



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** Design Review DR08-0003/The Shops at El Dorado Hills

**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:** Peter L. Navarra & Leslie Towns Navarra, Co-Trustees, Navarra Family Trust, 3220 Northrop Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95684-5023

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** Peter L. Navarra, 3220 Northrop Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95684-5023

**Project Agent's Name and Address:** Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., 4080 Plaza Goldorado Circle, Cameron Park, CA 95682-8257

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:** Gene E. Thorne & Associates (see above address)

**Project Location:** West side of El Dorado Hills Boulevard at the intersection of Saratoga Way and El Dorado Hills Boulevard, El Dorado Hills area.

**Assessor's Parcel Number(s):** 120-690-06 (3.317 acres)

**Zoning:** CP-DC (Planned Commercial – Design Control overlay)

**Section:** Por. 2 & 11      **T:** 9N    **R:** 8E

**General Plan Designation:** C (Commercial)

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

1. Design Review request to construct three (3) commercial buildings totaling 30,628square feet. Building 1 would be 13,368 square feet, Building 2 would be 11,539 square feet and Building 3 would be 5,775 square feet.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences)
Site:	CP-DC	C	Vacant Land
North:	CP-DC	C	Commercial buildings
East:	C-DR	C	El Dorado Hills Blvd/Commercial buildings.
South:	CP-DC	C	Highway 50/Commercial Buildings
West:	R2-DC	MFR	Multi-family Residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is a 3.317-acre parcel that is irregularly shaped. The property has been previously disturbed by rough grading activities and is gently sloping, with elevations ranging from 653 above mean sea level (AMSL) on the northern portion of the property to 630 AMSL on the southern portion of the property. Vegetation onsite consists of exotic grasses typical of an annual grassland community; there are no trees on the property. A small seasonal wetland exists onsite (0.01-acres). No sensitive plant or animal species were found onsite. The project site is located in Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2. Soils onsite consist of Auburn silt loam (AwD), 2-30% slopes, and Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD), 2-30% slopes. No cultural resources exist onsite.

The project is bounded on three sides by existing development, including residential development to the west and northwest, commercial development to the north and east, and road development (Highway 50) and commercial development across Highway 50 to the south.

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

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

<b>X</b>	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources	<b>X</b>	Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	<b>X</b>	Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation	<b>X</b>	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 12, 2008

Printed Name: Gordon Bell For: El Dorado County

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

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**Discussion:**

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

- a. **Scenic Vista.** A review of the Important Public Scenic Views identified in the El Dorado County General Plan revealed that the only scenic vista near the project site would be from southbound Salmon Falls Road between Highway 49 and the Folsom Reservoir toward the south and west. The project site is located east of Salmon Falls Road and would not affect views at this scenic vista. The project site would not be visible from any other identified public scenic vista; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic vistas.
- b. **Scenic Highways.** The nearest state scenic highway to the project site would be Highway 50 from Placerville to South Lake Tahoe. The project site is located over 17 miles west of this portion of Highway 50. The proposed project will be visible from Highway 50 in the El Dorado Hills area, and thus requires design review by the Planning Commission in order to ensure that the character of the development is consistent with surrounding development and any design guidelines relevant to the area. This potential impact is discussed below. However, given that the project is not located adjacent to a designated scenic highway, it would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.
- c. **Visual Character.** The project will significantly change the existing visual character from vacant land to developed commercial land with associated buildings, parking, landscaping, and lighting. This change will result in a significant change in visual character as seen from residential property west and northwest of the site which will no longer have unimpeded views across the vacant site of the hillsides and development east of the site. However, the El Dorado County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance has designated this land as commercial and as such anticipated potentially significant impacts in the General Plan EIR (available for review online at <http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm> or at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667) resulting from the development of land associated with commercially zoned property adjacent to residentially zoned property. Design elements have been incorporated into the project to soften views of the project from surrounding residential properties, and to ensure that the project is consistent with surrounding commercial development. These design elements include landscaping, articulated/stepped walls, tower elements of varying heights, arches, stone veneer on retaining walls, trellises with creeping vines, and relatively large windows as seen from residential development to the west. Other design elements include the use of colors and hues consistent with surrounding residential and commercial development. Thus, residents will not be looking at flat, unarticulated walls devoid of character or landscaping and monotone color

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

schemes typical of the rear walls of commercial buildings. One potentially significant impact associated with the project design is the current parking lot configuration which allows for long uninterrupted rows of parking as seen from Saratoga Way. Long uninterrupted rows (10 or more spaces) of parking are required by the zoning ordinance to be broken up by landscape islands or large trees. Section 17.18.090.C.4 of the El Dorado Zoning Code states, “At least one tree having a minimum size of fifteen gallons or equivalent shall be provided for each ten parking spaces exclusive of the landscape buffers.” In order to mitigate the visual impact related to long interrupted rows of parking, the following mitigation is required:

**MM-VIS-1:** The applicant shall include one landscape island/finger within the parking area associated with Walgreens along Saratoga Way. This planter shall be planted with at least one large shade tree. In order to break up other long uninterrupted rows of parking spaces, the applicant shall plant large shade tree clusters (2-3 trees) every ten parking spaces within the perimeter landscape buffer to break up views of the parking lot as seen from the surrounding residential properties and Saratoga Way.

*Timing/Implementation: The applicant shall revise all site plans and grading plans to include a landscape island within the parking area associated with Walgreens along Saratoga Way. The landscape plan shall also include large shade tree clusters (2-3 trees) every ten parking spaces within the perimeter landscape buffer.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring Prior to issuance of construction/grading permits, El Dorado County Planning Services shall review site plans and landscape plans to ensure that these measures have been included.*

Given that the applicant has taken measures to make the development aesthetically pleasing to surrounding areas, proposed a project that is consistent with surrounding commercial architecture and character, and proposed a project on land designated and zoned for commercial uses consistent with the County’s General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, impacts to visual character are considered to be less than significant.

- d. **Light and Glare.** Lighting associated with residential development on this site would create new sources of light and glare that will have an impact on residential development to the west in terms of changing the character of this parcel from open space/vacant land which generates no light to a lighted commercial parcel which is similar to existing commercial development in the area. However, all future outdoor lighting for future development will 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. This ordinance requirement requires that no light spill over onto adjacent properties as demonstrated by a photometric study that will be reviewed for compliance during the building permit process. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding:** The proposed project has the potential to result in the construction of 32,900 square feet of commercial development consisting of buildings, landscaping, lighting, and parking. This development is entirely consistent with the character of surrounding commercial development. While the proposed project will result in a change in the current character of the property and impinge upon views as currently experienced from surrounding residences, the property is designated and zoned for the proposed use and has incorporated design features to ensure compatibility with surrounding commercial development and soften impacts to surrounding residential development. Mitigation requiring landscape revisions are required to reduce potentially significant visual impacts associated with long uninterrupted rows of parking spaces. For this “Aesthetics” category, impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of proposed mitigation measures.

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

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

- a. **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. The El Dorado County Resource Conservation District has reviewed the project and did not identify important Agricultural Preserves or Districts within the project area. This property is located within an urban community and designated and zoned for the proposed use. 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. There are no agricultural activities within the vicinity of the project site, nor are any lands in the vicinity of the project designated or zoned for agricultural. There would be no impact.
- c. **Non-agricultural Use.** This project is located in an area designated for commercial and residential uses. There are no agricultural opportunities available in close proximity to the project site which may be impacted by development of the proposed property. As such, there would be no impact.

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

<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X	

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

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

a. **Air Quality Plan.** The project site would be regulated by the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District and the applicable air quality plan is the 1994 Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan (State Implementation Plan). The updated air quality plan would be based on the growth projections and land use designations contained in the General Plans of each jurisdiction within the Sacramento region. The project would be consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan and would therefore be included in the updated air quality plan. Because growth resulting from the proposed project was anticipated and included in the air quality plan, no conflict would occur. Therefore, impacts as a result of the proposed project are considered 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<sub>3</sub>). 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 Quality Management District (EDCAQMD) 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. This has the potential to generate significant short-term dust-related impacts during these activities. However, adherence to EDCAQMD Fugitive Dust Emissions regulations would mitigate this impact to less

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

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 AQMD is required.

**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 Quality Management District (AQMD) with appropriate fees and approved by the AQMD prior to start of project construction.

*Timing/Implementation:* Prior to issuance of grading and building permits the applicant shall submit an FDP to the El Dorado County AQMD for review and approval.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* El Dorado County Planning Services shall verify that the El Dorado County AQMD has approved the FDP prior to issuance of grading and building permits.

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 Quality Management District standards at that time. Impacts would be less than significant with adherence to AQMD Rules and Regulations as concluded in the applicant prepared air quality analysis (*CEQA Evaluation of Potential Air Quality Impacts for the “The Shops” Mixed-Use Shopping Center, El Dorado County, CA*, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., June 27, 2008). This report is available for review in the project file located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667.

Long-term mobile emissions associated with the project were evaluated in the air quality analysis prepared by the applicant. Sycamore Environmental Consultants utilized the URBEMIS 2007 computer modeling program to determine project emissions of Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG) and Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>). Results of the modeling program indicated that the project would generate approximately 24.69 pounds of ROG and 22.90 pounds of NO<sub>x</sub> which is well below the 82 pound threshold for each of these criteria pollutants. Thus the project would have a less than significant air quality impact related to long-term mobile emissions.

Toxic air contaminants (TAC) are pollutants that pose a present or potential hazard to human health. TACs are classified as either carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic. The state and federal governments regulate TACs through statutes and regulations that require maximum or best available technologies be incorporated in the source of the pollutants in order to limit emissions. For example, dry cleaning businesses are regulated in their handling and use of perchloroethylene. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified asbestos, including naturally occurring asbestiforms, as a carcinogenic TAC in 1986.

Soil in the project area is Auburn silt loam, 2-30% slopes and Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2- 30% slopes (Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, Soil Conservation Service 1974). The property is mapped within a quarter mile of an area more likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) (El Dorado County Asbestos Review Areas Western Slope County of El Dorado State of California July 2005). Before any project located within a quarter mile of an “Area More Likely to Contain Asbestos” can begin construction, El Dorado County requires property owners/operators to submit a report prepared by a California-registered geologist that documents the presence or absence of NOA. If NOA is detected on-site, then the property owner/operator must prepare an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan that describes mitigation measures that will be implemented to limit the potential health risks to a less than significant level. Alternatively, the property owner/operator may assume that NOA is present on the site and prepare an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan. With the

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

incorporation of the following avoidance measures, impacts resulting from grading and construction activities related to the eventual development of the proposed project on soil that contains NOA would be considered less than significant.

**MM AQ-2:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit the property owner/operator shall submit to the El Dorado County AQMD a report prepared by a California-registered geologist that documents the presence or absence of NOA. If El Dorado County AQMD agrees that NOA is not present on-site then no additional avoidance measures are required. If El Dorado County AQMD agrees that NOA is present on-site then the property owner/operator shall prepare and implement an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan will be reviewed and approved by El Dorado County Environmental Management and AQMD prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall include BMPs for implementing the asbestos dust control measures identified in the El Dorado County Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control and Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan.

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits the applicant shall submit the report referenced above for review by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department and the Air Quality Management District. If NOA is present, the applicant shall prepare and submit an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan for review and approval by the Environmental Management Department and the AQMD.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: Environmental Management Department and the AQMD shall approve the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan, if necessary, prior to issuance of grading and building permits. El Dorado County Planning Services shall verify that the El Dorado County APCD has approved the FDP prior to issuance of grading and building permits.*

- d. **Sensitive Receptors.** Sensitive receptors are considered residences, schools, parks, hospitals, or other land uses where children or the elderly congregate, or where outdoor activity is the primary land use. Two elementary schools and a preschool are located within one mile of the project: the William Brooks Elementary School is 0.45 miles northwest of the site, and Oak Meadow Elementary School is 0.81 miles northeast of the site, and the KinderCare Learning Center is 0.15 miles east of the site on Park Drive, east of El Dorado Hills Boulevard. Existing multi-family and single-family residential development occurs between the project site and the elementary schools. El Dorado Hills Boulevard and a parking lot occur between the project site and the KinderCare Learning Center. The nearest assisted living facility for seniors is located approximately 9.12 miles from the project site. Because the residential development occurs between the site and the elementary schools and assisted living facilities are located over one mile from the project site, the proposed project would not conflict with these sensitive receptors and impacts would be considered less than significant.
- e. **Odors.** Future Construction activities would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel powered engines that emit exhaust fumes. Asphalt paving as well as the application of architectural coatings are also sources of construction-related odors. However, construction-related emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday, and the exhaust odors would dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity of the equipment. Operation of the proposed project would involve the use of products for home maintenance such as paints or fertilizers and other landscaping materials. Odors created by home maintenance activities would be minimal, would quickly dissipate and would not differ substantially from those created by surrounding land uses. This impact would be considered less than significant.

**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 permit 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.

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

<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
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?		<b>X</b>	
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?		<b>X</b>	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>

**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 proposed project represents an urban infill project on a site that has been previously disturbed due to development activities in the area associated with Highway 50 and adjacent roadways. The site has been rough graded and is relatively level with no significant vegetation. The only vegetation onsite consists of annual grassland. No trees exist onsite. There are no natural communities, plant or animal, that exist onsite. The site is surrounded by a highway, a major road, and a collector road, and as such human activities would tend to scare sensitive animal species from the site. However, the site is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2, and as such the applicant prepared a special status plant survey (Special-Status Plant Survey for Westside Commercial, El Dorado County, California. ECORP Consulting, Inc. Environmental Consultants, September 20, 2006). This report is available for review in the project file located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA. The report identified special-status species that had the potential to exist onsite and targeted those species during the onsite survey.

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

The survey did not identify any special-status species on the project site. No impacts to special-status species or sensitive natural communities would occur as a result of this project.

- b. **Riparian Habitat.** There is no riparian on site or in proximity of the site that would be impacted by the proposed project. Thus, there would be no impact to riparian habitat.
- c. **Wetlands.** The report discussed in (a) above did identify a small depression on site that could be called a seasonal wetland. The site is approximately 0.01 acres in size. However, a determination from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers concludes, based upon a site visit with ECORP staff on January 18, 2007, that, “the approximately 0.007-acre isolated depressional feature on the above drawing (see Special-Status report referenced above) does not appear to have hydric soils and lacks any apparent interstate or foreign commerce connection. As such the site does not contain any features currently regulated by the Corps of Engineers.” (Letter dated March 30, 2007 from Kathy Norton, Chief, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). Based on this letter from the Army Corps of Engineers, impacts to wetlands are considered to be 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 project is located in an urbanized area, adjacent to major roadways, and residential and commercial development. Wildlife does not generally have access to this area given the project sites urban character, and thus it is devoid of wildlife corridors. As such, impacts to wildlife corridors is considered to be less than significant.
- e. **Biological Resources.** As discussed above in (a), there are no significant biological resources on the project site. There would be no impact.
- 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:** As the project site does not contain any significant biological resources, implementation of the project would not have an impact on biological resources.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a. **Historical Resources.** The applicant has conducted a cultural resources record search (letter from North Central Information Center (NCIC) to Sycamore Environmental Services dated March 21, 2007) that indicated that no recorded resources exist onsite or in the near vicinity of the project. Given previous disturbance on the site and surrounding areas, little potential exists for any historical resources. As such, no mitigation is required, and impacts are less than significant.
- b. **Pre-Historic Resources.** As discussed in (a.), a cultural resources records search was prepared for the property. No prehistoric resources have been identified in the vicinity of the project site, nor are any expected to exist onsite. The NCIC concluded that given the environmental setting there is low to moderate potential for pre-historic or ethnohistoric-period Native American sites in the project area. Also, as discussed above, there has been significant previous disturbance to the site due to the construction of Highway 50 and the Saratoga Way. This disturbance has resulted in rough grading of the site that would have removed any cultural materials. As such, no mitigation is required, and impacts are less than significant.
- c. **Paleontological Resources.** There are no unique paleontological or geologic features located on the project site. As such, impacts to these resources are less than significant.
- d. **Human Remains.** Based on the results of the cultural resource investigation, 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 records search conducted for the site, and the fact that the site has been previously disturbed, it is determined that there are no significant historic or pre-historic resources on the subject property that would be affected by the project. As such, impacts are considered to be less than significant. For this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			<b>X</b>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			<b>X</b>
iv) Landslides?			<b>X</b>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>

**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.** A geotechnical study prepared for the project site by Wallace Kuhl & Associates, Inc. found that the west branch of the Bear Mountains Fault is located approximately 1000 feet east of the project site according to the *Generalized Geology Map of the Folsom 15-Minute Quadrangle*. This branch of the fault represents the westernmost fault within the “Foothills Fault Zone.” The California Division of Mines and Geology have evaluated the Bear Mountains Fault Zone and determined that no special seismic zoning of this area is warranted. This zone did not warrant zoning because they it is either poorly defined at the surface or lack evidence of recent displacement (within the last 11,000 years).

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

Additionally, El Dorado County does not appear on the Alquist-Priolo lists for affected counties; however, due to the large number of seismic areas in California, the project site may experience some minimal groundshaking during seismic events. Impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating structures in the project area would be offset by compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards.

- b. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). The proposed project would result in approximately 4,935 cubic yards of cut, and 5,935 cubic yards of fill to be balanced onsite. One thousand (1,000) cubic yards of material will be imported to the site. 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.

The Auburn Soils series dominates soil types on the project site. These soils are considered to have a moderate to high erosion potential. However, the project site is gently sloped and surrounded by roads and developed property. Erosion potential is considered to be low, and thus impacts associated with erosion are considered less than significant.

The project will result in the removal of topsoil, but this impact is considered to be less than significant given that the project will result in a parcel that is entirely developed and stabilized in terms of soil erosion at its completion.

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.

- c. **Slope Stability.** The project would be located on a moderately-sloping site in El Dorado County. The potential for earthquake or ground shaking activity is low in the region due to the lack of active faults or geologically active sites in the area. During the site reconnaissance conducted by the Wallace Kuhl & Associates, Inc., no evidence of slope instability, such as landslides or mudflows, were observed. The potential for impacts related to the stability of the soils would be low because of lack of geologic activity. Therefore, impacts resulting from potentially unstable soils are less than significant.
- d. **Expansive soils.** Geologic study of the project area conducted by Wallace Kuhl & Associates determined that the top one to five feet of the site consist of unconsolidated artificial fill material underlain by bedrock of the Copper Hill Volcanics. The unconsolidated artificial will be scarified and utilized onsite where appropriate and compacted. Underlying volcanic materials are considered to be non-expansive. Thus, there would be no impact resulting from expansive soils.
- e. **Septic Systems.** The proposed project would be served by public sewer. Sewer service would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District. There would be no impact resulting from septic systems.

**Finding:** No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the design review request either directly or indirectly. For this "Geology and Soils" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

a. **Hazardous Substances.** Hazardous materials may be used and transported to and from the project site during construction of the proposed project including construction equipment fuels, paints, debris, etc. Additionally, once constructed, tenants of the site may use common commercial hazardous materials such as fertilizers, pesticides, paints, solvents, etc. The transport, use and storage of hazardous materials on the project site would be minimal and are strictly regulated at the federal, state, and local levels. Business plans describing the use of hazardous materials will be required

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

to be prepared, submitted, and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. In the unlikely event of a hazardous material leak or spill, the El Dorado Hills Fire Department would respond to manage the emergency. The closest fire station (Station 85) is approximately one mile north of the site. The transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials resulting from project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public. The potential for impact would be less than significant.

- b. **Hazardous Materials Release.** Hazardous materials may be used during construction and operation of the proposed project; however, such use would be minimal and would be strictly regulated at the federal, state, and local levels. In the unlikely event of the release of hazardous materials, the El Dorado Hills Fire Department would respond to manage the emergency. The closest fire station would be approximately one mile north of the site. See Section XIII, Response (a) for a full discussion of fire protection services. The potential for upset or accident conditions to occur would be considered low and therefore the potential impact would be less than significant.
- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no public schools within ¼ mile of the project site. KinderCare Learning Center is located within 0.15 miles of the project site. However, 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](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List), accessed October 18, 2008; *California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, Accessed October 18, 2008*; *California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, Accessed October 18, 2008*). There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The proposed project is not located with an airport land use plan area. The nearest airport to the proposed project site, Cameron Park Airport, is located approximately five miles northeast of the project site. Therefore there would be no potential 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 not conflict with any County-adopted emergency or disaster response or evacuation plans, as it would not change any existing roads, highways or traffic patterns. All businesses would be required to implement individual emergency response plans as part of their normal operations. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- h. **Fire Hazards.** The project is a commercial infill project located within an urban area that has adequate infrastructure in terms of fire hydrants, fire flow, and roadways. The project site is located within a moderate fire hazard area which would not generally be subjected to wildland fires as it is surrounded by existing development and roadways. The project will be required to meet all requirements of the El Dorado Hills Fire Department (letter dated June 25, 2008). With the incorporation of measures included in that letter and compliance with Chapter 8.08 of the El Dorado County Code, also known as the County Fire Hazard Ordinance, which includes rules and regulations covering emergency access, signing and numbering, and emergency water, fire hazard impacts are considered to be less than significant.

**Finding:** No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the proposed design review request, either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			<b>X</b>
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)?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			<b>X</b>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			<b>X</b>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

- a. **Water Quality Standards.** The project proposes to construct commercial/retail buildings. Commercial/retail uses would not directly discharge any wastewater or other effluent into streams. Wastewater generated by future land uses would be collected by EID’s Wastewater Treatment Plant. Wastewater from the project site would be treated and discharged in accordance with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) waste discharge requirements. The impact is less than significant.
- 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 as soil types on the project site are not generally conducive to groundwater recharge (volcanic bedrock), and the site represents a relatively small area (3.317 acres) in terms of recharge capability. 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 proposed project would not significantly alter or change any existing on site or off site drainage patterns. Currently drainage from the site, in the form of sheet flow, would flow to surrounding streets and drainage ditches. These patterns will remain post project, as all drainage from the site would be channeled to existing drainage infrastructure through the proposed storm drain system as shown on preliminary grading and drainage plans. There would be no impact.

The project would require coverage under the Regional Water Quality Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. Construction activities subject to this permit include clearing, grading and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Section A of the Construction General Permit describes the elements that must be contained in a SWPPP including, site map(s), Best Management Practices (BMPs), a visual and chemical monitoring program; and a sediment monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the 303(d) list for sediment. Implementation of an approved SWPPP would reduce the potential for impact to less than significant.

- e. **Stormwater Runoff.** As noted in d) above, the proposed project would generate an increase in surface runoff, which would enter existing stormwater drainage facilities. Compliance with the provisions of the County’s Design and Improvement Standards Manual would ensure existing drainage facilities can accommodate the additional runoff.  
  
 Runoff from commercial areas contributes to water quality degradation. Urban storm water runoff contains pesticides, oil, grease, heavy metals, motor vehicle fluids, other organics, and nutrients. Because these pollutants accumulate during the dry summer months, the first major autumn storm can flush a highly concentrated load to receiving waters and catch basins. However, after the “first flush,” contaminant concentrations in runoff would be greatly reduced. Impacts would be less than significant. Also, in 2004, the County adopted the *Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County*. The *Storm Water Management Plan* contains a chapter on Post Construction Runoff Control, which contains provisions designed to reduce the water quality impacts of runoff after completion of construction work. Compliance with these provisions would reduce potential water quality impacts of runoff to a level that is less than significant.
- 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. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0687 D last updated October 18, 1995) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain. There are no significant drainages or watercourses adjacent to the site that would contribute to site flooding. There would be no impact.

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

**Finding:** No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the design review request either directly or indirectly. For this “Hydrology” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- Established Community.** The project would not divide an established community. The project is proposed on property designated by the County’s General Plan as commercial and all impacts associated with commercial projects at this location have been considered in the General Plan EIR (available for review online at <http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm> or at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667). Thus, there would be no impact to an established community.
- Land Use Plan.** The project is a commercial infill project on commercially designated and zoned property. The project is consistent with the General Plan, thus there would be no impact.
- Habitat Conservation Plan.** Protected and sensitive natural areas within El Dorado County include: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database. The project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. Therefore there would be no potential impact.

**Finding:** The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan policies for commercial 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 impacts to “Land Use” would occur as a result of the proposed project.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a,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 8.19 miles to the northeast 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.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a. **Noise Standards.** The most significant source of noise to which future development on the project site would be exposed would be traffic noise from nearby roadways (Saratoga Way, El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Highway 50). The County’s General Plan Noise Contour Map for this area (Map B-5) shows entire project site would be within the 60 dBA contour by the year 2025, as well as surrounding residential and commercial uses to the west, east, north and south. Therefore, the proposed buildings would be exposed to noise levels of 60 dBA or greater. However, Table 5.10-4 of the County General Plan EIR, based on the State’s General Plan Guidelines, indicates the exposure of business commercial land uses to noise levels of up to 70 dBA is normally acceptable, while noise levels above 75 dBA are normally unacceptable. However, it is not likely that the building would be consistently exposed to noise levels exceeding 75 dB. Moreover, building practices and local building codes applicable to commercial buildings would reduce the interior noise levels of the buildings. This impact would be less than significant. Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan are not applicable to this project, as commercial/retail land uses are not designated noise-sensitive land uses.
- b. **Groundborne Vibration.** The project may generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction. However, those impacts are temporary and would be confined to standard construction hour limitations, as described in d) below. Moreover, the nearest sensitive land use to groundborne vibrations or noise are the residences west of the project site across Saratoga Way, which are approximately 100 feet away or more. It is unlikely that residences would experience groundborne vibration or noise impacts at that distance. The impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Ambient Noise Levels.** The project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, due mainly to vehicle traffic generated by the proposed commercial/retail development. However, this development would occur in an area of substantial commercial development, adjacent to busy roadways (El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Highway 50). The noise levels the project would generate would not be greater than those generated by the shopping center to the east and by traffic on Saratoga Way (upon extension), El Dorado Hills Boulevard, and Highway 50. The contribution of the project to noise levels would be relatively minor, and not likely to exceed the 3 dBA increase threshold. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Temporary Ambient Noise Levels.** The project may generate temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity during construction periods. This noise increase would be temporary and would cease after completion of construction. Also, the distance to the nearest residence, the land use most likely to be disturbed by construction noise, is approximately 100 feet. Construction noise would be attenuated by this distance. Nevertheless, noise levels on the project site during construction may be sufficiently elevated to be noticeable by nearby residents. This is a potentially significant impact.

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

**MM-NOI-1:** Construction activities shall be conducted in accordance with the County noise regulation or limited to the following hours and days: 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on any weekday; 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends and federally recognized holidays.

*Timing/Implementation:* The applicant shall include this measure as a note on all grading, building, and improvement plans.

*Enforcement/Monitoring Prior to issuance of construction/grading permits, El Dorado County Planning Services shall verify that this measure is incorporated as a note on the plans.*

Compliance with the mitigation measure would result in no construction noise during hours when residents are more likely to be disturbed by noise, particularly nighttime hours. With mitigation, the impacts 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.

**Finding:** With the incorporation of mitigation requiring limitation of construction hours, impacts would be less than significant. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction 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 project may induce some population growth in the area directly by proposing commercial development that would generate employment. However, potential employees would most likely come from the community of El Dorado Hills and nearby communities. Few employees are likely to come from areas farther away. The project is consistent with the land use designation under the County General Plan, which anticipates population growth in the County based on these designations. Therefore, anticipated population growth would not be altered by this project. The project would utilize existing infrastructure, and therefore would not require new infrastructure that may indirectly induce population growth. Impacts related to population growth would be less than significant.

b. **Housing Displacement.** The project will not displace any existing housing. There would be no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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 design review request, as this commercial land use was considered in the 2004 General Plan and would be considered an infill project. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**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.** Fire protection for the project site would be provided by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department Station 85 located at 1050 Wilson Boulevard just over one mile north of the project site. The El Dorado Hills Fire Department has submitted a letter dated June 25, 2008, that indicates that they would be able to serve the project as long as conditions of approval outlined in that letter are adhered to in accordance with El Dorado County General Plan, State Fire Safe Regulations as adopted by El Dorado County, and the California Fire Code. This impact would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection.** The El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department would provide law enforcement services to the proposed development. The El Dorado Hills Satellite Sheriff Station is located at 981 Governors Drive approximately

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

2.2 miles north of the project site. The development of commercial square footage 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.** School services in the El Dorado Hills area are provided by the Buckeye Union Elementary School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The proposed project is a commercial, which by itself would not generate an increase in student population requiring additional facilities. As discussed in the Population and Housing section, the project may attract new employees, but most would come from the surrounding area. The project is not expected to attract a significant number of new residents. Future development would be required to pay impact fees for new facilities adopted by both districts, which would mitigate any potential impacts of the project. The impact would be less than significant.
- d. **Parks.** The proposed project is a commercial project and would not generate a need for parks. As such, impacts are considered to be less than significant.
- e. **Other Government Services.** No other government services would be required as a result of the proposed commercial project. 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. **Parks and Recreation.** As noted in the Public Services section, the project is not expected to increase demand for park service as it is a commercial project, nor is it expected to induce significant population growth that would create the need for park services. There would be no impact.

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

- b. **Facilities Expansion.** The project does not include recreational facilities. As noted in a) above, the project would not generate an increase demand for park services. Therefore, the project would not require construction or expansion of additional facilities. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** No significant impacts to recreation are expected either directly or indirectly given that the project is a commercial project that would induce substantial population growth. For this “Recreation” category, there would be no impact.

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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 Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. in October of 2008 to establish and analyze existing and future traffic conditions based on the additional traffic generated by the proposed development of the Shops at El Dorado Hills project. Results of the study can be found in the report (*Saratoga Way Mixed Use Center, El Dorado Hills, CA*, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., October 9, 2008, addendum November 11, 2008) which is on file with El Dorado County Planning Services, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. 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. These improvements include: 1) construction of 5-foot sidewalk, curb, and gutter per DISM 101A along the Saratoga Way frontage beginning at the southwestern edge of the project site and extending to the intersection of Saratoga Way and El Dorado Hills Blvd, and (2) design and construction of a 14-foot wide left turn pocket at the primary entrance, according to the provisions of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual and/or AASHTO.

As proposed, the project will have three access to the site will be provided via three driveways along Saratoga Way. The northern driveway is right-in, right-out, only, while the other two driveways are full access. These driveways will distribute traffic onto area roadways as described in the traffic study. A summary of the 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 Hills Boulevard @ Wilson Boulevard
2. El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ Serrano Parkway
3. El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ Saratoga Way (north)
4. El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ Saratoga Way (south)
5. El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ US-50 Westbound Ramps
6. Latrobe Road @ US-50 Eastbound Ramps
7. Latrobe Road @ Town Center Boulevard
8. Latrobe Road @ White Rock Road
9. Saratoga Way @ Finders Way
10. Saratoga Way @ Arrowhead Drive
11. Saratoga Way @ Mammouth Way
12. Saratoga Way @ Primary Site Access Driveway (Center)

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

- A. Existing (2007) Conditions
- B. Existing (2007) plus Proposed Project Conditions
- C. Existing plus Approved Projects (2012) Conditions
- D. Existing plus Approved Projects (2012) plus Proposed Project Conditions
- E. Existing plus Approved Projects (2012) Conditions with Saratoga Way Extension
- F. Existing plus Approved Projects (2012) plus Proposed Project Conditions with Saratoga Way Extension
- G. Cumulative (2025) Conditions
- H. Cumulative (2025) plus Proposed Project Conditions

The study found that the project would be expected to generate 3,297 new daily trips, including 80 new AM peak-hour trips and 240 new PM peak-hour trips based on trip generation rates contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual.

Project impacts were determined by comparing conditions with the proposed project to those without the project. Impacts for intersections are created when traffic from the proposed project forces the LOS to fall below a specific threshold. The County’s standards specify the following:

“Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and State highways within the unincorporated areas of the County shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions.” (El Dorado County General Plan Policy TC-Xd)  
 The proposed project is within the El Dorado Hills Community Region.

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

“If a project causes the peak-hour level of service...on a County road or State highway that would otherwise meet the County standards (without the project) to exceed the [given] values, then the impact shall be considered significant.”

“If any county road or state highway fails to meet the [given] standards for peak hour level of service...under existing conditions, and the project will ‘significantly worsen’ conditions on the road or highway, then the impact shall be considered significant.” According to General Plan Policy TC-Xe, ‘significantly worsen’ is defined as “a 2 percent increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or the addition of 100 or more daily trips, or the addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.”

The final traffic analysis dated October 9, 2008, found potentially significant impacts at the Latrobe Road/Town Center Boulevard intersection under existing (2007) plus proposed project conditions, existing plus approved projects (2012) plus proposed project conditions, and existing plus approved projects (2012) plus proposed project with Saratoga Way Extension conditions. However, since completion of the study, the lane configuration of the westbound Town Center Boulevard approach to Latrobe Road has changed. The previous configuration of that approach was a **Left, Through, Right** configuration. The current configuration is a **Left, Through/Right, Right** configuration. With this modification, the intersection operates, and would operate at an acceptable level of service, LOS “D”, and thus previously identified significant impacts are no longer considered significant. An addendum to the traffic study (Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. letter dated November 11, 2008) confirms these conditions and provides backup documentation to this effect. As a result of this modification, the only potentially significant impact is as follows:

Existing (2007) plus Proposed Project Conditions

***El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ US-50 Westbound Ramps***

The intersection operates at LOS F during the AM peak-hour without the project and the project contributes more than 10 trips to the intersection during this peak-hour. **This is a significant impact.**

Planned improvements to this intersection, as described below, would mitigate this impact to less than significant levels:

***El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ US-50 Westbound Ramps***

The significant impact at this intersection during the AM peak-hour is mitigated with the implementation of the ultimate configuration for the El Dorado Hills Boulevard intersection with US-50 WB Ramps. The reconfiguration of this intersection is included in the County’s *Fee Program Project List – 2004 General Plan*. With incorporation of the ultimate intersection lane configuration, the intersection would operate at LOS C during the AM peak-hour.

With the CIP proposed and completed improvements, and road improvements required by DOT to area roadways (Saratoga Way) 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.** Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. evaluated the project for potential hazards in their traffic analysis, which included a sight distance evaluation and a preliminary traffic safety evaluation. The study found that the project would not create or exacerbate hazards in the area, nor were there any hazards that might impact the project, as long as project landscaping was maintained in such a manner so as not to obstruct sight distance along Saratoga Way. There would be no impact.

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

- e. **Emergency Access.** The project includes three access points to the project on Saratoga Way. The proposed project site has adequate access from Saratoga Way. The interior roadways are anticipated to provide adequate on-site circulation within the development. Additionally, the project design must comply with emergency access standards contained in the El Dorado County SRA Fire Safe Regulations (Title 14, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Article 2 Emergency Access) with regard to road width, surface, grade, and radius; turnouts; driveways; and gating. Fire Department review of plans associated with building permits would ensure compliance with these standards. This impact would be less than significant.
- f. **Parking.** The applicant has proposed 153 parking stalls to be constructed with the project. Per the County’s Zoning Ordinance, Section 17.18.060, the applicant would be required to provide 152 spaces (*22,182 square feet general merchandising @ 1 space/300 s.f. = 74 spaces; 8,500 s.f. restaurant with 234 fixed seats @ 1 space/3 fixed seats = 78 spaces, Total Required = 152 spaces*).

In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 17.18.060.16, the applicant is required to provide for 1 recreational vehicle (RV) parking space for every 10 spaces of parking designated for the restaurant use. Thus, eight (8) RV spaces would be required for the proposed restaurant uses. The applicant has not provided such parking spaces in their parking plan. This is considered a potentially significant parking impact. However, Section 17.18.040.C & D allows for administrative relief of this requirement when such relief is warranted as determined by the planning commission or planning director.

In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 17.18.080, the applicant is required to provide for 1 off-street loading space per 15,000 square feet of building area. The applicant has provided one space for Building 1 (Walgreens), but has not made provisions for an off-street loading space for Buildings 2 & 3. This could create potential circulation conflicts if deliveries occur during peak business hours. In order to mitigate this potentially significant traffic impact, the following mitigation is required:

**MM-TRAF-1:** The applicant shall post signs on Buildings 2 & 3 in a conspicuous location that notifies delivery drivers that deliveries are only allowed from 6 a.m. to 10 a.m., seven days a week.

*Timing/Implementation: The applicant shall include this measure as a note on all building, and improvement plans.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring Prior to issuance of building permits, El Dorado County Planning Services shall verify that this measure is incorporated as a note on the plans. Planning Services shall verify that signs have been posted in an acceptable location prior to occupancy clearance.*

- 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, significant traffic impacts may occur due to the addition of traffic to intersections already operating at LOS “F”. However, planned improvements to the potentially impacted intersection would mitigate this impact to a level of insignificance. Proposed parking lot layout may result in circulation conflicts during deliveries as noted above, creating a potentially significant circulation impact. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded, or have been mitigated to a level of insignificance with the incorporation of proposed mitigation measures or planned improvements to roadway systems.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Wastewater.** Wastewater treatment would be provided for the site by El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). The Regional Water Quality Control Board sets treatment requirements for the collection, processing, and disposal of waste, with which EID must comply. It has been determined that the proposed project would utilize approximately 6.0 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of wastewater treatment. The project has obtained 8.0 EDUs of wastewater treatment from Serrano Associates, LLC (EID letter dated January 22, 2007), which already had 152.203 EDUs allocated to them by the EID. As the project would utilize EDUs already accounted for by the EID, the project would not lead to the EID's wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) exceeding treatment requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- b. **Facilities Expansion.** Water and sewer service for the proposed development would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Existing water and sewer lines exist on or immediately adjacent to the property. Currently a 6-inch water line exists on the northern portion of the project parcel. The project would connect to this line with no facility expansions required. A large sewer trunk line exists on the southern boundary of the project parcel. The project would connect to this sewer line with appropriate pressure reduction as determined by the EID; no facilities expansion would be required as a result of this connection. As stated above, the EID has already accounted for the water and sewer needs associated with the Serrano Associates development. Given this fact, there will not be a need to expand water or wastewater facilities as a result of this project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Stormwater.** The proposed project would not require construction of new or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities offsite. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, the project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County’s Design and Improvement Standards Manual related to storm drainage. Compliance with these provisions would ensure existing drainage facilities can accommodate the additional runoff. The project will construct an onsite stormwater drainage facilities which will tie into the existing stormwater drainage system adjacent to the site. The impacts are less than significant.
- d. **Water Supply.** As discussed above, the project has obtained a transfer of both water and wastewater EDUs allocated to Serrano Associates, LLC. The EID, which would provide water to the proposed project, has transferred 8.0 EDUs from Serrano Associates to the applicant (letter dated January 22, 2008). Serrano had 61.362 EDUs of Assessment District #3 water currently allocated to property under its ownership. The resultant amount allocated to Serrano Associates’ projects would be 53.362 EDUs after the transfer. There would be less than significant impacts to water supply, as the EID has already accounted for provision of water service to this project.
- e. **Wastewater Facilities.** As discussed in (a & b) above, existing EID facilities are adequate to serve the proposed project with no expansion of either the infrastructure or the wastewater treatment plant. Impacts to wastewater facilities would be less than significant.
- 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:** It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to water, wastewater, drainage, or solid waste utilities. Identified thresholds of significance for the utilities and service systems category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

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

**Discussion:**

- a. The project would not cause degradation of scenic resources, biological resources, water quality, cultural and historic resources, or other resources associated with the physical and biological communities and environment of the project. There would be no impact to natural resources.
- 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. As outlined and discussed in this document, as mitigated and conditioned, this project proposes a less than significant chance of having project-related environmental effects (air quality, noise, transportation/traffic) which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

The following documents are available at El Dorado County 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.)