



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Z07-0057/P07-0052 - Cold Springs Estates Rezone and Tentative Parcel Map

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

Contact Person: Robert Peters, Assistant Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-7428

Property Owner's Name and Address: Living Care I, LLC, 11151 Sun River Drive #C, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Project Applicant/Agent's Name and Address: Demetre Harambakis, 11151 Sun River Drive #C, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., 4080 Plaza Goldorado Circle, Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Location: West side of Boulder Lane southwest of the intersection with Cold Springs Road in the Placerville Area.

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 323-250-42 (5.08 acres)

Zoning: Estate Residential 5-Acre (RE-5)

Section: 11 **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Medium-Density Residential (MDR)

Description of Project: Rezone a 5.08-acre lot from Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) to One-Acre Residential (R1A) and a tentative parcel map creating four (4) parcels ranging in size from 1.01 to 1.71 acres. The project includes on-site road improvements.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

| | <u>Zoning</u> | <u>General Plan</u> | <u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School) |
|--------|---------------|---------------------|---|
| Site: | RE-5 | MDR | Single-Family Residence |
| North: | RA-20 | AL-A | Single-Family Residences on agriculturally zoned parcels. |
| East: | R1A | MDR | Single-Family Residences |
| South: | RE-5 | MDR | Vacant Residential Land |
| West: | R1A | MDR | Single-Family Residences |

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 5.08-acre subject parcel is located in the Placerville Community Region at an approximate elevation of 1,750 feet above mean sea level. The parcel contains an existing single family residence with associated hardscape and landscape features. The existing residence currently takes access from Boulder Lane, and existing gravel road. The primary on-site biological communities include blue oak woodland and annual grassland. No riparian areas are found on the project site. Oak woodland canopy currently covers approximately 1.96 acres (38.7 percent) of the project site. Project site soils consist of Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam (DfD) 15 to 30 percent slopes, and Boomer gravelly loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes (BhD). The site contains slopes in excess of 40 percent.

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

agreement.):

El Dorado County Department of Transportation, El Dorado County Fire Protection District, Environmental Management, Air Quality Management District, El Dorado County Surveyor, Resource Conservation District, El Dorado County Building Services, El Dorado Irrigation District.

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 | | Noise | | Population / Housing |
| | Public Services | | Recreation | | Transportation/Traffic |
| | Utilities / Service Systems | | Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Robert Peters For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a,b) No scenic vistas, resources, trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or designated scenic highways would be affected by this project. No impact would occur.
- c) The parcel map will result in four (4) parcels which are suitable for residential use. The surrounding neighborhood, south of Cold Springs Road, is equally well suited to residential use and has been developed accordingly. The proposed project will not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project design proposes the removal of on-site oak trees; however, proposes development of a curvilinear access road in order to retain the aesthetic quality of Boulder Lane by allowing preservation of several large oak trees within the Boulder Lane road and public utility easement. The property will continue to provide the natural visual character and quality that currently exists by keeping the scenic areas of the property intact. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) This four (4) lot division of land does not propose development that will create substantial light or glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area. All future building plans issued for the parcel(s) must comply with Section 17.14.170 of the County Zoning Ordinance which prohibits unnecessary and unwarranted illumination of an adjacent property. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: For the “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. No significant environmental impacts will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
 - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
 - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a) Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that the northwest corner of the project site contains Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam (DfD), 15 to 30 percent slopes, which are identified as Unique Soils and/or a Soils of Local Importance. The project site is predominantly Boomer gravelly loam, 15-30 percent slopes. The site is designated by the General Plan as Medium-Density Residential (MDR), is currently zoned Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5), and currently supports a single-family residential land use. No current agricultural pursuits exist on the project site. El Dorado County has established the Agricultural Districts (-A) General Plan Land Use Overlay and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan Land Use Map for the project area indicates that there are areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural Districts (-A) General Plan Land Use Overlay District to the north of the project site, across Cold Springs Road; however, the project site is not designated Agricultural Land, is not located in the Agricultural Land Use Overlay, or agriculturally zoned. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. As such, the project related impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The project proposes to rezone an existing residentially zoned property to a higher density residential zone and proposes increased residential development adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands, located across Cold Springs Road. The project site is designated MDR by the County General Plan and is located in the Placerville Community Region. The proposed density and lot sizes are consistent with the MDR designation, and the MDR designation is considered appropriate in Community Regions. The project site is located adjacent to properties which are zoned Residential Agricultural Twenty-Acre (RA-20). General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 requires agriculturally zoned lands be buffered from increases in density on adjacent lands by a minimum parcel size of 10 acres for any parcel created adjacent to such lands. However, this General Plan Policy is currently under review for amendment and proposed amendments would allow the approving authority to approve parcels less than 10 acres in size for parcels located within Community Regions adjacent to agriculturally zoned

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

lands that would not intensify conflict with an adjacent agricultural operation. The project parcel is currently less than 10 acres in size. There are currently no agricultural pursuits on the agriculturally zoned parcels adjacent to the project parcel. The project would result in three (3) additional residential parcels; however, the project has been designed so that proposed parcel 1 has an east to west parcel configuration eliminating multiple residential parcel adjacencies. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) The project would not result in conversion of existing agricultural farmlands to nonagricultural uses or result in other changes in the existing environment which would result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The project site is designated for residential land uses by the County General Plan and is zoned for residential development. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: This project will have no significant impact on agricultural lands and will not affect properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding properties are mostly developed with single-family residences on tracts that are one- acre in size or larger and would allow limited agricultural uses. For the “Agriculture” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

| III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project: | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|--|
| 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.

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

- a) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NOx, and O₃). Activities related to the implementation of this parcel map would create a less than significant impact for air quality. Items are included in the conditions for project approval that require grading and construction activities to implement specific measures such as a Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan and reduction of air pollutants from vehicles and equipment in order to reduce the likelihood of defined particulate in this category. Therefore, the potential impacts of the project would be less than significant.
- b,c) The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of standard County measures, the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality. These measures are included as conditions of project approval within Attachment 1 of the staff report and would reduce any impact in this category to a level of less than significant.
- d) The El Dorado County AQMD reviewed the project and identified that no sensitive receptors exist in the area and would not be affected by this project. As such, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide. The proposed parcel project would not result in significant impacts resulting from odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project in that no sensitive receptors would be adversely impacted, no objectionable odors would be created, and the project would not obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan. Based on the inclusion of standard conditions of approval, no significant adverse environmental effect would result from the project.

| 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, | | | X |

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

| | | | |
|--|--|----------|--|
| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | | |
| 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) This parcel map request will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The applicant submitted a “Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for Cold Springs Subdivision, El Dorado County, CA” prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., dated October 3, 2007. According to the evaluation “The PSA does not provide potential habitat for species listed under the state or federal endangered species acts.” (*Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for Cold Springs Subdivision, El Dorado County, CA, October 3, 2007*) Impacts would be less than significant.

b/c) The project proposed no impacts to 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, or proposed impacts to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The applicant submitted a “Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for Cold Springs Subdivision, El Dorado County, CA” prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., dated October 3, 2007. According to the evaluation “A formal jurisdictional delineation of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. was not conducted. However, a wetland survey was conducted to identify any potential wetlands or channels in the PSA. No Channels or wetlands were observed in the PSA.” (*Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for Cold Springs Subdivision, El Dorado County, CA, October 3, 2007*) Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Review of the California Fish and Game *Deer Ranges Map* (1990) indicates that there are no mapped critical deer migration corridors within the project site. The applicant submitted a “Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for Cold Springs Subdivision, El Dorado County, CA” prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., dated October 3, 2007. According to the evaluation “The PSA provides potential nesting habitat for birds of prey protected under California fish and game code and birds protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act.” (*Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for Cold Springs Subdivision, El Dorado County, CA, October 3, 2007*) However, with implementation of the mitigation measure below, the project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native

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

resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

If construction is scheduled to begin between February 1 to August 31 then a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for active nests at the project site and within 250-foot radius of the construction site from publicly accessible areas within 30 days prior to construction. If no active nests of a bird of prey or Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) bird are found, then no further mitigation measures are necessary.

If an active nest of a bird of prey or MBTA bird is found in the project study area, then the biologist shall flag the active nest tree so that a minimum 250-foot Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) around the nest tree if the nest is of a bird of prey, and a minimum 100-foot ESA around the nest if the nest is of an MBTA bird other than a bird of prey.

No construction activity shall be allowed in the buffer until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or unless monitoring determines that a smaller buffer will protect the active nest.

The construction contractor shall install stakes or temporary flagging, fencing, etc., at the edge of the minimum 250-foot or 100-foot ESA. The ESA shall be maintained throughout the construction period.

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 project specific conditions.

Timing/Implementation: If construction begins during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31), the preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to clearing and grubbing and submitted prior to grading permit issuance.

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

- e) The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Existing project oak tree canopy coverage is estimated at 1.96 acres, or 38.7 percent of the 5.08 acre site. (*Oak Canopy Retention Analysis, Preservation, and Replacement Plan for the Cold Springs project, El Dorado County, CA, December 14, 2007*) Under General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4.4, Option A, 85 percent of the existing canopy must be retained. As proposed, the project would remove 0.29 acres of oak canopy and retain 85.2 percent of the oak tree canopy at the site. The proposed project will retain the necessary tree canopy as required by General Plan policy 7.4.4.4 and the El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan. Impacts to oak woodlands would be less than significant.
- f) The project, as designed, would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: It has been determined that all potential biological resource impacts as a result of the proposed project are less than significant or less than significant with proposed mitigation. As such the impacts in the “Biological Resources” category would be less than significant for this project.

| 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.

a/b) The applicant submitted a “Cultural Resources Study of APN 323:250:42, Placerville, El Dorado County, California” prepared by Historic Resource Associates in January 2007. According to the study “No significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts were found, nor were any historic buildings, structures, or objects discovered.” (*Cultural Resources Study of APN 323:250:40, Placerville, El Dorado County, California 95667, January 2007*). No further cultural resource study is recommended. In the event sub-surface historical, cultural, or archeological sites or materials are disturbed during earth disturbances and grading activities on the site, standard conditions would be included within Attachment 1 of the staff report to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil strata/locales. No impacts would occur.

d) Due to the scope of the project, there is not a high potential to discover human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the standard conditions within Attachment 1 shall be implemented immediately.

FINDING: Established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category. Standard conditions of approval would insure that impacts would be less than significant.

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

| 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.
- a) As shown in the Division of Mines and Geology’s publication Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, there are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones mapped for El Dorado County. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically

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

induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating buildings in the project area would be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.

- b) According to the submitted drainage report, “On-site drainage structures are sized to accommodate 100 year storm events.” (*Drainage Report For Cold Springs Estates, Living Care I, LLC., December 17, 2007*) Project grading will be required for improvements associated to road construction and widening, driveway, and general access improvements. No mass pad grading is proposed. All grading must be in compliance with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors on March 13, 2007 (Ordinance No. 4719), including the implementation of pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to eliminate run-off and erosion and sediment controls, which would reduce any potential significant impacts of soil erosion or the loss of topsoil to a less than significant level.
- c,d) As stated in the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974, the soils on the project site are primarily comprised of Boomer gravelly loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes (BhD), with slow permeability, medium surface runoff, moderate erosion hazard, and low to moderate shrink-swell potential. Also, the northwest corner of the parcel contains Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes (DfD), with moderately slow permeability, medium to rapid surface runoff, moderate to high erosion hazard, and low shrink-swell potential. The project site can adequately support the required road improvements and the residential uses proposed for this project. The project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, is not anticipated to result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse, nor would the project be located on expansive soils. The project would require all future improvement activities to implement the requirements established by the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* and any future building designs to implement Uniform Building Code Seismic construction standards. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Waste discharge area analysis was completed and was reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of geological or seismological anomalies on the project site. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that would result in significant impacts. There is adequate soils permeability for the proposed septic disposal areas. For the “Geology and Soils” category, established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

| VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project: | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|
| 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 | | | X |

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

| VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|
| compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | | | |
| 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) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be transported, used, or disposed of for the project. Any hazardous materials used at the project site shall comply with the El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - b) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be utilized for the project. The project would not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - c) As proposed, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. There are no schools located within a quarter mile radius of this property. Impacts within this category would be less than significant.

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

- d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites near this property. As such, there would be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.
- e,f) As shown on the El Dorado County Zoning Map, the project is not located within an Airport Safety (AA) District overlay. *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan and there would be no immediate hazard for people residing or working in the project area or safety hazard resulting from airport operations and aircraft over-flights in the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would occur within these categories.
- g) The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. The County emergency response plan is overseen by the County Sherriff’s Department and they are located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville. Impacts would be less than significant.
- h) The degree of hazard in wild-land areas depends on weather variables like temperature, wind, and moisture, the amount of dryness and arrangement of vegetation, slope steepness, and accessibility to human activities, accessibility of firefighting equipment, and fuel clearance around structures. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and concluded that the project would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area with the implementation of the conditions of approval included in Attachment 1 of the staff report. Also, the project has been conditioned to require a Wildland Fire Safe Plan be submitted prior to filing the parcel map. To ensure impacts are less than significant, the project shall be required to comply with the “Fire Safe Requirements” and fully implement the approved Wildfire Fire Safe Plan.

FINDING: The proposed project will not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires. For the “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed project with the implementation of standard conditions of approval from the AQMD, the El Dorado County Fire Protection District, and implementation of a fire safe plan.

| 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 | | | 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> | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | |
| 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) Any grading and improvement plans required by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) and/or Development Services shall be prepared and designed to meet the *County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. These standards require that erosion and sediment control be implemented into the design of the project. The project “Geologic Evaluation for the Tentative Map of the Cold Springs Estates Rural Subdivision, George A. Wheelton, dated July 2007”, for waste discharge area analysis has been reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department- Environmental Health Division. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The proposed project would be required to connect to public water via the El Dorado Irrigation District. El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 26, 2007 stating that public water services and required fire flow are available to the serve the proposed

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

project with a water line extension from the 8-inch water line in Cold Springs Road. (*Facility Improvement Letter, Cold Springs Estates, March 26, 2007*). Impacts from connection to existing water facilities would be minimal. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Proposed grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply to this project. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- d/e) There will be no substantial change in the pattern of drainage on or off the property with this project. Compliance with the standards and requirements contained within the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* considers the requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and will limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site. As such, there will be limited erosion and siltation resulting from this project and impacts would be less than significant.
- f) The project will not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site. The project would be required to connect to public water. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- g/h) The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0750B, 10/18/83) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- i) The subject property is located within the Placerville area and is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters. There would be no impact.
- j) The proposed project is not located near a coastal area or adjacent to a large body of water such as a lake, bay, or estuary, volcanoes, or other volcanic features, and the site is located on relatively stable soils. There is no potential for impacts from seiche or tsunamis, or from mudflow at this site. There would be no impact.

FINDING: For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and therefore no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

| 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 |

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

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) The project would not result in the physical division of an established community. The project is located within the Placerville Community Region and proposes densities and parcel sizes consistent with the General Plan’s MDR land use designation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the 2004 General Plan, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed density and parcel sizes are consistent with the proposed rezone to R1A zone district and the MDR land use designation. Also, the project is located within the Placerville Community Region, and Table 2-1 of the General Plan lists the MDR land use designation consistent with Community Regions. The project does conflict with General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 which requires agriculturally zoned lands be buffered from increases in density on adjacent lands by a minimum parcel size of 10 acres for any parcel created adjacent to such lands. However, this General Plan Policy is currently under review for amendment and proposed amendments would exclude parcels which are located within Community Regions adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands and would not intensify conflict with an adjacent agricultural operation. The project parcel is currently less than 10 acres in size. There are currently no agricultural pursuits on the agriculturally zoned parcels adjacent to the project parcel. The project would result in three (3) additional residential parcels; however, the project has been designed so that proposed parcel 1 has an east to west parcel configuration eliminating multiple residential parcel adjacencies. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other conservation plan. As such, there is no possibility of the proposed project conflicting with an adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

FINDING: For the ‘Land Use Planning’ category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 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 |

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

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) The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan. No impacts would occur.
- b) The Western portion of El Dorado county is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that this site does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: No impacts to any known mineral resources will occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. For the ‘Mineral Resources’ category, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

| 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;

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

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

a/c) The project would not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project will not generate noise levels that exceed the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan as it involves the creation of three (3) additional lots and related residential noise. Other than temporary noise generated from construction equipment, no significant noise would be expected from the development of the project. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

b/d) Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of minor grading and improvement activities during development or upon completion of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards established by an adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. No impacts would occur.

f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: For the ‘Noise’ category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a) The proposed project has been determined to have a minimal growth-inducing impact as the project includes the creation of two (2) parcels where one currently exists. No residential development is proposed with the parcel map and all future development would be required to meet established County development standards. Any future development must meet

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

comprehensive County policies and regulations before building permits can be issued. The project does not include any school or large scale employment centers that would lead to indirect growth beyond what is currently anticipated by the General Plan. The land use designation for the project would not change and the existing designation of Medium-Density Residential (MDR) permits one dwelling unit per 1.0 consistent with the project proposal. Impacts would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. No existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project. No impacts would occur.
- c) No persons would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: The project would not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project will not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or expanding infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|--|
| 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.

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

- a) **Fire Protection:** The El Dorado County Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Fire District from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District would review the project improvement plans and conformance with Fire District conditions of approval must be proven prior to filing the parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Police Protection:** The project site will be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80 percent of the population within Community Regions. No specific minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The addition of one residential lot would not significantly impact current response times to the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Gold Trail Union School District. The affected school district was contacted as part of the initial consultation process for review and comment. No specific comments or mitigation measures were received or included for this project that creates an incremental increase in student body. School impact fees will be assessed and collected during the building permit review phase for any future single-family residential development. Impact would be less than significant.
- d) **Parks:** The proposed project would not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. Provisions to provide parkland or the payment of in-lieu fees are included as the project is residential in nature. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the creation of three additional parcels, either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

| 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

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

- Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- a) Because the project would only include the creation of three (3) additional residential lots, it would not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The project proposal does not propose any on-site recreation facilities and would not be required to construct any new facilities or expand any existing recreation facilities with the scope of this project. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: No significant impacts to recreation or open space will result from the project. For the “Recreation” section, 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 |
| 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.

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

- a/b) The Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the proposed project and determined it would not trip the traffic impact threshold of the General Plan. The 2004 General Plan Policies TC-Xe and TX-Xf (which incorporate Measure Y) require that projects that “worsen” traffic by two percent, or 10 peak hour trips, or 100 average daily trips must construct (or ensure funding and programming) of any improvements required to meet Level of Service standards in the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. DOT has reviewed the proposed project and determined that it would not trigger the threshold described above because of its limited size. DOT has conditioned the project to address this General Plan consistency issue by requiring payment of traffic impact mitigation fees with each building permit.
- c) The project will not result in a change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity. No impacts would occur.
- d) The project would be required to make on-site road improvements consistent with the provisions of the DISM. As such, the proposed project would not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersection or incompatible uses that would increase hazards. The applicant is requesting a design waivers related to road construction to reduce the on-site roadway width of Boulder Road to a modified 101B standard to 20- feet with one (1) foot shoulders without curb, gutter, and sidewalk. Due to the relatively low Average Daily Trips (ADT) and limited development potential along Boulder Road, DOT has supported the requested design waiver. The applicant has also requested to eliminate roadway widening of the project frontage on Cold Springs Road. DOT supports the request to eliminate the widening of Cold Springs Road; however, DOT has conditioned the project to require the applicant to dedicate a 30-foot Irrevocable Offer of Dedication along the project frontage of Cold Springs road along with applicable slope easements. Lastly, the applicant has request to allow the centerline of Boulder Lane to not follow the centerline of proposed right-of-way. DOT does not support this request. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) The El Dorado County Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and concluded that the project would not result in inadequate emergency access to any potential residential structure with the implementation of the conditions of approval included in Attachment 1 of the staff report. Also, the project has been conditioned to require an approved Fire Safe Plan prior to filing the parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The proposed parcels would provide adequate space to comply with all parking requirements. Future development would be required to meet on-site parking requirements identified by use within Section 17.18.060 of the County Zoning Ordinance. Future requests for building permits would be reviewed for conformance with parking standards during the review process. A single-family residence requires two on-site parking spaces in tandem. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan Policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The applicant is requesting design waivers for reduction of required curb, gutter, sidewalks, and a 10-foot shoulder as required by DISM standard plan 101B and General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element Policy TC-4i which seeks the inclusion of pedestrian/bike paths connecting to adjacent development and to schools, parks, commercial areas and other facilities in Community Regions where feasible. The project is located within the Placerville Community Region, however, there are no schools, parks or commercial areas, nor is there existing sidewalks within the project vicinity. DOT has reviewed and approved the proposed design waiver and Planning Services is recommending relief of the pedestrian/bike path requirement of Policy TC-4i. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: For the “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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

| 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 |

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) Environmental Management has reviewed and approved the existing and proposed septic designs. There is adequate septic capability for the existing and proposed systems. No significant wastewater discharge will result from the proposed parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) No new water or wastewater treatment facilities are proposed or are required because of the project. The existing septic and proposed systems have been reviewed and approved by the Environmental Management Department. The El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 26, 2007 stating that public water services and required fire flow are available to the serve the proposed project with a water line extension from the 8-inch water line in Cold Springs Road.

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

(*Facility Improvement Letter, Cold Springs Estates, March 26, 2007*). Impacts from connection to existing water facilities would be minimal. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Existing and proposed storm water drainage facilities are addressed in the “Drainage Report for Cold Springs Estates, Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., December 17, 2007.” The drainage report states “On-site drainage structures are sized to accommodate 100 year storm events.” (*Drainage Report for Cold Springs Estates, Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., December 17, 2007*) The *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply to this project. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- d) The El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 26, 2007 stating that “In order to provide fire flow and receive service, the applicant must construct a water line extension form the 8-inch water line in Cold Springs Road.” (*Facility Improvement Letter, Cold Springs Estates, March 26, 2007*). Impacts from connection to existing water facilities would be minimal. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- e) In this case, wastewater disposal for the proposed parcels will be provided by existing and proposed septic disposal systems. Environmental Management has reviewed and approved the existing and proposed disposal systems for the project.
- f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

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

- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development proved areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collection and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste and recyclables collection for the proposed lots would be provided by a local waste management provider contracting to the property owner for the service. Adequate space would be available at the site for solid waste collection. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: No significant impacts will result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the “Utilities and Service Systems” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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

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

Discussion:

- a) Potential impacts to biological resources have been mitigated to a less than significant level and are not anticipated to reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. All potentially significant effects on biological resources can be mitigated to a level of less than significant. The project would not eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Subsurface earthwork may expose previously undiscovered buried resources; however, standard conditions of approval are incorporated into the project within Attachment 1 of the staff report ensuring that impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant impact. Any impacts from the project will be less than significant due to existing standards and requirements, and proposed mitigations imposed in the conditioning of the project.
- 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, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." Based on the analysis in this Environmental Checklist, it has been determined that all cumulative impacts related to air quality, biological resources, and hazards and hazardous materials are either less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts on these areas. Impacts are less than significant.
- c) All impacts identified in this MND are either less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that 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 Development Services, Planning Services in Placerville:

2004 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.

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume II - Comments on Supplement to DEIR to Comments on DEIR
Volume III - Technical Appendices B through H
Volume IV – Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR
Volume V – Appendices

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 Manual

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.)

El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan

PROJECT SPECIFIC REPORTS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Cultural Resources Study prepared by Historic Resource Associates, dated January 2007

Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory, prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., dated October 3, 2007

Facilities Improvement Letter, prepared by El Dorado County Irrigation District, dated March 26, 2007

Geologic Evaluation, prepared by George A. Wheeldon, dated July, 2007

Drainage Report for Cold Springs Estates, prepared by Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., dated December 17, 2007

Oak Canopy Retention Analysis, Preservation and Replacement Plan, prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., dated December 14, 2007

Mitigation Measure Agreement for Z07-0057, P07-0052/Cold Springs Estates

As the applicant, owner, or their legal agent, I hereby agree to amend the above named project by incorporating all required mitigation measures, as identified in the related Environmental Checklist, which are necessary in order to avoid or reduce any potentially significant environmental effects to a point where clearly no significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

I understand that by agreeing to amend the proposed project through incorporation of the identified mitigation measures, or substantially similar measures, all potentially adverse environmental impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level and a "Proposed Negative Declaration" would be prepared and circulated in accordance with County procedures for implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). I also understand that additional mitigation measures may be required following the review of the "Proposed Negative Declaration" by the public, affected agencies, and by the applicable advisory and final decision making bodies.

I understand the required mitigation measures incorporated into the project would be subject to the El Dorado County Mitigation Monitoring program adopted in conjunction with the Negative Declaration, and that I would be subject to fees for the planning staff time to monitor compliance with the mitigation measures.

This agreement shall be binding on the applicant/property owner and on any successors or assigns in interest.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Planning Director or his assign, representing the County of El Dorado, and the applicant/owner or his legal agent have executed this agreement on this _____ day of _____, _____.

El Dorado County Planning Services
Robert Peters, Assistant Planner

Signature of Applicant / Owner / Agent:

By _____

Print Name and address below

Print Name and title above

