetlands** | | **4.197** |

As discussed above, all wetland areas are proposed to remain in open space, and thus impacts to wetlands are considered less than significant.

d. **Wildlife corridors.** Migratory Deer Herd Habitats occur within some areas of El Dorado County. The project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any migratory deer herd habitats as shown in the El Dorado County General Plan. This impact would be less than significant.

Riparian corridors also act as wildlife corridors. As mentioned above, there are several ephemeral channels that are tributaries/drainages to Indian Creek and the reservoirs. The channels which are located in the development footprint do not necessarily exhibit riparian characteristics but still provide corridors for wildlife accessing the water impoundments on Indian Creek. These channels, as well as the existing water impoundments, are all proposed to remain in open space and will continue to provide migratory corridors for local wildlife subsequent to project development. There would be no impact to riparian corridors.

e. **Biological Resources.** As discussed in (b) above, the project will result in impacts to biological resources, primarily oak woodland. Impacts to oak woodlands have been addressed in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR, available for review online at http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm or at El Dorado County Planning Services offices located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667. Mitigation in the form of General Plan policies have been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels. In this instance, adherence to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and measures contained within the Oak Woodlands Management Plan will mitigate impacts to oak woodland to less than significant levels. The project is also located in Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2. While no rare plants were identified in surveys conducted by the applicant as discussed in (a) above, the applicant will be subject to payment of a mitigation fee. Other impacts to wildlife would be mitigated with the designation of large open space areas and protection of water features and migration corridors through the designation of open space areas on the tentative map. Impacts to biological resources are considered less than significant with adherence to General Plan Policies required mitigation, and mitigation incorporated into the project description in the form of open space designations.

f. **Adopted Plans.** Protected and sensitive and natural resources/areas within El Dorado County include: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database. The project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** There would be a less than significant impact to listed local, state, or federal biological resources as these have been protected in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations applicable to these resources. There would be no significant impacts to biological resources, oak trees and/or oak woodland tree canopy with adherence to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. Impacts to rare, endangered, or sensitive species throughout the site would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation requiring appropriate surveys to be conducted and protection implemented if necessary prior to initiation of construction activities. As such, the impacts in the 'Biological Resources' category would be potentially significant, but less than significant based on the proposed mitigation measures and adherence to county policies and ordinance requirements.

| **V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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:

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

- 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. **Historical Resources.** A cultural resources study was prepared for the proposed project in October of 2006 by Historic Resource Associates. (*Cultural Resources Study of the Indian Creek Ranch Project, Echo Lane, El Dorado, El Dorado County, CA 95623,* Historic Resource Associates, October 2006). The study did identify historic artifacts and features on the project site. These consisted of a diffuse scatter of historic artifacts commonly used by 19th century miners, and a mining feature that consists of a segment of an abandoned earthen mining ditch or canal. The location of the historic artifacts is also associated with a prehistoric site. This site has been determined to have potential cultural significance and appears to be eligible for the California Register under Criterion 1 and for the National Historic Register of Historic Places under Criterion D. Due to the fact that there is some significance associated with the site, the applicant has designed the project to completely avoid it by incorporating into an open space area which will not be disturbed by construction activities. Therefore no mitigation is required, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Pre-Historic Resources.** As discussed in (a.), a cultural resource records study was prepared for the proposed project. The study did identify an archaeological site of significance which is also associated with a historic site as discussed above. The site is proposed to be incorporated into an open space area which would not be disturbed by construction activities. However, the fact that the area is currently proposed as open space does not mean that future development could not occur within this sensitive resource area. In order to protect the resource identified in the cultural resource study as being potentially significant in perpetuity, mitigation requiring designation of potentially significant cultural resource areas as unbuildable areas shall be recorded with the final map.

**MM CUL-1:** In order to protect sensitive cultural resources, the area delineated as Open Space Lot "A" on the Tentative Subdivision Map shall be designated on the final map as an unbuildable area. No reference to specific locations of the cultural resource site shall be recorded with the final map.

*Plan Requirements/Timing: A note designating Open Space Lot "A"(or the area delineated as such) as an unbuildable area shall included on the final map.*

*Compliance: El Dorado Planning Services shall review the final map to ensure that a note is included.*

c. **Paleontological Resources.** There are no unique paleontological or geologic features located on the project site. As such, there would be no impact as a result of the proposed project.

d. **Human Remains.** Based on the results of the cultural resource study, the project is unlikely to disturb any human remains. In the event that remains are discovered, all work shall be halted and the significance of the remains shall be evaluated in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

**Finding:** Based upon the cultural resources report prepared for the site, it is determined that there potentially significant cultural resources on the project site. In order to protect these resources in perpetuity, mitigation requiring long-term protection of the resource by designating the area as non-buildable is required. For this "Cultural Resources" category, proposed mitigation would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | **X** |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | | | | **X** |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | **X** | |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | **X** |
| iv) Landslides? | | | | **X** |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | **X** | |
| c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | | | **X** | |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property? | | | | **X** |
| e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;

- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or

- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction**. There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. No other active or potentially active faults

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

have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. Although there are no known faults on the project site, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The nearest active fault, according to Alquist-Priolo criteria, is the Dunnigan Hills Fault approximately 48 miles to the northwest. There would be no impacts.

b,c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil**. All grading activities 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* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). 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 site grading and construction of any onsite and off site road improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

There are five separate soil units which are mapped on the project area. These include Auburn silt loam (AwD), Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD), Auburn cobbly clay loam (AzE), Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam (DfC), Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam (DgE), and Placer Diggings (PrD). These soils are considered to have a moderate to high erosion potential. The site consists of gentle rolling hills with steeper slopes along drainage channels. The majority of the site consists of slopes under 30% (0-10% slopes = 28.3% of site, 11-20% slopes = 37.2% of site, 21-29% slopes = 19.2% of site, 30% slopes and greater = 15.3% of site). Given that there are ample areas with slopes less than 30%, it is anticipated that building pad, and driveway development associated with lot development will be able to avoid 30% slopes consistent with general plan policies limiting development on slopes greater than 30%. The majority of proposed road development will occur on slopes less than 30%, with the exception of a few small segments that traverse 30% or greater slopes as the road crosses drainage channels. These minimal intrusions into steeper slopes are consistent with general plan policies regarding development on 30% or greater slopes, which allows for roads to traverse steeper slopes. Erosion associated with these intrusions into steeper-sloped area is expected to be insignificant, as the drainages are ephemeral in nature and all improvements (culverts and open bottomed drainage channels with arched crossings) associated with these drainage crossings will be sized to handle flood flows so as not to create erosion impacts. Building pads and driveways will be evaluated for consistency with policies prohibiting development on 30% slopes during the plan check process as individual lot owners or developer apply for building permits.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Development Services Department would review the grading plans for the required road improvements. On and off site grading would be required to comply with the Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance. 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. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The Land Capability Report prepared by Carlton Engineering (May 2008) concludes that expansive or collapsible soil conditions are not to be expected within the building areas based on the soils observed during the site reconnaissance, soils testing for septic capability, and the general lithology of the underlying geologic units. There would be no impact to the project as a result of expansive soils.

e. **Septic Systems.** Future homes on the project site would all be served by septic systems. The applicant has tested proposed development areas in consultation with El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. An onsite Sewage Disposal Study was done for the project by Joe Norton, Professional Geologist in March of 2008. The report analyzed a total of forty-four (44) test pits and percolation tests during the fall of 2007. All pits were inspected by the Environmental Management Department. The conclusion of the study was the all proposed lots are in compliance

with the *Interim Guidelines for Tentative Parcel Maps and Subdivisions*, July 27, 2007, issued by the Environmental Management Department. Testing was unable to be completed for the area which underlies proposed Lot 53, which is currently developed with buildings and paved areas. The Environmental Management Department will require additional testing for Lot 53 if that lot is to be developed with other residential buildings than what currently exists at the present time. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the rezone, development plan, and tentative map either directly or indirectly. For this "Geology and Soils" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| **VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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.** No hazardous substances are involved with the rezone, development plan, and tentative map. Temporary use of heavy equipment for driveway and building improvements would be required. A diesel fuel storage tank may be located on site for the heavy equipment. The potential storage and transport of diesel fuel in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment would require an approved hazardous material business plan issued from the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. Said hazardous material business plan would identify potential impacts to the environment and require mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Based on the amount of site improvements required (grading of the proposed roadway and infrastructure) and the duration of heavy equipment on site and off site to complete the site improvements, and that fuel storage would most likely not occur, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant with an approved hazardous materials business plan.

c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no 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, accessed September 23, 2004; California Regional WaterQuality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004;California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004).* 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 is no private airstrip(s) in the immediate vicinity that is identified on a U.S. Geological Survey Topography Map. There would be no impact.

g. **Emergency Response Plan.** The proposed project would create three points of access, two off of Echo Lane, and one access to Sundance Trail. All accesses would be available for emergency ingress and egress by both the project residents and the Sundance Trail neighborhood. At this time there no adopted emergency response or evacuation plans for the area. Fire response and fire safety issues have been reviewed by the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District. The Fire Department would require a Fire Safe Plan prepared by a registered professional forester. Based upon the conditions of approval for on-site and off-site road improvements and fire safety measures (maintenance of defensible space, structural setbacks, adequate fire flow maintenance, provision of secondary access, etc.) impacts would be less than significant.

h. **Fire Hazards.** The project site is located in an area that is designated as having a moderate fire hazard (*El Dorado County Fire Hazard Safety Zone (FHSZ) Map,* California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, adopted November 2007*).* The project would be served by EID water, and will be required to make improvements to existing facilities in order to provide adequate fire flows for fire protection. These improvements consist of the development of a looped water system. The applicant has proposed two alternatives for a looped water line, one of which will be selected

upon review of the systems by EID. In order to mitigate the potential fire safety impacts of establishing additional residences in this high fire hazard area, the Fire Department will require as conditions of approval that the applicant incorporate fire safety measures that will include a Fire Safe Plan to be prepared by a registered professional forester, and development of accesses to Fire Department standards. With incorporation of these measures, fire hazard impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding:** No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the rezone, development plan, and tentative map either directly or indirectly with incorporation of mitigation measures requiring the provision of two means of emergency access. For this "Hazards" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| **VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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** |

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Water Quality Standards.** The applicant has prepared an onsite Sewage Disposal Study (Joe Norton, Professional Geologist, March 2008). The study analyzed a total of forty-four (44) test pits and percolation tests done during the months of October, November, and December of 2007. The minimum depth of each test pit was 8 feet. The test pits were inspected by the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management (EMD) and the methodology utilized was also accepted by this department. The results of the study concluded that each of the test pits were in compliance with the *Interim Guidelines for Tentative Parcel Maps and Subdivisions* issued by EMD. All sewage disposal areas would also be set back at least 50 feet away from wetland areas and 100 feet away from major channels or streams consistent with County policies. As such, there would be no impacts to water quality as a result of waste discharge.

b. **Groundwater.** There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The project is required to connect to the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) water line (see Utility and Services Systems category). There would be no draw from groundwater sources in the area with the approval of this project and impacts in this category would be less than significant.

c-d. **Drainage Patterns.** The applicant prepared a preliminary drainage report for the project (*Preliminary Drainage Report for Indian Creek Ranch*, Carlton Engineering Inc., May 2008). The study identified pre- and post-development conditions for the project site and the surrounding vicinity. The study concluded that offsite watersheds would not be impacted by project development. Onsite watersheds and drainage patterns would be altered with implementation of the proposed project. Currently, there are three watersheds on the project site identified as Sheds D, E, and G in the Drainage Report. The study concludes that these watersheds will be subdivided into smaller watersheds due to the construction of project roadways and grading activities. In order to maintain pre-development drainage patterns, the project proposes drainage culverts underneath the roadways at six different locations. The report analyzes pre- and post-development conditions during flood flows, and concludes that the proposed culverts are sized adequately to maintain pre-development drainage patterns. Primary project drainage will continue to be conducted towards the onsite reservoir and Indian Creek. As such, impacts to drainage systems are considered less than significant

e. **Stormwater Runoff.** As discussed above (c,d), the project would alter drainage patterns slightly due to grading activities and road improvements. Stormwater runoff has the potential to increase due to the introduction of impervious surfaces into areas not previously developed. Primary increases in runoff would be attributed to road surfaces, and not individual homes on relatively large lots which would be able to disperse sheet flow onto pervious surfaces surrounding the homes. However, the Preliminary Drainage Study concludes that at the most important discharge point from the project (the spillway at Indian Creek Reservoir 1) runoff would actually be reduced slightly for both the 10-year, 24-hour event and the 100-year, 24-hour event. Thus, there would be no impact due to stormwater runoff.

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

f. **Degradation of Water Quality.** The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area due to construction activities or long-term project operation. Stormwater and sediment control measures outlined by the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* that implement a project specific Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SWMP), the state's Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Program (SWPPP) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) would be required to be designed with grading and drainage plans. The designs would also include and implement pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs), as well as permanent drainage facilities, in order to address the issue of water quality. As a result, there would be a less than significant impact.

g-j. **Flooding.** There are no 100-year flood hazard areas at or adjacent to the site. The site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is not in an area subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. None of the proposed parcels are located within the floodplain of Indian Creek or in danger of flooding in the event of a dam failure from Reservoir 1. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0750 B, last updated October 18, 1983) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain (Flood Rate Zone "C"). There would be no impact.

**Finding:** No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the rezone, development plan, or tentative subdivision map either directly or indirectly. For this "Hydrology" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Established Community.** The majority of the proposed project is not located within an established community, but is located in the Rural Region immediately adjacent to the Placerville Community Region General Plan Planning Concept

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

Area to the east. Small portions of the project are within the Community Region (Assessor's Parcels 327-050-02 (5.01 acres w/in project boundaries) & 327-070-56 (8.98 acres)) and are designated Medium Density Residential and zoned R3A. As the majority of the project will maintain its Low Density Residential land use designation, and will maintain a rural character consistent with surrounding land uses, the project will not divide an established community and thus there will be no impact.

b. **Land Use Plan.** As discussed above, the majority of the parcels involved in the proposed project currently have a Low Density Residential land use designation, and are located outside the community region boundary line. Parcels within the community region boundary line will maintain a land use designation of Medium Density Residential and a zoning designation of R3A, consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.1.1. Development proposed within the Medium Density Residential land use designation consists of open space and parcels of 1.07 to 1.23 acres, consistent with parcel sizes allowed in the Medium Density Residential land use designation (parcel sizes of 1.0 to 5.0 acres). The project proposes to maintain the existing Low Density Residential land use designation and RE-5 zoning, but will create parcel sizes ranging in size from 1.0 to 5.02 acres which are much smaller than those generally promoted in the rural region (5.0 acres and larger). Small parcel sizes are allowed to be created through the Planned Development overlay proposed as part of the project consistent with General Plan Policies 2.2.3.2 (Planned Developments) and 2.2.4.1(Density Bonus). These small parcel sizes within the rural region are potentially inconsistent with the objectives of the rural region (Objective 2.1.3) which is to "Provide a land use pattern that maintains the open character of the County, preserves its natural resources, recognizes the constraints of the land and the limited availability of infrastructure and public services, and preserves the agricultural and forest/timber area to ensure its long-term viability for agriculture and timber operations", posing a potentially significant impact, since the smaller lot sizes would not maintain the open character of the County. The applicant has proposed to mitigate this impact by designating a large portion of the project site as open space (76.61 acres or 42% of the overall 182.83 acres). Designation of these areas as open space on the tentative map is considered beneficial, but not adequate mitigation, as much of the area could be considered developable in the future should the property owner apply for future entitlements. In order to ensure that the open space character is maintained, mitigation requiring rezoning of designated open space lots to an Open Space zone district is required as mitigation. With incorporation of this mitigation, impacts to the rural character of the area would be mitigated.

**MM LU-1:** All areas designated on the tentative map as an "Open Space Lot" shall be zoned as Open Space as part of the rezone application. Minor deviations from approved exhibits shall be allowed as needed to accommodate roads and grading adjustments that may occur during development of final improvement plans and the final map.

*Plan Requirements/Timing: Prior to final approval, the applicant shall amend the project description to request that all areas designated on the recorded final map as Open Space Lots be rezoned to an Open Space zoning district.*

*Compliance: El Dorado County Planning Services shall incorporate the revised project description into all planning documents forwarded to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Prior to the issuance of any development permits (building or grading permits), the County shall amend zoning maps consistent with the tentative map submitted for recordation as the final map. Planning Services shall review submitted maps to ensure consistency with the intent of this condition of approval, which is that all areas designated as an open space lot be zoned as such. The applicant shall be responsible for coordinating with El Dorado County Planning Services to ensure zoning maps have been updated consistent with the proposed final map.*

The proposed project would designate a large portion of the project as open space (42%) consistent with the requirements of the General Plan for Planned Developments and Density Bonus. As currently proposed, this open space

area is proposed to be private, as the community to be developed would be gated with no access for the general public. General plan policies that provide for density bonus (Policy 2.2.4.1) require the following:

> Planned Developments shall be provided additional residential units (density bonus), in accordance with A through C, for the provision of otherwise developable lands set aside for **public benefit** including open space, wildlife habitat areas, parks (parkland provided in excess of that required by the Quimby Act), ball fields, or other uses determined to provide a bona fide **public benefit**.

Although consistency with this general plan policy requiring a public benefit is considered a potentially significant impact since direct access by the "general" public is not allowed, the set aside of this open space significantly benefits wildlife by providing habitat, thus providing an indirect public benefit.

c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community plans within the project vicinity. Impacts are less than significant.

**Finding:** The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan policies for rural residential uses. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property. No significant impacts are expected. For this "Land Use" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| X. **MINERAL RESOURCES.** *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 (El Dorado County General Plan, Figure CO-1). Approximately 4.50 miles to the east and 9.25 miles to the west from the proposed project are MRZ-2-classified areas, 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 current mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect existing uses. There would be no impact.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XI. NOISE.** *Would the project result in:* | | | | |
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | **X** | | |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | **X** | |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | **X** | |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | **X** | |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level? | | | | **X** |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Noise Standards.** The applicant has prepared an acoustical analysis for the proposed project based upon the fact that portions of the project site are located in areas which may be impacted by vehicular noise from Highway 50 (*Environmental Noise Assessment: Indian Creek Ranch Single-family Residential Development, El Dorado County, California*, Bollard Accoustical Consultants, March 5, 2008). General Plan Policy 6.5.1.1 requires such an analysis where noise-sensitive land uses are proposed in areas exposed to existing or projected exterior noise levels exceeding the levels specified in Table 6-1 or the performance standards of Table 6-2, an acoustical analysis shall be required as part of the environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be included in the project design. The acoustical analysis included a survey of existing noise levels to determine existing exposure at the closest proposed residential lots. These lots were determined to be proposed Lots 65 (Site A) and 71(Site B), located along Echo Lane. Results of the survey were that the measured ambient noise exposure from Highway 50 at Lot 65(Site A) and a site near Lot 71(Site B) were approximately 59 dB $L_{dn}$ and 66 dB $L_{dn}$, respectively. Noise exposure at Site A was significantly lower than Site B due to acoustical shielding from intervening trees and topography and distance from Highway 50. The acoustical analysis identifies mitigation requiring installation of noise barriers. With incorporation of this mitigation, long-term noise impacts would be less than significant.

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

**MM NOI-1:** The applicant shall construct property line noise barriers measuring 6-7 feet high above the existing ground elevations for Lots 65, 66 and 71 consistent with the Bollard Accoustical Consultants, Inc. Environmental Noise Assessment prepared for the Indian Creek Ranch Single-Family Residential Development dated March 5, 2008. Alternatively, the applicant may provide El Dorado County Planning Services with updated acoustical analyses for these lots which provide for alternative methods of noise attenuation, including, but not limited to, siting of building envelopes on the final map outside areas of exposure in exceedance of General Plan Noise Element criteria (60 dB $L_{dn}$ for residential uses).

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits for individual lots 65, 66, and 71, El Dorado County Planning Services shall verify that building plans include noise barriers consistent with the requirements of the above-referenced noise study. Alternatively, updated analyses may be presented to Planning Services for review and approval that describe alternative methods of noise attenuation which shall be implemented as part of project development on identified lots.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services*

Grading activities associated with roadway, driveway improvements and the creation of building pads would generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment (dump trucks, bulldozer, graders) at a potentially significant level (greater than 60 dB $L_{eq}$ and 70 dB $L_{max}$ between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 GP table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in rural regions-construction noise). However, the site is located on a large parcel surrounded by low density and medium density residential uses and no sensitive receptors are located 500 feet or greater from potential building sites. Construction operations for road improvements and building pad creation would require adherence to construction hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. during weekdays and will require the heavy construction equipment to install the latest noise reduction technologies available. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant.

b. **Ground borne Vibration & Noise.** Ground borne vibrations are associated with heavy vehicles (i.e. railroad) and with heavy equipment operations. All noise generation due to construction activities would be required to comply with the Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element as noted above. Vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project would be typical of traffic generated by the adjacent residential uses; passenger cars and trucks, which are not a source of significant vibration. This impact would be considered less than significant.

c. **Ambient Noise Levels.** Subdivision of the land and construction and occupation of the 74 additional homes would result in periodic noise generation from the use of vehicles, noises generated on home sites, and landscape maintenance. The overall types and volumes of noise would not be excessive and would be similar in character to surrounding land uses which are low to medium density residential in nature. This impact would be considered less than significant.

d. **Temporary Increases in Noise Levels.** The construction phase of the project would result in an increase in noise levels to surrounding residences as individual homes were built on lots. Construction noise would be temporary and would be minimized by compliance with Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. Project operation would also result in periodic noise generation above current levels from the use of vehicles, landscaping equipment, etc. The overall types and volumes of noise from project operation would not be excessive and would be similar in character to surrounding land uses. Thus, as a result, this impact would be less than significant.

e&f. **Airport Noise.** The project site is not within the airport land use plan. There would be no impact.

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

**Finding:** Long-term noise impacts were identified for several of the proposed lots. Mitigation requiring installation of noise barriers would reduce these impacts to a level of insignificance. Short-term noise impacts would be reduced to levels of insignificance with adherence to General Plan Policies limiting hours of construction. For this "Noise" category, impacts are considered to be less than significant with adherence to General Plan policies and adherence to mitigation measures.

| **XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** *Would the project:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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. **Population Growth.** The proposed project will ultimately result in the addition of seventy-four (74) new single-family dwellings (one single-family dwelling currently exists on the site) and approximately 207.2 individuals into this area based upon population densities contained in Table 2-2 of the General Plan. The project will also develop new roadways for access that will be solely for the purpose of serving the development and will not create a need for new infrastructure such as water and sewer lines, as the proposed parcels will be served by existing domestic water supply lines (water lines will be connected to existing water lines in the neighborhood without upgrades to those lines) and new private septic systems. As such, the proposed project will not induce growth in the area. There would be no impact.

b. **Housing Displacement.** The project will not displace any existing housing. Existing occupied housing on the project site will remain, other unoccupied temporary/farmworker housing will be removed and replaced with a single-family residence. There would be no impact.

c. **Population Displacement.** The proposed project will not displace any people. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed rezone, development plan, and tentative map either directly or indirectly. For this "Population and Housing" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.** *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:* | | | | |
| a. Fire protection? | | | **X** | |
| b. Police protection? | | | **X** | |
| c. Schools? | | | | **X** |
| d. Parks? | | | | **X** |
| e. Other government services? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Fire Protection.** The project site is and would be served by the Diamond Springs - El Dorado County Fire Protection District. 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 responsible Fire Department would review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection.** The proposed parcel map would create 75 residential lots. The development of additional residential lots on the project site may result in a small increase in calls for service but would not significantly impact the Department. The project applicant would be responsible for the payment of development fees to the Department to offset any project impacts. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.

c. **Schools.** The project is located within the Mother Lode Union School District. Conversations with the Superintendent's Office (email communication with Superintendent Shanda Hahn, 9/2/2008) indicates that the school district does have the capacity to serve the proposed project. Students would attend either Charles Brown or Indian Creek for grades K-5. All students attend Herbert Green Middle School. High school students are served by the El Dorado Union High School District, and would attend El Dorado High School. The high school district has indicated

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

that they have the capacity to serve the proposed project (Letter from Facilities Director Patti McClellan dated 10/21/08). Mitigation fees for schools would be collected at the time of building permit issuance. There would be no impact.

d. **Parks.** The project is located within the El Dorado Recreation District which is maintained by the El Dorado County Department of General Services, Division of Airport, Parks and Grounds (Parks Recreation). The district does not maintain any parks in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The closest parks are Henningsen Lotus Park (51-acre park) located at 950 Lotus Road in Lotus and Bradford Park (5-acre park) located at 4224 Motherlode Drive in Shingle Springs. These parks are located approximately seven and 4 miles from the project site, respectively. The City of Placerville also maintains three parks within 5 miles of the project site (Goldbug, Lumsden, and Lions Parks). County Parks does not maintain parkland standards. The development of seventy-five (75) single family dwellings on medium to low density parcels would create an insignificant demand for recreational opportunities, especially in light of the fact that outdoor recreational opportunities would exist within the project development, and at other County maintained facilities in the area. The El Dorado County Parks does not currently maintain a fee program to offset impacts to recreational facilities, although Quimby fees are required to be paid per standard conditions of approval for subdivisions. Given that the County Parks does not maintain standards for parkland, no threshold has been exceeded and thus there is no impact as a result of the project.

e. **Other Government Services.** No other government services would be required as a result of the rezone, development plan, and tentative map. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services either directly or indirectly. For this "Public Services" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 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. **Parks and Recreation.** The proposed rezone, development plan and tentative subdivision map would not result in a population increase that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities (see "d" in Section XIII). Park facilities are maintained by the El Dorado County

Department of Services, Division of Airport, Parks and Grounds (Parks Recreation). There would be a less than significant impact.

**Finding:** No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected either directly or indirectly given the small increase in population and open space resources that will be created by the proposed project. For this "Recreation" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| **XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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/Level of Service.** A Traffic Study was prepared by Prism Engineering in October of 2007 to establish and analyze existing and future traffic conditions based on the additional traffic generated by the proposed development of the Indian Creek Ranch project. Results of the study can be found in the report (*Indian Creek Ranch: ADH TS Indian Creek Ranch Final Traffic Impact Study*, Prism Engineering, October 10, 2007) which is on file with the County. The report was circulated to the El Dorado County Department of Transportation and Caltrans for their review. Both agencies concurred with the findings of the report, although DOT has specific recommendations with regards to

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

improvements required as a result of the project in order to ensure that surrounding roadways provide adequate roadway capacity for the project together with existing and proposed future traffic volumes on area roadways. As proposed, the project will have three driveways, two on Echo Lane with both ingress and egress privileges, and one on Sundance Trail providing egress only. These driveways will distribute traffic onto area roadways as described in the traffic study. A summary of this analysis is provided below:

The project analysis focused on the existing roadway network in the vicinity of the proposed development, as well as adjacent and key intersections in the vicinity of the project site, including the following intersections:

1. El Dorado Road and US 50 EB Off Ramp
2. El Dorado Road and US 50 WB Off Ramp
3. El Dorado Road and Runnymeade Drive
4. El Dorado Road and Missouri Flat Road
5. Missouri Flat Road and Mother Lode Drive
6. Missouri Flat Road and US 50 EB Off Ramp
7. Missouri Flat Road and US 50 WB Off Ramp
8. Echo Lane and El Dorado Road
9. El Dorado Road and Sunshine Lane (trip distribution has been allocated to Sundance Trail/El Dorado Road as a result of project revisions)
10. Project Driveway (east) and Echo Lane Road
11. Project Driveway (west) and Echo Lane Road

Four different scenarios were analyzed for the traffic study. These scenarios included:

a. Existing Year 2007 AM and PM
b. Existing Year 2007 AM and PM Plus Project
c. Future Year 2011 EAP AM and PM
d. Future Year 2011 EAP AM and PM Plus Project

The study found that the project would be expected to generate approximately 786 Average Daily Trips, 64 AM peak hour trips, and 86 PM peak hour trips based on trip generation rates contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual.

The analysis found that the project has a significant impact at 8 out of the 11 study intersections for the existing and future Year 2011 scenarios based on County criteria for levels of significance (the addition of 10 or more cars). Mitigation is required at intersections where the levels of service exceeds the allowed threshold as defined in the County's General Plan Circulation Policy TC-XD. The General Plan Policy TC-XC defines the threshold as LOS D in rural areas and LOS E in community areas; except where defined in Table TC-2 in the same document.

The intersection of US 50 EB ramps at Missouri Flat Road experience LOS F conditions in the PM peak hour for the existing condition. The intersection of US 50 WB ramps at Missouri Flat Road also experience LOS F conditions in both existing AM and PM peak hours. The capital improvement projects (CIP) that are planned or are completed under construction for the US 50 at Missouri Flat Road ramp intersections will mitigate conditions to acceptable levels of service "C" and "D" conditions during the future year 2011 scenario.

With the CIP proposed and completed improvements, and road improvements required by DOT to area roadways (Echo Lane and Sundance Trail) as part of the conditions of approval, impacts to capacity and level of service are considered less than significant.

c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.

d. **Hazards.** The project has been reviewed by El Dorado County Department of Transportation and was found not to create any design hazards with development of roads to County Design Standards as proposed by the applicant (see Design Waiver Requests in the project description). With incorporation of conditions of approval as required by DOT, impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access.** The proposed project will provide three points of access in accordance with Fire Department requirements. Two points of access will be provided on Echo Lane and one point of access will be provided on Sundance Trail. In order to minimize traffic on Sundance Trail the proposed gate will be an egress only gate but will be equipped with overrides per Fire Department requirements, or other acceptable means that meet the El Dorado County Fire Prevention Officers Standards (Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District letter dated 8/29/08). This override will allow for an emergency egress for residents of the Sundance Trail neighborhood in the event of a fire that causes access on Sundance Trail to be blocked. This is considered a net benefit of the project. All access gates on Echo Lane will be provided with overrides as well. The applicant will also be required to develop a Fire Safe Plan to be approved by the Fire Protection District prior to final map approval. With incorporation of Fire Department requirements for proposed gates and provision of a Fire Safe Plan, there would be no impact to emergency access. It should be noted that the Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District's current position is that no gates be allowed within the project (letter dated 10/15/08). Whichever way the project proceeds, impacts to emergency access are considered to be less than significant as long as a form of secondary emergency access is provided.

f. **Parking.** No additional parking required for the residential units is anticipated to be created by the tentative map. Lot sizes would all be in excess of one acre and are expected to have adequate space for parking. There would be no impact.

g. **Alternative Transportation.** No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected because such features are not present at or adjacent to the project site. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** As discussed above, potentially significant traffic impacts at area intersections and roadways would be mitigated to levels of insignificance with planned or completed capital improvement plan projects (CIP), and with DOT-required conditions of approval. For this "Transportation/Traffic" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| **XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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** |

| XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | | **X** |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | **X** | |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | **X** | |

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Wastewater.** The El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed 75-lot subdivision and found that the creation of proposed septic systems on lots ranging in size from 1.0 to 5.02 acres would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, as they have reviewed sample test pits and percolation studies for majority of the lots and found that adequate percolation would exist throughout the development. There would be no impact.

b,d, e. **New Facilities.** No new or expanded water facilities would be required for the proposed project. The El Dorado Irrigation District has indicated that they have the ability to serve the project with existing mains as long as the applicant meets Fire Protection District standards development of a looped water system within the proposed development. This system would tie into existing lines in the neighborhood with no upgrades required. No new wastewater facilities would be required as the project would be served by individual septic systems. There would be no impact.

c. **Storm Water Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the "*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*," as determined by the Department of Transportation. The DOT has reviewed the preliminary drainage report and determined that there would be no impact.

f&g. **Solid Waste.** In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) are allowed to be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal site. All other waste materials that cannot

be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

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

County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. For residential development some on-site separation of materials is required and areas are required to be set aside for the storage of solid waste in accordance with Ordinance No. 4319. Chapter 8.42.640C of the county Ordinance requires that solid waste, recycling and storage facilities must be reviewed and approved by the County prior to building permit issuance. There would be a less than significant impact.

**Finding:** No significant utility and service system impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this "Utilities and Service Systems" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| **XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.** *Does the project:* | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | **X** | | |
| b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | | | **X** | |
| c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | **X** | |

**Discussion:**

a. The proposed project has the potential to significantly impact biological resources as well as cultural resources as discussed in this document. However, as conditioned and mitigated, and with strict adherence to County General Plan policies and permit requirements, this rezone, development plan and tentative subdivision map and the typical residential uses expected to follow, would not appear to have the potential to 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 California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project would be less than significant due to the design of the project and required standards that would be implemented with the process of the final map and/or any required project specific improvements on or off the property.

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

b. Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as "two or more individual effects, which when considered together, would be considerable or which would compound or increase other environmental impacts." Based on the analysis in this study, it has been determined that the project would have a less than significant impact based on the issue of cumulative impacts.

c. The proposed project has the potential to generate potentially significant impacts to humans with respect to noise and land use as discussed in this document. However, as conditioned and mitigated, and with strict adherence to County General Plan policies and permit requirements, this rezone, development plan and tentative subdivision map and the typical residential uses expected to follow, are not likely to cause project-related environmental effects which would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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