



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Cameron Hills (Rezone Z07-0027, Planned Development PD 07-0017, Tract Map TM 96-1325E)

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: Douglas Hanzlick c/o Clifford Stokes, 4312 Anthony Court, Ste. A, Rocklin, CA 95677-2100

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Douglas Hanzlick c/o Clifford Stokes, 4312 Anthony Court, Ste. A, Rocklin, CA 95677-2100

Project Agent's Name and Address: Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., 4080 Plaza Goldorado Circle, Cameron Park, CA 95682-1812

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

Project Location: West side of Cambridge Road approximately 150 feet south of the intersection with Berry Road

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 116-010-04 (20.13 acres)

Zoning: R1 (One Family Residential)

Section: 28/29/32/33 **T:** 10N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: HDR (High Density Residential)

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

1. Rezone from R1(One Family Residential) to R1-PD (One Family Residential/Planned Development)
2. Development Plan to allow clustering of lots to avoid sensitive plant species, steep slopes, and a reduction in the minimum parcel size of 0.5 acres in the R1 zone district and 5 acres in the Airport Safety Zone 3.
3. Tentative Subdivision Map to create 41 residential lots ranging in size from 0.14 to 0.47 acres and five lettered open space lots totaling 8.16 acres.
4. Design Waiver from required sidewalk width of 6 feet to 4 feet.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences)
Site:	R1	HDR	Vacant Land
North:	R1	HDR	Residential development
East:	R1	HDR	Residential development
South:	R1	HDR	Residential development
West:	RE-5	HDR	Vacant land

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is a 20.13-acre site set amidst an existing residential neighborhood. The site is currently vacant, with no existing development. It is surrounded by high-density residential development to the east, south, and north, with vacant land and lower density residential uses to the north. Topography onsite is moderate to steep with the bulk of the property having slopes of 15 to 20 percent.

The steepest slopes are in the westernmost corner adjacent to Woodleigh Lane, with slopes becoming gentler as they approach Cambridge Road. Elevations range from 1,225 feet to 1,450 feet above sea level (asl). Vegetation on the majority of the site consists of Gabbroic northern mixed chaparral. Vegetation is dominated by chaparral shrubs including chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*), manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* sp.), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), western rosebud (*Cercis occidentalis*), and hoary coffeeberry (*Rhamnus tomentella*). The herb layer is dominated by *Salvia sonomensis*, gold-wire (*Hypericum concinnum*), and annual species. Several interior live oaks (*Quercus wislizenii* var. *wislizenii*) occur on the project site. The mapped soil unit on the project site is Rescue extremely stony sandy loam. There are several ephemeral channels on the project site that drain the site to the south into Deer Creek. There are no wetlands onsite. There are no known cultural resources on the project site.

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
X	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	X	Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation	X	Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- 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: December 31, 2008

Printed Name: Gordon Bell For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a. **Scenic Vista.** A review of the Important Public Scenic Views identified in the El Dorado County General Plan revealed that there are no important scenic vistas within the vicinity of the project site. The existing character of the neighborhood is residential, and the proposed project would mirror that character as seen from surrounding areas. As the project site would not be visible from any identified public scenic vistas; the 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 12 miles west of this portion of Highway 50 and would not be visible from the highway. The proposed project would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.
- c. **Visual Character.** The project would create 41 new high-density residential lots, ranging from 0.14 to 0.47 acres in size, and 5 open space lots totaling 8.16 acres. The project would enable the construction of 41 new single-family residences on the newly created lots. Development of these homes and supporting infrastructure, including the removal of existing vegetation, would result in a change to the existing visual character of the site. Adjacent land uses include similar development consisting of homes on similarly sized parcels. Therefore, the project would be an extension of existing similar development and would not result in substantial changes to the visual character of the area and its surroundings, especially with the inclusion of the proposed open space which would retain some of the rural aspects of this area. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- d. **Light and Glare.** Lighting associated with residential development on this site would create new sources of light and glare consistent with existing neighborhood lighting. However, all future outdoor lighting for future development would be required to conform to Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America’s (IESNA) full cut-off designation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The proposed project has the potential to result in the construction of future residences and other structures on high density residential parcels. This development would be consistent with the character of surrounding medium and high-

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

density development. Future building would not be expected to impinge upon existing scenic vistas, and no scenic resources exist within the project vicinity. Light and glare associated with construction of new residences in previously undeveloped areas would not be expected to be significant and would be required to conform to zoning ordinance requirements. For this “Aesthetics” category, impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <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. 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. Adjacent property is zoned for high-density residential uses, and the majority is developed as such. There would be no impact.
- c. **Non-agricultural Use.** This project is located in an area zoned for high-density residential use, and not agriculture. Surrounding properties are already utilized for high-density residential uses and there is no potential for agricultural activities to occur in the area given the urban nature of the neighborhood and relatively small lot sizes. There are no agricultural support facilities in the area, nor are there any other agricultural pursuits in the vicinity of the project site. As such, the project would not result in conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses as a result of its implementation. There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to agricultural land are expected and no mitigation is required. The Rezone request, Planned Development and Tentative Map would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and proposed future uses in the neighborhood. For this “Agriculture” category, there would be no impact.

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

a. **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 (O₃). Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM10) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to meet the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

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

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

There would 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 EDCAPCD Fugitive Dust Emissions regulations would mitigate this impact to less than significant levels, as sensitive receptors are not immediately adjacent to proposed grading activities. In order to ensure that appropriate measures are applied to the grading activities associated with the project, project conditions requiring a Fugitive Dust Plan (FDP) to be submitted to the APCD shall be required.

Mobile emission sources such as automobiles, trucks, buses, and other internal combustion vehicles are responsible for more than 70 percent of the air pollution within the County, and more than one-half of California’s air pollution. In addition to pollution generated by mobile emissions sources, additional vehicle emission pollutants are carried into the western slope portion of El Dorado County from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area by prevailing winds. Future grading would potentially emit minor, temporary and intermittent criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and would be subject to El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District standards at that time. Impacts would be less than significant with adherence to APCD Standard Rules and Regulations.

- 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. Sensitive receptors within the vicinity of the project site may consist of residences immediately bordering the project site. As noted in Response (a) above, neither the construction nor operation of the proposed project would result in substantial increases in pollutant concentrations. Once developed, the project site would contain residences that are considered sensitive receptors. However, no sources of substantial pollutant concentrations are located in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impact.
- 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: 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 APCD standard conditions.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife		X	

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
Service?			
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X	
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X

Discussion:

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

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

a. **Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities.** Special status species have been evaluated on the project site several times. These studies/surveys included a Sensitive Plant Survey completed on May 29, 1997 by Michael F. Baad Ph.D. and a “Biological Resources Evaluation Report for the Cameron Hills Project, El Dorado County, CA,” prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., October 2, 2006. Both studies identified sensitive plant species on the project site. These species include the Federal threatened Layne’s butterweed (*Senecio layneae*), and special-status plants which include the Bisbee Peak rush-rose (*Helianthemum suffrutescens*) and El Dorado County mule ears (*Wyethia reticulata*). The Sycamore Environmental study identified one animal species of special concern (California horned lizard), impacts and mitigations are discussed below.

The four known records of California horned lizard from El Dorado County (two in the California Natural Diversity Database and two observations by Sycamore Environmental) are all from gabbroic northern mixed chaparral in areas of gabbro soil, such as the project. After the Biological Resources Evaluation was completed (2 October 2006), Sycamore Environmental observed a California horned lizard basking on Woodleigh Lane approximately 500 feet west of the project on 24 May 2007. It is likely that a population of California horned lizard persists in the area of the project, primarily in undeveloped areas that contain gabbroic northern mixed chaparral. The project avoids grading of approximately 6.3 acres of on-site gabbroic northern mixed chaparral that is California horned lizard habitat.

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

The project has a potentially significant impact because grading would remove California horned lizard habitat and could cause mortality or injury to individual lizards.

The County rare plant mitigation fee is used for the acquisition and management of rare plant habitat that is also California horned lizard habitat (gabbroic northern mixed chaparral). Payment of the rare plant mitigation fee for zone 1 would permanently protect California horned lizard habitat elsewhere in the County.

MM BIO-1: A pre-construction survey for California horned lizard shall be conducted not more than one hour prior to clearing or grubbing of vegetation. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted at a time of day when the lizard is most likely to be found (basking behavior during mid-morning), determined by a qualified biologist, and most likely to result in detection and capture of California horned lizard if present. California horned lizards, if found, shall be moved to an open space area on-site.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading permits, a note shall be included on all grading plans which states the above measure. This measure shall be implemented prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading on the project site.

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

The project site consists of gabbroic northern mixed chaparral with Rescue series soils and provides habitat for the Pine Hill Plants. A botanical inventory of the project site was conducted during the evident and identifiable period of all of the Pine Hill Plants. Three of the Pine Hill Plants were found on-site, Layne’s butterweed, Bisbee Peak rush-rose, and El Dorado County mule ears.

A total of 308 Layne’s butterweed plants were counted in the project site. Project grading would remove approximately 195 Layne’s butterweed plants. The remaining approximately 113 Layne’s butterweed plants would be avoided and included in project open space.

A total of 10,200 El Dorado County mule ears plants were estimated on the project site. El Dorado County mule ears grow from spreading underground stems called rhizomes. The spreading rhizomes and aboveground stems often occur as distinct patches of a few yards in width. Due to the rhizomes, aboveground stems that appear separate at the soil surface may be part of the same individual. The separate above-ground stems are termed ramets. The estimate for El Dorado County mule ears plants is an estimate of the number of ramets. Consequently, the number of actual individuals of El Dorado County mule ears on the project site is likely substantially less than 10,200. Project grading would remove approximately 1,720 El Dorado County mule ears plants (ramets). The remaining approximately 8,480 El Dorado County mule ears plants (ramets) would be avoided and included in project open space.

A total of eight Bisbee Peak rush-rose plants were counted in the project site. The scientific taxonomic status of Bisbee Peak rush-rose is not settled. The California Native Plant Society considers it a plant with uncertain taxonomic status (List 3). The most widely used California flora, The Jepson Manual, (Hickman, ed. 1993), considers Bisbee Peak rush-rose to be a synonym of a more common plant, *Helianthemum scoparium*. The Jepson Flora Project (2008) provides current information on taxonomy and indicates that the taxa are conspecific and would both be treated as *Helianthemum scoparium* in the next edition of The Jepson Manual. Bisbee Peak rush-rose is considered a rare species by El Dorado County Code Chapter 17.71. All rush-rose plants found on the project site were conservatively identified as Bisbee Peak rush-rose, because that taxon has previously been identified from the gabbro soil area of El Dorado County, and because El Dorado County Code recognizes the taxon. Project grading would remove six rush-rose plants. The remaining two rush-rose plants would be avoided and included in project open space.

The project has a potentially significant impact on the Pine Hill Plants because grading would remove gabbroic northern mixed chaparral habitat and would remove individuals of three of the Pine Hill Plant species. A combination of the

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

payment of required in-lieu fees for Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1, habitat preservation and restoration, and long-term avoidance measures would reduce impacts to Pine Hill Plants to less than significant levels. Proposed measures are listed below.

MM BIO-2: The Pine Hill Plants that are within the limits of grading shall be transplanted and/or propagated to designated open space areas. The transplanting and/or propagation shall be overseen by a qualified botanist, approved by the El Dorado County Planning Services. The botanist shall identify the location to receive the plants, identify the methods of transplantation and/or propagation, and oversee the work.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of the grading permits, the applicant shall prepare a transplant/propagation plan for plants within the limits of grading areas. The applicant shall submit the plan with the qualifications of the botanist to El Dorado County Planning Services for review and approval. The Pine Hill Plants within the grading limits would be transplanted and/or propagated prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

MM BIO-3: A deed restriction shall be placed on the project open space and incorporated into the CC&Rs except for a 25-foot buffer from limit of grading. The deed restriction shall restrict activities not compatible with long-term preservation of the Pine Hill Plants such as grading, plowing, or use of herbicides not specific to groups of plants that do not include any of the Pine Hill Plant species present on the site. The deed restriction shall allow activities compatible with the long-term preservation of the Pine Hill Plants such as large brush removal above the soil surface, and passive recreational uses such as a trail. The deed restriction shall be written in consultation with a qualified botanist, approved by El Dorado County Planning Services.

Timing/Implementation: The deed restriction shall be recorded at the time of filing of the final map. This deed restriction shall be noted and incorporated into the project CC&Rs.

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

With incorporation of the above listed mitigation measures, impacts to sensitive plant and animal species would be reduced to less than significant levels.

- b. **Riparian Habitat/Sensitive Natural Communities.** Sycamore Environmental Consultants prepared a report (*Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for the Cameron Hills Project, El Dorado County, CA*, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., October 2, 2006), that identified six (6) ephemeral channels on the subject site. Analysis of these channels for suitability as wetlands was evaluated in that report. The findings of the report were that none of the channels qualified as wetlands, nor did they represent any riparian characteristics, as all vegetation surrounding the channels were “Upland” in nature. There would be no impact to riparian habitat.

Two sensitive natural communities occur on the project site: oak canopy and northern gabbroic mixed chaparral. Oak canopy is discussed under Item e).

Gabbroic northern mixed chaparral is considered a high priority for inventory in CNDDDB by DFG (List of California terrestrial natural communities recognized by the California Natural Diversity Database, September 2003). Project grading would remove approximately 13.75 acres of gabbroic northern mixed chaparral. Approximately 6.3 acres of gabbroic northern mixed chaparral are avoided. The removal of gabbroic northern mixed chaparral is a potentially significant impact. The County rare plant fee is used for the acquisition and management of Pine Hill Plant habitat

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

(gabbroic northern mixed chaparral) elsewhere in the County. Payment of in-lieu fees for properties in Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1 reduces the impact to gabbroic northern mixed chaparral to less than significant levels.

- c. **Wetlands.** There are six ephemeral channels on the project site. Ephemeral channels lack a groundwater component of flow. Ephemeral channels flow only in direct response to surface stormwater runoff and hence only flow for a few hours or days after a storm event. The ephemeral channels do not support riparian communities due to lack of groundwater and the brief, discontinuous flow regime, and hence do not provide habitat values substantially different from adjacent uplands or serve as corridors for wildlife. General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 only contains setback standards for perennial and intermittent channels. Ephemeral channels are specifically excluded from the definition of intermittent channels by the “Interim Interpretive Guidelines for El Dorado County General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4” adopted 22 June 2006.

The ephemeral channels do not appear to meet the “significant nexus” test established for Section 44 Clean Water Act jurisdiction by the Rapanos Supreme Court case and ensuing joint Corps/EPA guidance. The significance nexus test requires a “non-relatively permanent water” to have more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical, or biological integrity of a downstream traditionally navigable water. The nearest downstream traditionally navigable water from the ephemeral channels is the Mokelumne River, approximately 50 river miles downstream.

The project would be subject to the existing County “Erosion control for site development” policy that addresses prevention of significant downstream water quality impacts, therefore there would be no impact.

- d. **Wildlife corridors.** The ephemeral channels are not large enough to support fish or other aquatic or riparian species. The project site is surrounded by existing development and would not impact migratory wildlife corridors. The project is not located in a County-designated important habitat area for migratory deer herds. The project is not located in a County designated important biological corridor (IBC).

The project site does provide potential nesting habitat for birds of prey and birds listed by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). A bird could establish a nest prior to construction. The nesting season is generally 1 February through 31 August. An active nest is one which contains eggs or unfledged young. A potentially significant impact would occur if an active nest was removed during construction or if construction disturbance caused nest abandonment prior to fledging of the young birds. Significant impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant with the implementation of the mitigation measures described below.

MM-BIO-4: If construction begins outside the 1 February to 31 August breeding season, there would be no need to conduct a preconstruction survey for active nests. If a nest becomes active after construction has begun, then the bird is considered adapted to construction disturbance.

- If construction is scheduled to begin between 1 February and 31 August, then a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for active nests in the construction footprint and within 250 ft of the construction footprint from publicly accessible areas within two weeks prior to construction. If no active nest of a bird of prey or Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) bird is found, then no further mitigation measures are necessary.
- If an active nest of a bird of prey or MBTA bird is found, then the biologist shall flag a minimum 250-foot Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) around the nest if the nest is of a bird of prey, and a minimum 100-foot ESA around the nest if the nest is of an MBTA bird other than a bird of prey.

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

- No construction activity shall be allowed in the ESA until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or unless monitoring determines that a smaller buffer would protect the active nest.
- The buffer may be reduced if the biologist monitors the construction activities and determines that no disturbance to the active nest is occurring. The size of suitable buffers depends on the species of bird, the location of the nest relative to the project, project activities during the time the nest is active, and other situation specific conditions.

Timing/Implementation: The above-described measures shall be included as a note on all grading plans. El Dorado County Planning Services shall verify that this measure has been included as a note on grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit. The applicant shall conduct the monitoring no more than two weeks prior to clearing and grubbing if construction begins during the nesting season (1 February – 31 August).

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

- e. **Biological Resources.** As determined by an Arborist Report prepared by Phil Mosbacher (certified arborist) for Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc. (letter report dated December 8, 2008), the 20-acre project site contains approximately 0.719 acres of oak canopy. This includes all oak canopy, including dead and dying oaks. This canopy constitutes approximately 3.60% of the project site. The existing oak canopy would be impacted as part of road and infrastructure improvements and future residential development of the site. It is highly likely that all existing oak canopy would be impacted or removed as a result of this development, thus creating impact to this canopy that would be mitigated with adherence to County policies. Consistent with the Oak Woodland Management Plan which requires 10% retention for this project given the existing oak canopy coverage on the site, the applicant would be allowed to remove and mitigate (replace or payment of in-lieu fees) approximately 0.072 acres under “Option A” of the Oak Woodland Management Plan. Any oak canopy removal beyond 0.072 acres (the remaining 0.647 acres of oak canopy) would be required to mitigate under “Option B” of the Oak Woodland Plan. Conditions of approval to be included in the staff report would require adherence to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and the Oak Woodland Management Plan. Given that the applicant is able to adhere to this policy and the OWMP, impacts due to conflicts with local policies or ordinances are considered to be less than significant.
- f. **Adopted Plans.** The project contains oak canopy subject to the County Oak Woodland Management Plan, see Item e) above. The County is currently drafting an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans that are applicable to the project site.

The project site is not in designated critical habitat for any species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. The project site is not in the USFWS recovery plan (2002) recommended preserve boundary for the Pine Hill Plants. The project is in Core Area 4 of the Recovery Plan for the California red-legged frog. Core Area 4 encompasses virtually all of southwestern El Dorado County and much of northern Amador County. The project site does not contain breeding or aestivation habitat for California red-legged frog, is outside the dispersal range of the nearest known population, and is surrounded by existing development. The project would not interfere with implementation of the recovery plan, therefore there would be no impact.

Finding: Potential impacts could result to biological resources due to the proposed project. The project would impact sensitive plant and animal species and oak canopy onsite. Implementation of mitigation measures identified above and adherence to the Oak Woodland Management Plan would reduce these potential impacts to biological resources to less than significant levels. Impacts to riparian habitat, wetlands, and migratory wildlife habitats, as well as conflicts with community conservation plans and habitat conservation plans have been determined to be less than significant. It has been determined

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

that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to biological resources with the incorporation of the above mentioned mitigation measures.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- Historical Resources.** A field survey was conducted on the project site for cultural resources by Human Resource Associates to determine if the site contained archaeological or cultural resources. The survey report concluded that there is no indication of sites in the area based upon a literature search and a field visit. As such, no mitigation is required, and impacts are less than significant.
- Pre-Historic Resources.** As discussed in (a.), a cultural resource field investigation was conducted for the proposed project and surmised that there are no cultural resources of significance on the project site. As such, impacts are considered to be less than significant.
- Paleontological Resources.** There are no unique paleontological or geologic features located on the project site. As such, there would be no impact.
- 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 investigations conducted on the site, 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

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

considered to be less than significant. For this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X	
iv) Landslides?		X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?		X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X

Discussion:

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

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

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

- a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** According to the Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent areas, faults located in the proximity of the project area are a part of the Melones Fault Zone and the Bear Mountains Faults Zone, both of which are a part of the Foothills Fault System. The California Division of Mines and Geology has determined that the Melones Fault and the Bear Mountains Fault Zones were evaluated and no special seismic zoning of these areas was recommended. These zones did not warrant zoning because they are either poorly defined at the surface or lack evidence of recent displacement. According to the California Division of Mines and Geology (Jennings, 1992), the nearest known active fault is the Dunnigan Hills Fault located approximately 40 miles to the northwest.

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. Any potential impact caused by locating structures in the project area would be offset by compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. Impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant.

- b. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** All grading activities exceeding 50 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719). The proposed project would result in approximately 64,076 cubic yards of cut, and 63,842 cubic yards of fill, with 234 cubic yards to be exported offsite. 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 future site grading and construction of foundations and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions. The issuance of a grading permit would address potential impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Rescue Soils series dominates soil types on the project site. These soils are considered to have a moderate to high erosion potential. The majority of the site is moderately sloped, with the majority of development activities to occur on slopes of less than 30%, thus minimizing the potential for erosion and sedimentation to occur due to home and road and driveway construction. Several of the lots (Lots 7, 8, and 14) do have small areas of 30% or greater slopes. Development on these lots would be required to adhere to General Plan Policy 7.1.2.1, prohibiting development on slopes greater than 30%. The remainder of the steeper sloped areas (areas in excess of 30%) are proposed to remain undeveloped, primarily in Open Space Lot "A". Impacts to erosion and sedimentation are considered to be less than significant.

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 faults or geologically active sites in the area. 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.** Expansive soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the site has Rescue (RgE2) soils. These soils are listed as having low shrink-swell potential. Table 18-1-

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

B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The applicant may be required to submit a site-specific geotechnical study prior to obtaining a building permit for the residential units. The results of the site-specific geotechnical study would be used to ensure that any site specific conditions related to shrink-swell potential are identified and reflected in project design to minimize the risk to property and people. Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. **Septic Systems.** No septic systems are proposed as a result of the project. There would be no impact from septic systems.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- 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, residents of the site may use common household 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. In the unlikely event of a hazardous material leak or spill, the Cameron Park Fire Department (Station #89, 3200 Country Club Drive, Cameron Park, CA 95682) would respond to manage the emergency. The closest fire station is located approximately 2.5 miles from the project 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 Cameron Park Fire Department would respond to manage the emergency. The closest fire station would be over 2.5 miles southeast 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 schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.
 - d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (*California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List)*, http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List, accessed November 24, 2008; *California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004*; *California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004*). There would be no impact.
 - e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is located within Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport. The project as designed complies with applicable General Plan and Airport Land Use Plan policies. The residential project would not create any hazards for airport use in the area, as illustrated by the fact that the project is surrounded by other high-density residential development. The impacts would be less than significant.
 - 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. The project design must comply with emergency access standards contained in the El Dorado County SRA Fire Safe Regulations (Title 14,

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

Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Article 2 Emergency Access) with regard to road width, surface, grade, and radius; turnouts; driveways; and gating. County review of the proposed Tentative Subdivision Map would ensure compliance with these standards. This impact would be considered less than significant.

- h. **Fire Hazards.** The El Dorado County: Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA Map (Adopted by Cal Fire, November 7, 2007) identifies the project site as being located in an area of “High Fire Hazard”. Any potential development activity would be subject to SRA Fire Safe Regulations, which provide standards for basic emergency access and perimeter wildfire protection. The proposed residential development has been designed in compliance with state and local fire district regulations would reduce the risks associated with wildland fires to a less than significant level. Electrical equipment would be enclosed, and the project would not include any operations (e.g., use of hazardous materials or processes) that would substantially increase fire hazard risk. Emergency response access to the site and surrounding development would not be adversely affected, as discussed above. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

Finding: No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the rezone, development plan and tentative map either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
 - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a. **Water Quality Standards.** There are six ephemeral channels on the project site that eventually flow into Deer Creek. These channels are generally dry and do not conduct water flow except for immediately after storm events (see Biological Resources). The likelihood that activities onsite would have an impact on water quality is primarily limited to construction activities related to grading (movement of earth) during the wet season. Adherence to existing El Dorado County regulations (Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance) which would require utilization of Best Management Practices (BMPs) on site to minimize potential impacts from construction-related runoff would reduce impacts to a level of insignificance.
- 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, especially in light of the fact that the site is moderately to steeply sloped. Also, the project would avoid major drainages where groundwater recharge is most likely to occur. 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 project would have an impact on normal drainage patterns, through site grading and the creation of additional impervious surfaces. The applicant has prepared a preliminary drainage report that discusses pre- and post-project conditions (*Preliminary Drainage Report for Cameron Hills, Cameron Park, CA*, Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., February 21, 2007). As proposed, drainage would be collected at the rear of lots, directed to the street and into appropriate storm drains. Substantial erosion or siltation can occur without use of appropriate revegetation and erosion control measures. Drainage outfalls and stormwater collection would be channelized and carried into the existing stormwater drainage system in the area as illustrated on the applicant’s grading and drainage plan. As part of standard conditions, the applicant is required to submit an erosion control plan to the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District for review and approval. The erosion control plan includes appropriate practices and techniques to ensure that erosion and siltation resulting from construction is reduced to levels deemed acceptable to the District. Standard grading conditions would reduce the impact to be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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.** According to the drainage study prepared for the proposed project, the carrying capacities of existing natural drainage ways would be unaffected by project implementation, as offsite drainage flows are not expected to increase substantially, and may actually decrease. There would be no impact.
- f. **Water Quality Degradation.** Pollutant discharges from construction activities would be minimized through the implementation of an approved SWPPP (see Response (c) above). Once the project site has been developed, pollutant discharges to waterways, including automotive greases and oils, heavy metals, pesticides and fertilizers, may increase due to runoff flowing over project driveways, roads, and landscaped areas. Operational-phase stormwater pollution would not be regulated by the Clean Water Act; however, El Dorado County has developed programs to inform residents of ways to minimize polluted runoff from lawn care, septic system maintenance, auto care, and landscaping activities. The proposed project consists of 41 new residential homes and would not be expected to provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This impact would be considered 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 0725 C last updated December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the rezone, development plan, and tentative subdivision map 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:

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

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

- a. **Established Community.** The project is an infill project in an existing community. The project would actually connect existing neighborhoods to the north and south of the project by providing a through road from Harvey Road to Kimberly Road. There would be no impact.
- b. **Land Use Plan.** The project includes the Rezoning of the site from One Family Residential (R1) to One Family Residential/Planned Development (R1/PD) to allow for clustering of units to avoid topographical and biological constraints as well as maintain consistency with the General Plan which requires addition of the PD overlay for development within the Airport Safety zone overlay. The proposed project would not create a conflict with the land use plan, as the project site is already designated for High Density Residential (HDR) uses, and development would be consistent with surrounding land use patterns which are also high density residential in nature. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- c. **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. There would be no impact.

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

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <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.

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

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 7.00 miles to the east 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.

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

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.** Noise would be generated on the project site from construction activities associated with new homes and improvements to roadways and infrastructure. This noise generation would be temporary and intermittent in nature. Construction noise would be subject to Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. This policy identifies maximum allowable noise exposure for construction generated noise, and outlines limited construction hours to ensure less than significant impacts from construction-related noise. However, in order to ensure that

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

contractors adhere to these hours, mitigation is proposed, consistent with General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11, in order to reduce this potentially significant impact and ensure that this measure is included on project plans.

MM NOI-1: Construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on weekends and federally-recognized holidays.

Timing/Implementation: All building and grading plans shall include a note reflecting the above referenced measure. El Dorado County Planning Services shall verify that this note has been included on all grading and building plans prior to issuance of grading and building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services shall verify that the above measure has been incorporated on the building and grading plans prior to issuance of building and grading permits.

Compliance with the above noise policy would be sufficient to ensure that impacts due to construction noise are less than significant.

- b. **Groundborne Vibration.** Ground borne vibrations are associated with heavy vehicles (i.e. railroad) and with heavy equipment operations. All noise generation due to construction activities would be required to comply with the Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element as noted above. Vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project would be typical of traffic generated by the adjacent residential uses (passenger cars and trucks), which are not a source of significant vibration. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- c. **Ambient Noise Levels.** Subdivision of the land and construction and occupation of the 41 additional homes would result in periodic noise generation from the use of vehicles, noises generated on home sites, and landscape maintenance. The overall types and volumes of noise would not be excessive and would be similar in character to surrounding land uses. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- d. **Temporary Ambient Noise Levels.** Construction of the project, including road improvements and lot development, would result in a temporary increase in noise levels. The construction noise would be temporary and would be minimized by compliance with Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element, and mitigation Measure NOI-1. The impacts are less-than-significant with adherence to general plan policies and required mitigation noted in MM NOI-1.
- e,f. **Airport Noise.** The project is located within Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport (a public airport, no private airstrips exist in the vicinity of the project). Table 6-1 in the El Dorado County General Plan establishes 60 dB as the maximum threshold level for residential land uses. The project site is located approximately 0.4 miles west of the 55 dB CNEL contour interval, and is not located within takeoff and landing patterns of the airport. As listed in the Conditions of Approval, the development is required to comply with Title 25 of the Administrative Code. This requires that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dBCNEL in any habitable room. The impacts from airport noise exposure would be less than significant.

Finding: With the incorporation of mitigation requiring notes to be put on project plans regarding construction hours and adherence to those hours of construction, impacts would be less than significant. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
- Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
- Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.

- a. **Population Growth.** The project would induce some population growth in the area directly by proposing new homes and indirectly through extension and improvement of roads and infrastructure. However, construction of 41 single-family residential buildings would not induce substantial population growth to the area. The population growth to the area is minor and the impacts are less than significant.
- b. **Housing Displacement.** The project would not displace any existing housing. There would be no impact.
- c. **Population Displacement.** The proposed project would not displace any people. There would be no impact.

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a. **Fire Protection.** The Cameron Park Community Services District Fire Department, located at 3200 Country Club Drive, currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. However, it has been determined by the Fire District that the level of service would not fall below the minimum requirements, as a result of the project. The responsible Fire District would review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards including but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking lots, fire sprinklers within buildings, building identification and project phasing. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. Impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant.
- b. **Police Protection.** Police services would be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department. Because of the size and scope of the proposed project, it is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for police services. The property has already been designated for residential uses and is consistent with the General Plan; thus the impacts to public services have already been considered. The impact would be less than significant.
- c. **Schools.** The state allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project site is located within the Rescue Union School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The affected school districts were contacted as part of the initial consultation and no specific comments or mitigation measures were provided. No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Parks.** Although the proposed project is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for parks, it can have a minor increase in service and usage for parks. In addition, the construction of homes on the project site can reduce open space opportunities for residents and neighbors. Payment of parkland in-lieu fees is sufficient to ensure that the impacts generated by the project are fully mitigated. As required by the Cameron Park Community Services District, the project would require payment of park fees at the time of building permit issuance. Impacts to parks would be less than significant.
- e. **Other Government Services.** No other government services would be required as a result of the rezone, development plan, and parcel map. There would be no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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.** The project could cause increased usage of existing parks or recreational facilities. Payment of in-lieu fees would be sufficient to ensure that the impacts resulting from the new homes are adequately mitigated. The impact is less than significant.
- b. **Facilities Expansion.** The project does not include recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of additional facilities. The project would increase demand for existing facilities, as discussed above. The impact is less than significant.

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X	
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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.** As required by County policy, a traffic study was prepared to analyze the potential traffic impacts resulting from the project. The traffic study (*Traffic Impact Analysis for Cameron Hills Subdivision, Cameron Park, El Dorado County, CA*, KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., September 26, 2006), provides analysis and conclusions relative to traffic impacts generated by the project. According to the report, the project would cause an increase in traffic on area roadways and intersections. The traffic study concluded that the project is expected to generate 38 AM and 48 PM peak hour trips, with 458 total average daily trips (ADT). The traffic study analyzed the project under several scenarios as required by the General Plan. These included the following:

- Existing Setting
- Existing + Project Conditions
- 2011 Setting
- 2011 plus Project Specific Impacts

The traffic study analyzed potential impacts to the following roadways and intersections:

- Cambridge Road/Oxford Road
- Cambridge Road/Knollwood Drive
- Cambridge Road/Country Club Drive
- Cambridge Road/US 50 Westbound Ramps – Merrychase Drive
- Cambridge Road/US 50 Eastbound Ramps
- Cameron Park Drive/Oxford Road

The analysis found that the project would result in the following impacts:

Existing Plus Project Conditions: The eastbound approach of the Cambridge Road/US 50 Eastbound Ramp intersection would decline to LOS F conditions while the Cambridge Road/US 50 Westbound Ramps – Merrychase Drive and Cameron Park Drive/Oxford Road intersections would continue to operate at LOS F. All three intersections would meet peak hour signal warrants. All other intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service, LOS “C” or better.

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

Year 2011 – Existing Plus Approved Projects: Five of the six intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service, operating at LOS “D” or better. The Cambridge Road/US 50 Eastbound Ramps intersection would operate at LOS “F” in the PM peak hour and would meet peak hour signal warrants.

Year 2011 – Existing Plus Approved Projects Plus Project: Five of the six intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service, operating at LOS “E” or better; the northbound approach to the Cambridge Road/Country Club Drive intersection would decline to an LOS “E” condition in the PM peak hour, but the intersection would operate at overall LOS “D” condition. The Cambridge Road/US 50 Eastbound Ramps intersection would continue to operate at LOS “F” in the PM peak hour.

All identified impacts would be mitigated either by DOT-required conditions of approval (e.g., requirements for stop signs and striping at Harvey Road/Berry Road intersection, maintenance of sight triangles at Kimberly Road/Road “Z” intersection, requirement for implementation of all-way stop signs at the Cambridge Road/US 50 Eastbound Ramps intersection, and payment of traffic impact mitigation (TIM) fees), or through the implementation of the County’s 5-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Identified improvements in the CIP include the following:

1. Signalization of the US 50 Westbound Ramps – Merrychase Drive/Cambridge Road intersection
2. Signalization of the Cameron Park Drive/Oxford Road intersection

With incorporation of DOT required conditions of approval, all capacity and level of service impacts would be mitigated to a level of insignificance. Future cumulative impacts related to the operation of the Cambridge Road/US 50 Eastbound Ramps intersection would be mitigated by future projects with the signalization of this interchange.

- c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project site is located in Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport. The project has been designed to comply with all requirements in the Cameron Park Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The project would not present an air traffic hazard as future homes would be lower in elevation than existing topography on the parcel and lower than surrounding residences. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazards.** The traffic study prepared by KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., identifies a potential traffic hazard at the Harvey Road/Berry Road intersection once the project is complete and Harvey Road becomes a through road. The potential hazard would be high speeds which could be obtained along Harvey Road, potentially creating a dangerous situation at the Harvey Road/Berry Road intersection. DOT has required, as a Condition of Approval, that the applicant install stop signs and striping at the intersection. According to the traffic study, this would mitigate the potential impact to a level of insignificance at this intersection. The applicant would also be required by DOT to demonstrate that adequate sight distance exists at proposed Road “Z” and Kimberly Road. In order to ensure that adequate sight distance is maintained, the following mitigation would be required:

MM-TRA-1: Any landscaping at the proposed Road “Z” intersection at Kimberly Road shall be limited to low lying landscaping no more than 3 feet in height and trees with canopies no lower than 10 feet from the ground. Sight triangles meeting County standards shall be maintained at this intersection.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits the applicant shall include a note reflecting the above requirement on all building, landscaping and grading plans. DOT and El Dorado County Planning Services shall review plans to ensure that these measures have been included on all relevant plans.

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services & DOT shall verify that the above measure has been incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a building and/or grading permit.

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

With adherence to all DOT project specific conditions of approval, and the proposed mitigation, potential hazards would be mitigated to a level of insignificance.

- e. **Emergency Access.** The project includes two access points to the project, one at the Berry Road/Harvey Road intersection and the other along Kimberly Road, just north of Knollwood Drive. These two access points would provide adequate emergency ingress and egress to the project and would be designed in accordance 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. County review of the proposed Tentative Subdivision Map would ensure compliance with these standards. This impact would be less than significant.
- f. **Parking.** The project would comply with Section 17.18.060.1 of the County Code requiring two off street parking spaces not in tandem per residential unit. In addition, proposed residences would likely include garages providing additional parking spaces. This impact would be less than significant.
- 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, no significant traffic impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this "Transportation/Traffic" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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 the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). The Regional Water Quality Control Board sets treatment requirements for the collection, processing, and disposal of waste, which must be complied with by EID. EID has indicated that it would be willing and able serve the proposed project, consistent with the requirements of the RWQCB. The impacts are less than significant.
- b. **Facilities Expansion.** The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. EID has indicated that it would be willing and able to serve the proposed project. The project would be required to develop the required infrastructure, which includes adequately sized water and sewer lines and dedication of appropriate utility easements. The addition of 41 residential units would not result in a substantial increase in demand for services. The project would contribute to the demand on the existing regional wastewater treatment facilities, which may need to be expanded or upgraded at some point in the future. The impact to this expansion is minimal. The impacts are less than significant.
- c. **Stormwater.** Storm drainage facilities required by the project are limited to on-site storm drains, drainage ditches and culverts. Potential environmental effects of constructing these drainage facilities are considered throughout this document as part of the project. No offsite drainage improvements are proposed as a part of the project. Any potential impacts would be avoided through the implementation of the County Grading Ordinance and thus this potential impact would be considered less than significant.
- d. **Water Supply.** The proposed project would be served by EID, which has indicated the ability to adequately serve the project. The EID has stated that there is a ten-inch waterline in Cambridge Road adjacent to the northeastern corner of the subject property, and there is an 8-inch waterline in Harvey Road stubbed out at the northern property line. This 41-unit residential development is not expected to need new or expanded entitlements, as EID is able to serve the project from existing resources. The impacts are less than significant.
- e. **Wastewater Facilities.** EID has determined that it can serve the proposed project, and that it has adequate capacity to handle the proposed development. The EID states that there is an eight-inch gravity sewer line in Harvey Road stubbed out to the northern property line. There is also an existing 6-inch gravity sewer line in Kimberly Road at the southern property boundary. The impacts are 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

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

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.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to biological resources. Potential impacts to biological resources include the alteration of habitat and/or direct impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species, the loss of oak woodlands, and potential impacts to migratory bird species. Impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species would be mitigated by **MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-4 and standard conditions of approval**, which requires specific measures that would reduce impacts to sensitive plant and animal species to levels of insignificance. These measures include payment of in-lieu fees, preservation and restoration strategies, and avoidance measures for potentially impacted plant and animal species. Impacts resulting from conflicts to local policies and ordinances are reduced with the adherence to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and mitigation strategies contained in the Oak Woodland Management Plan. Additional impacts to biological resources are less than significant.

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

The project would not cause degradation of scenic resources, water quality, cultural and historic resources, or other resources associated with the physical and biological communities and environment of the project. With implementation of the mitigation measures described above, this impact would be less than significant.

- 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, the project may have project related impacts associated with air quality, noise and traffic. As mitigated and conditioned, this project would have a less than significant chance of having project-related environmental effects 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.)