



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Z06-0002/ PD06-0002/ P06-0001/ Sunstone Business Park

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

Contact Person: Jonathan Fong, Planning Services **Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: El Dorado Development Partnership Group. 6806 Fallsbrook Court #2. Granite Bay CA, 95746

Project Applicant's Name and Address: El Dorado Development Partnership Group. 6806 Fallsbrook Court #2. Granite Bay CA, 95746

Project Agent's Name and Address: Stable Development. 3441 S. Eastern Ave. Las Vegas NV, 89109.

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: LeBeck Young Engineering, Inc. 3430 Robin Lane Bldg #2. Cameron Park CA, 95682/ GBH Partners. 3907 Park Dr. Suite 220. El Dorado Hills CA, 95762.

Project Location: The project is located on the south side of Suncast Lane 0.2 miles west of the intersection with Golden Foothills Parkway in the El Dorado Hills area.

Assessor's Parcel No: 117-100-32 (33.18-acres)

Zoning: Research and Development- Design Control (R&D-DC)

Section: 14 **T:** 9N **R:** 8E

General Plan Designation: Research and Development (R&D)

Description of Project: Request for a Rezone, Planned Development and Parcel Map. The Rezone would add the Planned Development Zoning overlay to amend the parcel zoning from Research and Development- Design Control (R&D-DC) to Research and Development- Planned Development (R&D-PD). The Planned Development would allow the construction of 25 buildings totaling 211,660 square feet of improvements. Each of the buildings would range in size from 5,700 square feet to 12,375 square feet. Adoption of the Development Plan would also include incorporation of Design Guidelines for the project site. The phased Parcel Map would create 25 parcels ranging in size from 1-acre to 2.41-acres in size. Each of the proposed buildings would be located on individual parcels. Design Waivers: Two Design Waivers have been requested to allow the following: 1) To omit the sidewalks along the proposed 'Road A' and 'Road B'; 2) To reduce the right-of-way width requirement from 60 feet to 50 feet except at the project entrances.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	R&D	R&D-DC	Undeveloped
North	R&D	R&D-DC	Existing Office/ Warehouse
South	R&D	R&D-DC	Existing Office/ Warehouse
East	R&D	R&D-DC	Existing manufacturing development
West	CC-6K	AP	Carson Creek Specific Plan, existing residential development

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The approximately 33-acre project site is located in the western edge of the El Dorado Hills Business Park. The project site is currently undeveloped. Improvements on-site are limited to an existing rock-line ditch which runs along the western property boundary. Directly adjacent to the

Hills Business Park. Vegetation on-site is limited to native grasslands. The site does not contain any oak woodland habitat and is not know to contain special status plant species. Slopes on-site are varied ranging from 580 feet to 490 feet above sea level. Three relative high points exist on-site located at 580, 560, and 545 feet above sea level. Slopes exceeding 30 percent total 0.5% of the site and are due to manmade grading for the parcel to the south
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): 1. El Dorado County Building Department: building permits 2. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: grading permits, encroachment permits 3. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District: Fugitive Dust 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
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology / Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology / Water Quality	Land Use / Planning
Mineral Resources	Noise	Population / Housing
Public Services	Recreation	Transportation/Traffic
Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** would be prepared.
 I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there would 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** would be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described in attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, pursuant to applicable standards; and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Jonathan Fong For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from construction of a commercial business park project to be located within the El Dorado Hills Business Park in the community of El Dorado Hills (proposed project).

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The 33.18-acre project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Business Park in the El Dorado Hills area. The project is bounded to the north and east by other parcels within the Business Park. Parcels to the west are existing residential lands within the Carson Creek Specific Plan Area. Land uses approved within the Business Park are limited to those enumerated in the Research and Development Zone District.

Project Characteristics

Project Description: The proposed project would include a Rezone, Planned Development, and Parcel Map. The Rezone would add the Planned Development (PD) Zoning Overlay to the project parcel to amend the Zoning from Research and Development- Design Control (R&D-DC) to Research and Development- Planned Development (R&D-PD). The Planned Development would allow the construction of 25 buildings ranging in size from 5,700 square feet to 12,375 square feet. The Parcel Map would parcelize each of the proposed buildings to create 25 parcels ranging in size from 43,463 square feet to 105,139 square feet.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The project site is accessible from Sandstone Drive and Suncast Lane. The project would construct a through access extending the existing Windplay Drive from Sandstone Drive to Suncast Lane. An internal looped road system would be constructed to provide access to the proposed parcels. All parking would be provided off-street within designated parking areas.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project would connect to EID public water and wastewater services. The District has determined that adequate water and sewer services would be available to serve the project. The project would connect to existing water and sewer lines within Sandstone Drive and Suncast Lane to provide services to the project.

3. Visual Elements and Landscaping

The project does not have any native vegetation. The project would be required to provide landscaping along the property boundaries and within the parking area. The project has been designed to comply with the architectural requirements of the Research and Development zone district. The project site currently does not contain any visual elements. The proposed project would not impair or affect any visual elements in the project vicinity.

4. Population

The project would not involve the construction of any residential units and therefore would not add to the population in the project vicinity.

5. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would involve the completion of the grading under the approved grading permit, construction of the remaining buildings, and improvement of the access encroachments.

6. CEQA Section 15152. Tiering- El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR

This Negative Declaration tiers off of the following Environmental Impact Reports:

Carson Creek Specific Plan EIR (SCH 94072021)
El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR (SCH 2001082030)
El Dorado Hills Business Hills Business Park (SCH 802070503)

The following impact areas are tiering off the General Plan EIR:

Traffic/Circulation

The following impact areas are tiering off the Carson Creek Specific Plan EIR:

Noise

The following impact areas are tiering off the El Dorado Hills Business Park EIR:

Noise
Traffic Circulation

In accordance with Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines. The above listed EIRs are available for review at the El Dorado County Development Services Department located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. All determinations and impacts identified that rely upon the General Plan EIR analysis and all General Plan Mitigation Measures are identified herein.

Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS. <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.** The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.¹ There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is not located within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at

¹ *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1.*

the project site.² The parcel is currently under development. There would be no impact to scenic resources as a result of development of the proposed project.

- c. **Visual Character.** The proposed project is located within the El Dorado Hills Business Park. Existing around the project site are existing offices and light manufacturing sites within the El Dorado Hills Business Park. To the west are existing residential units within the Carson Creek Specific Plan area. The project would be consistent with the development pattern within the Business Park. The project would be designed and landscaped to blend in with the surrounding area consistent with the Development Standards of the Research and Development Zone District. The impact to the visual character of the area would be less than significant.
- d. **Light and Glare.** All outdoor lighting shall conform to Section 17.14.170 of the County Code and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) full cut-off designation so as to minimize impacts from glare to less than significant. The project would be required to demonstrate that all proposed lighting conforms to the Development Plan Design Guideline standards for outdoor lighting. Therefore, the impacts of light and glare from this proposed project would be less than significant.

Finding

No impacts to views and viewsheds are expected with the development of project either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. 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.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not considered to be “Prime Farmland” nor is there properties designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses and there would be no loss of productive agricultural land or conflict with agricultural uses. There would be no impact.

² California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>).

- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract because the site is not designated for residential or agricultural use. There would be no impact.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The site is classified as other farmland under the Farmland Mapping Program; however, there are no agricultural operations or lands designated for agricultural uses present.³ There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. For this "Agriculture" category, there would be 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 nonattainment 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, would 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 toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

a. **Air Quality Plan.** The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan. There would be no impact.

b-c.

Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (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

³ State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map, 2002.

practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

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

Short-term minor grading and excavation activities associated with the construction of the building and parking lot could result in wind erosion and the introduction of particulate matter (dust) into the atmosphere and adjacent surface water resources. Odors from the construction activities may impact adjacent parcels but would be temporary in nature and therefore, less than significant. The applicant would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District’s permitting process requiring adherence to District Rule #223 for fugitive dust emissions. Additionally, a Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control Plan shall be submitted prior to any grading.

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. The project, by itself, would not likely increase traffic generated emission sources from what would normally occur along Golden Foothill Parkway. Adherence to the District rules and the Fugitive Dust Plan during project construction would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

d-e.

Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors. The proposed project would not include any features that would be a source of substantial pollutant emissions that could affect sensitive receptors or generate objectionable odors. There would be no impact.

Finding

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, inclusion of standard conditions of approval would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. For this “Air Quality” category, impacts would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory 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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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-c.

Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities The project site is located within Mitigation Area 2. Mitigation Area 2 is defined as areas not known to support Special Status species but those lands within the EID service area. Section 17.71.220A. of the County Zoning Ordinance requires that projects within Mitigation Area 2 pay the required fee in lieu of Ecological Preserve Mitigation. The Environmental Impact Report prepared for the El Dorado Hills Business Park determined that no significant impacts would occur to rare or endangered animals or plants⁴. Upon payment of the Rare Plant Mitigation Fee, impacts would be less than significant.

d.

Migratory corridors The project site would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites. There would be no impact.

e-f.

Tree and habitat conservation plans. No native oak trees exist on the project site. The project site is not located in an area containing sensitive biological communities. The project would not result in conflicts with local or regional conservation plans. There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts from biological resources are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Biological” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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	

⁴ El Dorado Hills Business Park. Draft Environmental Impact Report (Page 58). Planning Answers. August 1982.

Discussion:

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

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

a-d. No cultural resources would be expected to be impacted as a result of the project. The Cultural Resources Study performed for the site did not identify any cultural resources on the project site⁵. Standard conditions would be applied to the project requiring mitigation if cultural resources are found during project construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

Based upon the cultural resource study prepared for the site, it is determined that standard conditions have been incorporated in the project to reduce impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance. For this “Cultural Resources” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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:				
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:

⁵ Cultural Resource Assessment of the Stables Project. El Dorado Hills Business Park. El Dorado County, CA. Peak and Associates. September 2005.

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

- a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.⁶ No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.⁷ There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated west of the Melones fault zone and east of the East Bear Mountains fault zone. The East Bear Mountains fault zone is associated with the Foothills fault system, previously considered inactive but re-classified to potentially active after a Richter magnitude earthquake measuring 5.7 occurred near Oroville in 1975. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.⁸

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 50 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 50 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey.⁹ While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located.¹⁰ The project site is flat. There would be no risk of landslide. There would be no impact.

Development of the project would result in office and warehouse uses in an area subject to low to moderate groundshaking effects. The proposed project would not include uses that would pose any unusual risk of environmental damage either through the use of hazardous materials or processes or through structural

⁶ *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, p.5.9-29.*

⁷ *California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

⁸ *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, p.5.9-5.*

⁹ *California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002.*
(<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha>)

¹⁰ *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.*

design that could be subject to groundshaking hazard. There would be no significant impacts that could not be mitigated through proper building design, as enforced through the County building permit process, which requires compliance with the Uniform Building Code, as modified for California seismic conditions. There would be no impact.

- b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** The site has been disturbed under a previously approved grading permit. Adherence to the approved grading permit would reduce impacts to less than significant.
- d. **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the site has Argonaut gravelly loam (AkC) soils. These soils are listed as having low to moderate shrink-swell potential. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The applicant has submitted a site-specific geotechnical study and would be subject to review and approval 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 Capability:** There would be no impact related to septic systems because no septic system use is necessary for the project. The project is to be served public water and sewer. There would be no impact.

Finding

No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Geology and Soils” category, the impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
 - 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.** No hazardous substances would be involved with the project. Temporary use of heavy equipment for onsite construction may be required. A temporary fuel storage tank may be located on site for the heavy equipment. The potential storage and transport of diesel fuel in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment would require an approved hazardous material business plan issued from the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. Said hazardous material business plan would identify potential impacts to the environment and require mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Based on the amount of grading required and the duration of heavy equipment on site and off site to complete the required improvements, and that fuel storage would most likely not occur, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant with an approved hazardous materials business plan.
- b. **Creation of Hazards.** The project would result in a mixture of office and warehouse uses which would not likely involve the use of hazardous materials. Prior to storage or use of any hazardous materials, A hazardous materials plan would be subject to review and approval by the Environmental Management Department. Because use of hazardous materials is remote, impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are three private schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not be likely to include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. Any potential sources of hazardous emissions would be subject to a hazardous materials plan. Any proposed uses that could potentially result in hazardous emissions would require submittal of a Special Use Permit which would require full analysis of potential impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.¹¹ No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the proposed project site are known to have occurred. There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project is not located near or within any Safety Zones of a public airport. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** The adjacent parcel has an operating helicopter landing pad. No features of the project would produce a significant obstruction for the operation of aircraft. The project would not involve heights in excess of the height limitations of the R&D Zone District. No sources of light would produce any visual hazards in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g. **Emergency Response Plan.** Construction and occupation of the proposed facilities would involve negligible or no disruption of emergency access to and from occupied uses along Golden Foothill Parkway. There would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.

¹¹ California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List, <http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/>,

- h. **Fire Hazards.** The map of El Dorado County Fire Hazard Zones (V-4-2, El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report December 1994) identifies the project site as being located in an area of “Moderate 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 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 development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
 - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a & f. **Water Quality Standards.** Construction of the proposed project would involve little, if any, ground disturbance that could increase the level of sediments in stormwater discharges at the site. Operation of the proposed project would not involve any uses that would generate a significant increase in wastewater. There is no evidence indicating that the project or activities associated with the project would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, no water quality standards would be violated, and no impact would occur.
- b. **Groundwater.** El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are defined in El Dorado County. There would be no impact.
- c. **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit stormwater runoff and discharge from a site. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. Compliance with an approved erosion control plan would reduce erosion and siltation on and off site. The Department of Transportation is requiring as a condition of approval that the project applicant obtain a site improvement/grading permit, which would address grading, erosion and sediment control. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d-e. **Drainage Patterns.** The parcel on which the proposed project is to be situated is 33.18-acres. The project site is currently undeveloped. The site drains naturally from the three relative high points on-site flowing northeast, southeast and west. Drainage along the western property boundary is managed via an existing V-ditch located within a 10 foot wide drainage easement. The Preliminary Drainage Report concluded that the project scope would fall within the impacts analyzed in the Master Drainage Report prepared for the El Dorado Hills Business Park. Existing drainages along the western property boundary tie into the drainage system constructed as part of the Carson Creek Specific Plan Area residential projects. Those drainage systems were designed assuming development on the project site and would be capable of handling additional runoff generated as a result of development.
- Based on the Preliminary Drainage Report and upon the implementation of approved Drainage, Erosion Control and Grading Plans, as required by the Department of Transportation, the rate of surface runoff from the project site would be minimized. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. **Water quality.** The project site is located within the vicinity of Carson Creek. The project would be served by public water and would be subject to the implementation of approved Drainage, Erosion Control and Grading Plans, as required by the Department of Transportation. Upon adherence to the approved plans, there would be no impact.
- g, h, i& j. **Flooding.** The level project site is situated in an area of undulating terrain at an elevation of approximately 1280 feet above sea level. 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. There would be no impact.
- FIRM.** The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 06040 0725 C) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

Finding

The proposed project would require a site improvement and grading permit through the El Dorado County Building Department that would address erosion and sediment control. No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Hydrology” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a. **Established Community.** The project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Business Park and would involve land uses consistent with allowed uses within the Park. The project site is located directly adjacent to existing residential uses within the Carson Creek Specific Plan. The project would be an infill development within the El Dorado Hills Business Park and would be consistent within the Research and Development (R&D) General Plan Land Use Designation and R&D Zone District. All development would be required to comply with the Development Standards of the R&D Zone District or the Design Guidelines adopted as part of the Development Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Land Use Plan.** The project site is located in an area zoned for Research and Development (R&D) and the proposed office and warehouse uses are allowed by right pursuant County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use would not conflict with the adopted General Plan land use designation for the site (Research and Development (R&D)) or adjacent uses. The applicant has designed the project in compliance with County regulations, addressing aesthetics and health and safety concerns. There would be no impact.

c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is located in Mitigation Area 2 established for the Pine Hill rare plants. The proposed development would require payment of the required Mitigation 2 mitigation fee. There would be no impact.

Finding

The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan with the Design Review Revision. 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. For this ‘Land Use Planning’ category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present.¹² There are no MRZ-2-classified areas within or adjacent to the project site¹³, 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.¹⁴ There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect proposed uses or be affected by project development. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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

¹² California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.

¹³ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.

¹⁴ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.

Discussion:

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

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

a. Noise Standards. The project would not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2. Impacts would be less than significant.

b-c. Ambient Noise. The project would construct approximately 200,000 square feet of office and warehouse uses. The proposed uses would not likely increase ambient noise levels in excess of non-transportation noise thresholds established by the El Dorado County General Plan. The project would be located directly adjacent to residential lands within the Carson Creek Specific Plan Area. The Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Carson Creek Specific Plan Area determined that future off-site stationary noise sources within the El Dorado Hills Business Park would be a potentially significant impact on the residential uses within the Specific Plan area.¹⁵ The Carson Creek Specific Plan (CCSP) included mitigation measures requiring the construction of six foot high fencing along all property boundaries of the Specific Plan area including fencing between the El Dorado Hills Business Park (CCSP 7-3). Additionally, the CCSP requires a thirty foot rear yard setback for all residences along the eastern perimeter of the site. The setback would buffer the residential land uses from the El Dorado Hills Business Park (CCSP 3-13).¹⁶

The project would allow for a range of office and warehouse uses consistent with the Development Standards of the Research and Development (R&D) Zone District. The project would be subject to the Design Guidelines for the project which would be adopted as part of the Planned Development application. All future development of the site would be required to adhere to a required thirty foot landscape setback from all residential land uses within the CCSP.¹⁷

All future development within the project area would be subject to the required 30 foot landscaped setback. In conjunction with the existing six foot tall solid wall and the required 30 foot setback within the CCSP area, all future development within the project area would be buffered by a total of 60 feet and the existing solid wall. No uses proposed as part of the project or anticipated within the R&D Zone District would likely result in ambient noise levels in excess of El Dorado County General Plan Standards. Any uses which may result in significant long term impacts would be reviewed and approved through the Special Use Permit process. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the project vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and function mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. All storage, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas are required to be located as far as practicable from any residential areas. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. Airport noise exposure. The project is not located in the vicinity of any public airports, there would be no impact.

¹⁵ *Carson Creek Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report. Volume 1. State Clearinghouse No. 94072021. Michael Brandman Associates. May 1996.*

¹⁶ *Carson Creek Specific Plan. CTA Engineering and Surveying. September 1999.*

¹⁷ *Sunstone El Dorado Hills. Draft Plan Development and Design Guidelines. Graham Balmaseda Heaney. September 2008.*

- f. Private airstrip.** An operating helicopter landing pad is located on the adjacent parcel to the west. No significant noise impacts are expected as a result of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

No impacts to excessive noise are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, the impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth.** The project would construct a commercial development designated for office and warehouse uses. The project would construct 25 buildings totaling approximately 211,000 square feet of space. New infrastructure would include the construction of a new loop road system throughout the 30-acre project site. All utilities are currently provided within the El Dorado Hills Business Park. The project would likely create additional employment

Finding

The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with project either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, there would be no impact.

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	

Discussion:

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

- Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department's/District's goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;
 - Substantially increase or expand the demand for public law enforcement protection without increasing staffing and equipment to maintain the Sheriff's Department goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents;
 - Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services;
 - Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources;
 - Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
 - Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.
- a. **Fire Protection.** The El Dorado Hills Fire Department 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.** The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department with a response time of 8 minutes to 80% of the population located in the Community Regions. For the rural areas, there is no standard minimum level of service or response time. The project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Region. The addition of the proposed development would not significantly impact current responses times to the project area.
- c. **Schools.** The state allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/ industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project site is located within the Buckeye 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.** The commercial development would not be required to pay park in-lieu fees. There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Facilities.** No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. Adequate emergency services and public utility services are available to serve the project. The project site is approximately 30 acres in size. El Dorado County General Plan Policy 10.2.1.5, the project would be required to provide a Public Facilities and Services Financing Plan. The Plan would be required prior to project approval and would demonstrate that all facilities and infrastructure are available and no net cost would be burdened by existing residents. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a. Parks. The project would not require the increase in need for parks in the project area. The commercial project would not require the payment of park fees. There would be no impact.

b. Recreational Facilities. The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities. There would be no impact.

Finding

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Recreation” category, there would be no impact.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				
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. **Traffic Increases/ Level of Service.** The project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Business Park which utilizes Latrobe Road and White Rock Road as major access roadways. In accordance with General Plan Policies TC-Xa and TC-Xf, no development would be approved which could potentially worsen traffic on the County Road System. Prior to occupancy of any project which would worsen traffic, the developer would be required to either construct the necessary roadway improvements or ensure that adequate funding is identified or programmed to construct the improvements.

In accordance with these policies the project prepared a traffic study which determined the existing traffic impacts and the anticipated traffic impacts as a result of the project. The recommended mitigation measures included the signalization of White Rock Road and Winfield Drive. Upon the signalization of White Rock Road and Winfield Drive, the project impacts would not result in traffic increases or an impact to the level of service (LOS) beyond thresholds established by the General Plan.

General Plan Policy Amendments to Policy TC-Xa adopted by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on July 1, 2008 would allow for certain types of non-residential development to exceed the LOS E threshold currently established by the County General Plan. As determined in the Addendum to the County General Plan prepared by Development Services, the Policy Amendment would result in temporary decreases in LOS; however, the reductions would be offset by the use of alternative funding mechanisms and the TIM fee program funding.

In accordance with the Policy Amendment to TC-Xa the required signalization of White Rock Road and Winfield Drive may be deferred through payment of the required TIM fees at building permit issuance. The project would be conditioned to pay the required TIM fees in accordance with Policy TC-Xa as amended by the Board of Supervisors. Either requirement would be consistent with established thresholds and policies within the Traffic and Circulation Element of the General Plan. Performance of either requirement would result in a less than significant impact.

- c. **Air Traffic Patterns.** The project site is not located in the vicinity of a public airport. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazards.** The project site is readily accessible from Golden Foothill Parkway via Sandstone Drive and Suncast Lane. Delivery of the facility components during the construction period or occupation of the development would not involve frequent or substantial number of turning movements onto Golden Foothill Parkway that would interfere with traffic flow. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. There would be no impact.
- e. **Emergency Access.** The project site is accessible from Golden Foothill Parkway. Project construction, including staging, would occur entirely on-site. There would be no impact.
- f. **Parking.** The project has been designed to comply with Chapter 17.18 of the County Zoning Ordinance. Chapter 17.14 of the Zoning Ordinance requires a parking ratio of 1 space per 250 square feet of office space and 1 space per 2,000 square feet for warehouse. The project would provide all required parking and loading spaces as required by the County Zoning Ordinance.. There would be no impact to parking.
- 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 with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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
h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.				X

Discussion:

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

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

a. **Wastewater.** The project would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. Stormwater runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). There would be no impact.

b.,d.,e. **New Facilities** No new or expanded water or wastewater facilities would be required for the project because operation would not require these services. There would be no impact.

c. **Stormwater Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department

of Transportation. The project would be conditioned to comply with the County requirements. There would be no impact.

f & g. **Solid Waste.** Operation of the ground equipment shelter would not generate solid waste or affect recycling goals. There would be no impact.

h. **Power.** Power and telecommunication facilities are available at the project site. The power demands of the project would be accommodated through connection to existing lines, which are available at the parcel. There would be no impact.

Finding

No significant utility and service system impacts are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, there would be no impact.

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

Discussion:

a. The project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Business Park. The project site does not contain sensitive plant species or biological resources. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be no significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV). The project would be an infill development consistent with the goals and objectives of the El Dorado Hills Business Park based on the El Dorado Hills Business Park EIR and compliance with the Research and Development Zone District. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. Due to the scope of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project’s contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant. The project’s contribution to changes in the environment has been mitigated to less-than-significant levels through project design. The cumulative contribution to the viewshed would not be considerable.

c. Due to the scope of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

County of El Dorado Drainage Manual

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.)

PROJECT SPECIFIC INFORMATION LIST

Addendum to the El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2001082030) Amendment to Policy TC-Xa. El Dorado County Development Services, July 2008.

Carson Creek Specific Plan. Palisades Development, Inc. Adopted September 24, 1996. Minor Amendment September 28, 1999.

Carson Creek Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Carson Creek Specific Plan, El Dorado County. State Clearinghouse No. 94072021. Volume 1. Michael Brandman Associates. May 1996.

Cultural Resource Assessment of the Proposed Stables Project. El Dorado Hills Business Park. El Dorado County, CA. Peak and Associates. September 2005.

El Dorado Hills Business Park Draft Environmental Impact Report SCH#82070503. Planning Answers 1982.

Final Environmental Impact Report. A Supplement to the Draft EIR. Planning Answers 1982.

Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Study for Sunstone Business Park. El Dorado Hills, CA. Youngdahl Consulting Group. April 2006.

Preliminary Drainage Report for Sunstone Business Park. El Dorado Hills, CA. LeBeck Young Engineering, Inc. June 2008.

Submittal of the Revised Final Air Quality Analysis for the Sunstone Business Park Project. EN2 Resources, Inc. April 2008.

Sunstone Business Park Traffic Impact Study, El Dorado County. Wood Rodgers. May 2008.

Sunstone El Dorado Hills Draft Plan Development and Design Guidelines. GBH Partners. September 2008.

Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program, Supplement to the El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2001082030). El Dorado County Development Services Department. March 2006.