



**EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING SERVICES
2850 FAIRLANE COURT
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Z07-0033/PD07-0020/TM07-1448/McCann Subdivision

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

Contact Person: Tom Dougherty, Planning Services

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Project Owner/Applicant's Name and Address: Michael, Robynn, Joshua McCann, 12230 Herdal Dr., Auburn, CA., 95603

Project Engineer: Timothy Schad, L.S., 10699 Round Valley Road, Grass Valley, CA., 95949

Project Location: The property is located approximately 1,600 feet east of the intersection of Truscott Lane and Union Mine Road in the El Dorado area, Supervisorial District III.

Assessors Parcel No: 331-420-12

Parcel Size: 24.30 acres

Zoning: Planned Agricultural 20-Acre (PA-20)

Section: Portion of 36 **T:** 9N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: High Density Residential (HDR)

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

1. Rezone a 24.30-acre parcel from Planned Agricultural 20-Acre (PA-20) to One-Family Residential – Planned Development, (R1 – PD), and Open Space – Planned Development;
2. Request for a Development Plan and Tentative Subdivision Map to create 72 single-family residential lots ranging in size from 6,002 to 16,809 square feet, and one 7.5-acre open space lot;
3. Request for a Design Waiver to allow variations from Volume II, Section 2.B.5 of the El Dorado County Design Improvement Standards Manual (DISM) for reduced lot widths on Lots 17, 18, 20, 21, 48, 50, 51, and 52;
4. Request for a Design Waiver to allow variations from Volume II, Section 2.B.7 of the El Dorado County Design Improvement Standards Manual (DISM) to allow Lots 17, 18 and 51 to be flag-shaped lots;
5. Request for a Design Waiver to allow for sidewalks to be reduced to from six feet to four feet wide.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
North:	PA-20	HDR	Planned agricultural, vacant, (one, 24.36-acre parcel).
East:	RA-20	HDR	Residential agricultural, vacant, (one, 25.27-acre parcel).
South:	RA-20	HDR	Residential agricultural, vacant, (one 40-acre parcel).
West:	PA-20	HDR	School, Shenandoah High School, (one, 20.40-acre parcel).

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 24.30-acre parcel varies in elevation from 1,660 to 1,760 feet above sea level. The highest point is in the southwestern portion of the parcel which slopes moderately to steeply from that point in all directions. Deadman Creek is an intermittent stream that flows north to south in the western portion of the parcel. The majority of the parcel is grassland and the oak woodland exists primarily in the southern and western portions around the perimeter. The parcel has historically been used for grazing livestock, though not currently.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado County Surveyor, Building Services, Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District, El Dorado County Resource Conservation District, El Dorado Irrigation District, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, El Dorado County Department of Transportation.

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. The environmental factors checked below contain mitigation measures, which reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
X	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology/Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology/ Water Quality	X	Land Use/Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population/Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities/Service Systems	X	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: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____
 Printed Name: Pierre Rivas, Principal Planner 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.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed residential project. The project would allow the creation of fifteen residential parcels.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within the El Dorado - Diamond Springs. The project site is surrounded by existing developed and undeveloped residential parcels and a school.

Project Characteristics

The project would create 72 single-family residential parcels ranging in size from 6,002 to 16,809 square feet and one 7.5-acre open space lot. Interior roads, sidewalks, a Class 2 Bike Path and a non-motorized vehicle pedestrian trail would all be constructed within the project area for internal circulation and access onto Truscott Road east and west.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the project parcel would be provided from an access easement along Truscott Road from Union Mine Road to the parcel. The project would be required to provide an extension of the Truscott Road access from the existing cul-de-sac adjacent to Union Mine High School easterly to provide a secondary access to Solstice Circle. The project is proposed to create 72 residential lots, which would require two parking spaces per parcel. Parking for each parcel would be provided within private garages. No impacts to parking would occur as part of the project.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site is currently undeveloped. As part of the project, the extension of utilities services would be required. The project would be required to connect to El Dorado Irrigation District sewer facilities to the north near Charles Brown School and domestic metered water service to the southwest at Truscott Road.

3. Population

Using the 2000 U.S. Census figures which established that, in the unincorporated areas of the County, the average household size was 2.70 persons/occupied unit. The approval of the applications as proposed would potentially add 72 single-family units which at 2.70 persons/occupied unit currently propose to potentially add approximately 194 persons to the neighborhood. The project proposes a density of three units per acre. The High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation allows one to five units per acre. The project proposes to add less than the potential density allowed.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of both on and off-site road improvements including grading for on-site roadways and driveways.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from Development Services and obtain an approved Fugitive Dust Plan from the Air Quality Management District.

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

This Mitigated Negative Declaration tiers off of the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR (State Clearing House Number 2001082030 in accordance with Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines. The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR is available for review at the County web site at <http://www.co.el->

dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm or at the El Dorado County Development Services Department located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. All determinations and impacts identified that rely upon the General Plan EIR analysis and all General Plan Mitigation Measures are identified herein. The following impact areas are tiering off the General Plan EIR:

Aesthetics, Agriculture Resources, and Air Quality.

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 or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X

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

- a. **Scenic Vista:** The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Scenic Highways:** The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>)). Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Visual Character:** The DEIR for the General Plan had identified and examined the potential impacts that implementation of the General Plan would have to the visual character of the areas of the County. Section 5.3-2 states that the County mitigate the potential significant impacts by designing new streets and roads within new developments to *minimize visual impacts, preserve rural character, and ensure neighborhood quality to the maximum extent possible consistent with the needs of emergency access, on-street parking, and vehicular and pedestrian safety.* The proposed project is designed and conditioned to provide the General Plan designated HDR land with a secondary access for emergency safety, for 40 and 48-foot width roads on-site and offsite to facilitate on-street parking, bike lanes, and four-foot sidewalks to provide pedestrian safety. These are the minimum widths to permit this. In addition, the project clusters the dwelling sites to permit open space areas to partially buffer outside-in views.

Mitigation in the form of General Plan polices have been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels for impacts associated with agriculture resources. Cumulative impacts were previously considered and analyzed. With full review with consistency with General Plan Policies as well as the consistency rezone resultant of the subject applications, impacts would be less than significant. As designed and conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

- d. **Light and Glare:** If approved as proposed, the creation of these 72 lots would allow new lighting by creating the potential for residential units on each lot. These impacts would not be expected to be any more than any typical residential lighting similar and typical to other subdivisions created within a land use area designated by the General Plan for High Density Residential uses within the County. Section 5.3-3 states the potential significant impacts would be

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

mitigated by including *design features, namely directional shielding for street lighting, parking lot lighting, and other significant lighting sources, that could reduce the effects from nighttime lighting.* With exception to potential patio and garage entrance lighting, common area lighting is not proposed for this project. All lighting, including patio and garage entrance lighting would be required to meet the County lighting ordinance and must be shielded to avoid potential glare affecting day or nighttime views for those that live or travel through the area.

Twelve street lights are proposed. Planning recommends that the project be conditioned for all lighting to conform to Section 17.14.170, and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America’s (IESNA) full cut-off designation. It is further recommended that the height of pole lighting be restricted to a maximum of 16-feet tall from finished grade to the top of the light head so street trees can grow over the tops of the lights and not obscure the lighting. Planning would also recommend that a Lighting and Landscape District be formed to fund the street lighting and any shared street landscaping within the subdivision.

Mitigation in the form of General Plan polices have been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels for impacts associated with agriculture resources. Cumulative impacts were previously considered and analyzed. With full review with consistency with General Plan Policies as well as the consistency rezone resultant of the subject applications, impacts would be less than significant. As designed and conditioned, impacts from outdoor lighting would be less than significant with this project.

Finding: It could be found that as conditioned, the project would not significantly impact designated scenic highways, scenic viewpoints as well as outside-in views, and lighting impacts not normally anticipated from similar high density residential developments. As a result, there would be a less than significant level of 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, b, c.) **Conversion of Prime Farmland, Williamson Act Contracts, Non-agricultural Use:** The United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service *Soil Survey, El Dorado Area, California*, issued April of 1974

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

shows that the parcel contains the following soils: mariposa very rocky silt loam with 3 to 50 percent slopes (MbE), Diamond Springs very rocky very fine sandy loam with 3 to 50 percent slopes (DgE) and Mariposa gravely silt loam with 3 to 30 percent slopes (MaD). Pursuant to El Dorado County Agricultural Commission staff in their recommendation to the Commissioners, approximately 10 to 12 acres of choice soils would be lost to potential agricultural production. This property and project is not under, and would not conflict with an adjacent Williamson Act Contract. There would be a conflict with existing zone designations protecting agricultural uses and with General Plan Policies 8.1.3.1, 8.1.3.2 and 8.2.2.5 that require that newly created parcels adjacent to Agricultural land be ten acres or larger and be of such size as to allow for adequate setback. In Section 5.2-1, the General Plan DEIR identified potential significant impacts by new development that would convert Important Farmlands and grazing areas. DEIR Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(a) identifies that these impacts are significant and unavoidable in many instances. Table 5.2-5 identifies that an estimated 104,149 agriculturally zoned acres were subject to a medium or high conversion potential. DEIR Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(a) and (b) direct that the County *establish a General Plan conformity review process for all development projects* and that development be *located and designed in a manner that avoids adjacent incompatible land uses*.

The DEIR also suggests that zoning designations be changed be compatible with the relative General Plan designation, and the General Plan requires that as well. The project was reviewed at the El Dorado Agricultural Commissioner’s hearing on March 12, 2008 and they recommended denial because of conflicts with General Plan Policies 8.1.3.1, 8.1.3.2 and 8.2.2.5 for conflicts with existing, surrounding agriculturally zoned lands. They recognized that the requested rezone from PA-20 to R1 – PD would be consistent with the current General Plan designation of HDR for the subject parcel, as well as the adjacent parcels. However, they could not recommend approval until such time as the zoning of those parcels be changed to be compatible with the HDR land use designation and thus, the Commission had no other options available to them but to recommend denial of the project. Their memo dated March 19, 2008 that summarizes their decision states that *other General Plan Policies that are fundamental, mandatory and specific such as 8.1.3.1, 8.1.3.2 and 8.2.2.5 require that newly created parcels adjacent to Agricultural land must be ten acres or larger and be of such size as to allow for an adequate setback.*”

The subject parcel is located within the El Dorado – Diamond Springs Community Region. General Plan Policy 2.1.1.2 establishes Community Regions as those areas *which are appropriate for the highest intensity of self-sustaining compact urban-type development or suburban-type development*. The parcel also has a General Plan land use designation of High Density Residential and Policy 2.2.1.5 determines that that land use designation identifies *those areas suitable for intensive single-family residential development at densities from one to five dwelling units per acre*. Planning Services staff has determined it could be found that this is not an area intended by the 2004 General Plan to be one to be preserved for agricultural use.

Mitigation in the form of General Plan polices have been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels for impacts associated with agriculture resources. Cumulative impacts were previously considered and analyzed. With full review with consistency with General Plan Policies as well as the consistency rezone resultant of the subject applications, impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: This project would not impact properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The location within a Community Region and land use designation of High Density Residential diminish the importance of preserving the land for agricultural purposes. Impacts within this category would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

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

a. **Air Quality Plan:** 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, NO_x, and O₃). Because the project is located within the asbestos review area, the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) would require the project implement an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) during grading and construction activities. As part of the review to be incorporated into the grading plan, the ADMP would provide a comprehensive list of required and typical permit conditions to be implemented during construction of the project. The typical measures that are included in the permit would include, but are not limited to, sensitive grading standards, techniques, and minimization of heavy equipment operations that would reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions below a level of significance. The ADMP would be reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) prior to the approval of grading or construction permits. As a result, there would be a less than significant impact within this category.

b, c) **Air Quality Standards:** The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the *Air Quality Report* prepared by Foothill Associates on April 9, 2007 for this project and determined that by implementing typical conditions that are included in the project permit, that the project would have a less than significant level of impact in this category. The conditions are implemented as part of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) to be reviewed and approved by the AQMD prior to and concurrently with the grading, improvement, and/or building permit approvals would manage heavy equipment and mobile source emissions, as well as site disturbance and construction measures and

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

techniques. In addition, the General Plan DEIR Section 5.11 addresses air quality from transportation sources, specifically those generated by vehicles that travel on roadways in the County, partially from US Highway 50 as a generator. Such source emissions have already been considered with the adopted 2004 General Plan and EIR. Mitigation in the form of General Plan polices have been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels for impacts associated with air quality standards. Cumulative impacts were previously considered and analyzed. With full review with consistency with General Plan Policies as well as the consistency rezone resultant of the subject applications, impacts would be less than significant.

- d. **Sensitive Receptors:** The CEQA Guide identifies sensitive receptors as facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others that are especially sensitive to the affects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools and convalescent hospitals are examples of sensitive receptors. The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and identified this site as not being within the asbestos review area. Shenandoah High School adjoins the project parcel on the west side. However, by implementing ADMD Rules 223, 223 – 1, a Fugitive Dust Control Plan, as well as implementing typical conditions for the development of the site as it relates to pollutant concentrations based on Environmental Management rules, regulations, and standards, the impacts associated with this category would be less than significant.
- e. **Odors:** Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District’s (AQMD’s) CEQA guide does not classify residential development as an odor generating use. The proposed addition of 72 single-family units to the area would not be anticipated to generate or be subject to impacts associated with odor. There would be no impacts.

Finding: Standard conditions of approval, as required by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD), are included as part of the project permit. These conditions are typical for most projects throughout the County. As such, residential development of 72 units and the creation of a large open space lot would have a less than significant impact in this category.

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. **Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities:** A *Focused Plant Survey* done by Foothill Associates, dated May 29, 2007 that included the results of a survey of the parcel for the special status and locally significant plants and suitable habitat for the same. The field study was done on May 23, 2007 to encompass the blooming period of all special-status plants with a potential to occur on the site. The survey was done in accordance with the California Native Plant Society Botanical Survey Guidelines. No special-status species were found on the site. The project is also located in Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2. While no rare plants were identified in surveys conducted, the applicant would be subject to payment of a mitigation fee. Other impacts to wildlife would be mitigated with the designation of large open space areas and protection of water features and migration corridors through the designation of open space areas on the tentative map. Impacts to biological resources are considered less than significant with adherence to General Plan Policies required mitigation, and mitigation incorporated into the project description in the form of open space designations. Impacts would be less than significant.

b, c) **Riparian Habitat, Wetlands:** The project is not located within a sensitive natural community of the County, state or federal agency, including but not limited to an Ecological Preserve or USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries.

Potentially Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. The site supports potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. These areas are likely regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the El Dorado County General Plan. As stated in Policy 7.3.3.4 of the General Plan, El Dorado County requires a 100-foot setback from all perennial streams, rivers, and lakes and a 50-foot setback from all intermittent streams and wetlands (El Dorado County 2004). The western portion of the Deadman Creek drainage that transverses the parcel at the western boundary draining north to south, is mapped as an intermittent stream. The entire drainage length is characterized by blue oak woodland habitat of varying density. Implementing a 50-foot buffer from the drainage and proposed development is expected to protect riparian habitat values and quality of the drainage in the open space corridor.

The applicants submitted two reports, the *Jurisdictional Delineation Report*, Gibson and Skordal Associates, dated January 2007 and the *Revised Wetland Delineation Map, McCann property*, Gibson and Skordal, LLC dated May 16, 2008. The revised report examined the off site impacts to wetlands with the understanding that water lines would be placed within the new road alignments and sewer lines would be placed within existing sewer easements. The new sewer line proposed to connect to the existing lift station was surveyed for wetlands. A total of 0.3092 acres of channels and 0.0497 acres of seasonal wetlands were mapped in the combined study area and infrastructure corridors. It was

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

recommended by that report that in order to assure that wetland impacts are mitigated to a level that is less than significant, that wetland mitigation credits be purchased from an approved wetland mitigation bank at a ratio of one acre of credit purchased for each acre of wetland impact. The proposed road from the subject parcel to Truscott Road would cross Deadman Creek. There is the potential that construction activities associated with the development of this project may indirectly impact the potential waters of the U.S. that occur onsite from runoff during construction. If indirect impacts have the potential to occur during construction activities, additional measures may be required to maintain water quality standards of the waterways. Any alterations crossings of streams potentially require Streambed Alteration Permits. The following mitigation measures are to be implemented in order to reduce the impacts to the stream and watershed to a less than significant level:

After Planning consulted with U.S. Army Corps staff, the following mitigation measures were written and are recommended in order to bring potential impacts to wetland features to a less than significant level:

1. *Prior to disturbance of any waters of the United States including any wetland features, the wetland delineation study for the project site shall be submitted to the Corps for their verification and approval. If fill of any potential waters of the U.S are anticipated, the appropriate Corps 404 permit must be obtained prior to the fill activity occurring. The appropriate terms of mitigation including the wetland acreage to be mitigated for would be defined in the issued Corps permit. Any waters of the U.S. that would be lost or disturbed should be replaced or rehabilitated at a “no-net-loss” basis in accordance with the Corps’ mitigation guidelines. Habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement should be at a location and by methods agreeable to the Corps. A total of 0.3092 acres of channels and 0.0497 acres of seasonal wetlands were mapped in the combined study area and infrastructure corridors. Wetland mitigation for this project shall be required. Mitigation may include the purchase of mitigation credits from an approved wetland mitigation bank at an appropriate ratio for each acre of wetland /waters proposed to be impacted as determined by the Corps of Engineers. [MM Bio 1].*

Monitoring: *The applicant shall provide a copy of the 404 permit, if required, to Development Services prior to issuance of the grading permit. If no permits are required by the Corps, a letter from the Corps shall be provided to Development Services stating that no permit shall be required for this project.*

2. *A 50-foot setback line shall be recorded on the final map that begins at all high-water marks or the outer boundary of any adjacent wetlands along Dead Man Creek as determined by the Corps of Engineer’s verified wetland delineation of waters of the United States. No development shall occur within the setback area. No proposed lot boundary lines shall infringe on said setback lines. The identification shall be made on the final map, Site Plan Review, grading and building plans where applicable. [MM Bio 2].*

Monitoring: *Prior to filing of final map, Site Plan Review (SPR), grading and/or building plan approval, Development Services shall verify that the identification has been be made on the final map, Site Plan Review, grading and building plans where applicable. The setback lines shall be shown on any submitted development plans submitted for the grading permit and Development Services shall verify this prior to issuance of any grading permit.*

3. *A Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFG, pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code, for each stream crossing and any other activities affecting the bed, bank, or associated riparian vegetation of any stream on the site. Appropriate mitigation measures would be developed in coordination with CDFG in the context of the 1602 agreement process. Authorization prior to placement of any fill is required from the Corps of Engineers if any impacts are proposed to jurisdictional*

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

riparian habitat. This authorization may require mitigation as deemed necessary by the Corps of Engineers. [MM Bio 3].

Monitoring: *The applicant shall provide a copy of the 1602 permit to Development Services prior to issuance of any grading permit.*

In addition to the mitigations, the County requires that pre- and post construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) be implemented into the design of grading and improvement plans to reduce or eliminate run-off. Such BMPS would be required to meet the County’s Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SWMP), the state’s Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Program (SWPPP) criteria, and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) standards. As a result, impacts in this category would be reduced below a level of significant.

- d. **Wildlife corridors:** The project proposes to create a 7.5-acre lot dedicated as open space. That lot includes the riparian corridor associated with Deadman Creek, arguably the most important biological corridor because of the seasonal presence of water and where the native tree canopy would be preserved. With the adoption of the recommended mitigations, the impacts on this important biological corridor and migratory passageway would be less than significant.
- e. **Biological Resources:** Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes the native oak tree canopy retention and replacement standards. Impacts to oak woodlands have been addressed in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR, available for review online at <http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm> or at El Dorado County Planning Services offices located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667. Mitigation in the form of General Plan policies has been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels. In this instance, adherence to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and measures contained within the Oak Woodlands Management Plan would mitigate impacts to oak woodland to less than significant levels. The subject parcel contains 24.3 acres. There 11.17 acres in the infrastructure corridors where the roads and utilities would be expanded off site. That amounts to 35.47 acres of which there are 12.03 acres of oak canopy (8.81 + 3.22) or 34 percent of total oak canopy coverage. The Interim Interpretive Guidelines for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires retention of 85 percent of the indigenous oak tree canopy on the subject parcel and corridor as a whole. The submitted *Oak Tree Impacts* map prepared by Foothill Associates dated May 30, 2008 determined that 3.22 acres of the 12.03 would be impacted which is 27 percent. That means 73 percent would be retained which is less than the required 85 percent by 12 percent. In lieu of the replanting and monitoring requirements set forth in Option A, the applicant has chosen mitigate the impacts to oak woodland by complying with the oak conservation in-lieu fee requirements (Option B) of the Oak Woodland Management Plan. With the adoption of the recommended Condition of Approval No. 6, the project would be compliant with Policy 7.4.4.4.

Planning staff has analyzed the project impacts to oak tree canopy using an aerial photo and the submitted map in order to confirm the information received in the submitted studies. Because the project is using mass pad grading which would be done when the developer required infrastructure is put in, the trees would be impacted at that time and not with individual future building permits for each lot. Thus the burden of mitigating the project impacts to oak tree canopy falls wholly on the applicant.

- f. **Adopted Plans:** This project, as designed, does 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. There would be a less than significant impact in this category.

Finding: This site is not located within the County’s adopted Ecological Preserve or within the USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries. All wetlands and buffers must be protected and shall be shown on grading and improvement plans. The oak tree canopy impacts would be mitigated pursuant to the General Plan guidelines. With the implementation of mitigation measures and strict adherence to applicable County Codes, impacts within this category would be reduced below a level of significant.

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

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-d) **Historical Resources, Pre-Historic Resources:** A *Cultural Resources Inventory*, dated January 2007 by Ric Windmiller, Consulting Archeologist, was completed for the subject parcel that reported there were no significant prehistoric and historic-period cultural resources sites, artifacts, historic buildings, structures or objects found. Because of the possibility in the future that ground disturbances could discover significant cultural resources, the following standard condition is required:

In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit, to ensure that this notation has been placed on the grading plans.

Finding: As with many projects throughout the County, the potential to find historic, archaeological, or human remains outside of a designated cemetery could occur with this project. Combined with the typical project conditions outlined in the project permit, impacts would be reduced below a level of significance with this project.

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. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction:** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a

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

region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive. (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001). Impacts would be less than significant.

- b, c) **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil:** All grading activities exceeding 50 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. Project grading and improvements would occur on-site and off-site. Improvements that would be required for the project for access road, driveway, water and sewer line connections. On-site grading would be required to prepare the project for residential development to include pad grading, interior road circulation, driveway improvements, water/sewer connections, and drainages. Off-site grading would be required to extend “Street A,” as shown on the submitted map, to the west to Truscott Road and to the east to Solstice Circle. All grading plans and activities would be designed to comply with the *El Dorado County Grading and Drainage* standards, which would address pre-and post construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion and sediment controls. As a result, impacts within this category would be less than significant.

There are three soil classifications found within the parcel (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). Approximately half of the project soil is classified as Mariposa gravelly silt loam (MaD) with 3 to 30 percent slope, surface runoff is medium, permeability is moderate, and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate, predominately located within the northeastern portion of the parcel. The map shows some Mariposa very rocky silt loam (MbE) with 3 to 50 percent slope, surface runoff is medium to rapid, permeability is moderate, and the erosion hazard is slight to high. in the southern portion of the parcel up to the Deadman Creek vicinity. The map shows some Diamond Springs very rocky, very fine sandy loam (DgE) in the western portion of the parcel along Deadman Creek which is generally characterized as having 3 to 50 percent slopes, surface runoff is medium to rapid, permeability is moderate slow, and the erosion hazard is slight to high. Any future grading or improvement activities would be designed to comply with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. As a result, impacts within this category would be less than significant.

- d. **Expansive soils:** According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974* Based on the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, CA*, issued April 1974, and the Geotechnical Engineering Study prepared for the project, the area where development would occur has stable soil types that are suitable for residential development. There are no fault lines on the property and the project is not located within a seismic fault buffer. Any future development of the property must be designed to conform to the *County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* and the *Uniform Building Code (UBC)*. As a result, impacts within this category would be less than significant.
- e. **Septic Systems:** This project would connect to the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) water and sewer lines. Pursuant to Facility Improvement Letter FIL0607-180 dated June 25, 2007, there is existing water service available for water line connection near Union Mine High School at Truscott Road. There are no septic disposal areas proposed or allowed for this project and there is potential for the applicant to hook into existing sewer lines (see Utilities and Service Systems category). There would be no impacts to this category because of the availability of EID services for this project once the required EID extensions, improvements, and connections are made.

Finding: A review of the soils and geologic conditions of the property finds that the site comprises of stable soils that are suitable for the type of development that is proposed. The site has areas of variable slopes with different degrees of steepness, including some of which that are 30 percent and steeper. All grading would be designed to meeting *County of El*

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

Dorado Grading and Drainage standards. Any future construction of residential development would be designed to meet the *Uniform Building Code (UBC)* Seismic Safety Zone 3 construction standards that would apply to residential development. In this category, the threshold of impacts has not been exceeded.

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

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

- 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.

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

- a, b) **Hazardous Substances:** No significant amount of hazardous materials would be used for the project, including those that may be required during construction activities to prepare the site to construct single-family residential homes. Hazardous materials are not expected, and any such material that would need to be used at the project site must comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*. In addition, all materials that are to be used, including, but not limited to diesel powered construction equipment and other material typical of a construction project must be used under the County’s Air Quality Management District (AQMD) and Environmental Management guidelines. The project does not expect to experience any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. As such, impacts within this category would remain below a level of significant.
- c. **Hazardous Emissions:** 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, even though school facilities exist within one-quarter mile, just across and north of US Highway 50. There would be operation of construction equipment and the use of construction materials, none of which are classified as acutely hazardous materials and/or all materials would be regulated based on Environmental Management standards. Impacts within this category remain below significant.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites:** The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. There would be no impact within this category. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (*California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List)*), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List, accessed September 23, 2004; *California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004*; *California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004*). There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards:** *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and this project is not located within not located within two miles of a public airport. There would be no impacts within this category.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards:** *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 privately owned airstrip. There would be no impacts within this category.
- g. **Emergency Response Plan:** This project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan. The County’s Emergency Response Plan incorporates elements of the emergency response and evacuation procedures and includes reference to fire safety and circulation, as well as applicable contact and safety procedures linked to state and federal agencies responsible for emergency preparedness and response. The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) is responsible for maintaining the El Dorado County Emergency Management Policy and the County Sheriff’s Office is responsible for operating the County’s Office of Emergency Service (OES) for the entire County. The main El Dorado County Sheriff’s Office is located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville. There would be a less than significant impact in this category.
- h. **Fire Hazards:** The site is located in a neighborhood designated for high-density single-family residential development in all directions except west, where the schools are. As with most areas of the County, there is vegetation such as trees and foliage that exist on and adjacent to this property. The Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District reviewed the project and would require that fire hydrants be installed and that a Fire Safe Plan be developed for this project during the grading and/or building permit review phase. As conditioned, there would be adequate driveway and

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

emergency access to accommodate fire apparatus, emergency vehicle and automobile circulation on and around the site in case of an emergency. Project conditions have also been included by the Fire District and in cooperation with the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) improvements to ensure that adequate fire flow and water pressure is available for this project. As a result, this project poses a less than significant level chance to 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. The impacts within this category would remain below significant.

Finding: The site is not located within two miles of a public or private airport. The site is within one-quarter mile of school facilities however, no hazardous materials exist and/or no excessive exposures from diesel fuel, emissions, and/or construction materials would result from the project because the project be required to adhere to the Air Quality Management District (AQMD) and Environmental Management rules and regulations. Such rules are included in the project conditions and are typical. Fire hydrants, water line infrastructure, and the implementation of a Fire Safe Plan would address overall fire safety and reduces impacts associated to wildland fires for this project. Impacts within this category would remain below significant.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X
e. Create or contribute run-off 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			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>			
dam?			
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
 - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a. **Water Quality Standards:** Any grading and improvement plans required by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) and/or Building Services would 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. Combined with the design standards outlined by the *El Dorado Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM)*, as well as the *Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance*, all stormwater and sediment control methods required by the ordinance would be implemented and engineered correctly for the final design, including those necessary for site grading and drainage facilities. Grading and drainage designs shall consider and would be designed pursuant to a project specific Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SWMP). This would address Storm Water Prevention and Pollution Program (SWPPP) standards in order to adhere to the state requirements, as well as the federal, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for water quality and water discharge. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Groundwater:** There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The project is required to connect to the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) water line (see Utility and Services Systems category). There would be no draw from groundwater sources in the area with the approval of this project and impacts in this category would be less than significant.
- c, d) **Drainage Patterns:** All grading and drainage activities would be required to implement *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* standards to ensure that grading and/or ground disturbance include proper designs that would reduce and/or eliminate run-off pre-and post construction. The standards would apply to this project and impacts would be less than significant.

Should the backyards of the higher lots drain to the backyards of the lower lots, interceptor drains would be necessary and required and should be shown on the improvement plans. Offsite Drainage easements would need to be obtained for any offsite drainage. All stair-step effects from grading would be required to be minimized through the use of Contour Grading. The final drainage plan would be required to be designed to meet the *El Dorado County Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*. As conditioned and with strict adherence to County Code, there would be a less than significant impact in these categories.

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

- e. **Stormwater Runoff:** The project would alter drainage patterns slightly due to grading activities and road improvements. Stormwater runoff has the potential to increase due to the introduction of impervious surfaces into areas not previously developed. Primary increases in runoff would be attributed to road surfaces. The rate of surface runoff from development would be minimized through the application review process; there would be a less than significant impact from the current proposal’s minor road improvements and future impervious surfaces created with development on the new parcels. The access roads and lot pad areas would require modifications to comply with DOT and Fire Code regulations, and strict adherence to Resource Conservation District Best Management Practices.

The Drainage Manual Sections 1.3 & 1.4 require that a project mitigate for increased runoff. The pre-project runoff and post-project 10-yr flows must be equal or post-project flows must be less. If post-project flows exceed pre-project flows, the project must incorporate detention for the stormwater drainage. An area would be required By DOT to be set aside for stormwater detention due to stormwater runoff to assure stormwater is handled as discussed above. As conditioned by DOT and with strict adherence to County Code, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

- f. **Degradation of Water Quality:** The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. Stormwater and sediment control measures outlined by the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* that implement a project specific Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SWMP), the state’s Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Program (SWPPP) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) would be required to be designed with grading and drainage plans. The designs would also include and implement pre- and post- construction Best Management Practices (BMPs), as well as permanent drainage facilities, in order to address the issue of water quality. As discussed above in the *Biological Resources* section, a 50-foot building setback line would be required from the high-water mark on Deadman Creek and the project would be required to adhere to the California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers standards for potential wetland impacts. As a result, there would be a less than significant impacts.
- g, h, i) **Flooding:** The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0750 B, October 18, 1983) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. The site is not located downstream from any dam and is not located in any area protected by levees. The Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) maps designate this site as Flood Zone Category C, which allows development of residential uses at this location and within the Category C designation. There would be no impacts.
- j. **Inundation:** There is no potential for impacts from seiche or tsunami, or from mudflow at this site. There would be no impact.

Finding: The drainage facilities on and off-site would be conditioned to handle the run-off that would be associated to the project. Water would be provided for this project by connections to the EID system, as well as adequate capacity to connect to the existing EID wastewater system. All grading, drainage, to include BMPs for pre-and-post-construction for erosion and sediment controls would be incorporated into the final grading and drainage design for the project. Impacts within this category would remain below significant.

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

IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

- a. **Established Community:** The project would not create any physical divisions of an established community. The project area is part of the El Dorado – Diamond Springs Community Region and is designated by the General Plan for High Density Residential land uses. By rezoning to a more appropriate residential zone designation that would be consistent with the HDR land use designation, the project would provide appropriate single-family residential development in an area where similar development is planned to exist in the future. The location of the new lots consider the sensitive environmental resources that exist on the property, including potential migratory corridors and riparian habitat as well as buffering of the residences created by the location of the open space lot.. It could be found that the dominant pattern of parcel development for the project vicinity has been established and this project could be seen to fit into the intended dominant pattern of the land adjoining the parcel, also similarly designated by the General Plan. As a result, impacts would remain below significant.
- b. **Land Use Plan:** The parcel is zoned Planned Agricultural 20-Acre (PA-20) which is inconsistent with the High Density land use designation and therefore a rezone request to One-Family Residential – Planned Development, (R1 - PD) is requested. The proposed rezone, planned development and tentative subdivision map, as conditioned and mitigated, can be interpreted to be consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, and could be consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.

As discussed above, the project site currently has a High Density Residential land use designation, and is located inside the El Dorado – Diamond Springs Community Region boundary line. The applicant has proposed to designate 7.5 acres of the project site as open space (30.87 percent of the overall 24.3 acres). Designation of these areas as open space on the tentative map is considered beneficial, but not adequate mitigation, as much of the area could be considered developable in the future should the property owner apply for future entitlements. In order to ensure that the open space character is maintained, mitigation requiring rezoning of designated open space lots to an Open Space – Planned Development (OS – PD) zone district is required as mitigation. With incorporation of this mitigation, the open space area

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

would be preserved from development impacts. The following mitigation measure is recommended for addition into the project conditions:

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

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

c. **Habitat Conservation Plan:** There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community plans within the project vicinity. Impacts are less than significant. As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is not located in an ecological preserve mitigation area established for the Pine Hill rare plants or red-legged frog core area. The project would not conflict with any known habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: With an approved rezone, the proposed use of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan policies for high density residential uses. With that approval and as mitigated, there would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property. For this “Land Use” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

a, b.) **Mineral Resources:** The project site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) as mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology and is not classified or affected by any Mineral Resource overlays of the El Dorado County General Plan.

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

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-2 contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves that have been identified and 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. There would be no impact.

Finding: There are no mapped mineral resources or deposits on this property. No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this “Mineral Resources” category, there would be no impact..

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

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

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

a. **Noise Standards:** An *Environmental Noise Assessment* was prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. dated March 30, 2007 for this project that identifies the noise impacts associated to the project based on the pad locations for future homes. The study identified traffic noise standards based on Federal Highway Administration standards, and adjusted based on certain prediction methods, and based on an average vehicle speed of 65 miles per hour. The study

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

concluded that the McCann project site would be exposed to future Pleasant Valley Road traffic noise levels well below the County’s 60 dB Ldn exterior and 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standards for new residential projects, therefore, additional noise mitigation measures would not be required. Impacts in this category would be less than significant.

- b. **Groundborne Vibration & Noise:** Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the project vicinity during development. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. All storage, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas are required to be located as far as practicable from any residential areas. Ground borne vibrations are associated with heavy vehicles (i.e. railroad) and with heavy equipment operations. All noise generation due to construction activities would be required to comply with the Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. Vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project would be typical of traffic generated by the adjacent residential uses; passenger cars and trucks, which are not a source of significant vibration. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Ambient Noise Levels:** The submitted *Environmental Noise Assessment* found that the existing ambient noise in the project vicinity is defined primarily by existing traffic on Pleasant Valley Road. A 24-hour ambient noise level measurement survey was conducted on the project site. They were found to be consistent with rural areas affected by a local traffic noise source. This project would not add to the existing ambient noise levels of the surrounding area. Temporary construction noise would result and project conditions would be regulated as to the time of day and days per week such activity could occur by County Code. Subdivision of the land and construction and occupation of the 74 additional homes would result in periodic noise generation from the use of vehicles, noises generated on home sites, and landscape maintenance. The overall types and volumes of noise would not be excessive and would be similar in character to surrounding land uses which are low to medium density residential in nature. There would be a less than significant impact.
- d. **Temporary Increases in Noise Levels.** The construction phase of the project would result in an increase in noise levels to surrounding residences as individual homes were built on lots. Construction noise would be temporary and would be minimized by compliance with Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. Project operation would also result in periodic noise generation above current levels from the use of vehicles, landscaping equipment, etc. The overall types and volumes of noise from project operation would not be excessive and would be similar in character to anticipated and expected surrounding land uses within a high-density designated area. Thus, as a result, this impact would be less than significant.
- e, f) **Airport Noise:** The project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not experience noise from a private airport. There would be no impacts within this category.

Finding: No significant impacts to or from noise is expected directly as a result of this proposal. Any future development proposal would have all potential environmental impacts analyzed further during the grading/building permit processes. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

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

a. **Population Growth:** The proposed project would not induce growth directly or indirectly by providing infrastructure that would create development beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan because the land use designation would not change and the existing designation of High-Density Residential (HDR) permits one to five dwelling unit per 1.0 acre and the project proposes three per acre. If approved as proposed, the project would ultimately result in the addition of 72 new single-family dwellings. The 2000 U.S. Census figures as noted in Section 2, *Housing Assessments and Needs, Population Characteristics*, established that, in the unincorporated areas of the County, the average household size was 2.70 persons/occupied unit. The approval of the applications as proposed would potentially add 72 single-family units which at 2.70 persons/occupied unit could potentially add approximately 194 persons to the neighborhood. The proposed project would not induce growth in the area that was not previously anticipated when the General Plan High-Density Residential land use designation was adopted. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Housing Displacement:** The project would not displace any existing housing. The proposed project would not displace people or existing housing, which would prevent the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There would be no impact.

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

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

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

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. <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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other government services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

a. **Fire Protection:** The Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. The District was solicited for comments to determine compliance with fire standards, El Dorado County General Plan, State Fire Safe Regulations as adopted by El Dorado County and the California Uniform Fire Code. The District did not respond with any concerns that the level of service would fall below the minimum requirements as a result of the proposed tentative subdivision map, with the adoption of the required fire safe plan to be approved by District and Cal Fire staff as well as the conditions of approval in the staff report. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. The District would review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. The impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection:** If approved as proposed, the proposed parcel map would create 72 residential lots. The development of additional residential lots on the project site may result in a small increase in calls for service but would not significantly impact the Department. The project applicant would be responsible for the payment of development fees to the Department to offset any project impacts. The project site would 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% of the population within Community Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The creation of 72 lots

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

would not significantly impact current Sheriff’s response times to the project area. The impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **Schools:** Elementary and middle school students are served by the Mother Lode Union School District. Students would attend Charles Brown for grades K-5. All students would then attend Herbert Green Middle School. High school students are served by the El Dorado Union High School District, and would attend either Union Mine or Shenandoah High Schools. Neither school district responded with concerns about having the available capacity to handle the potential additional students. Mitigation fees for schools would be collected at the time of building permit issuance. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Parks:** If approved as proposed, the project would add 72 lots of housing units and would create a slight increase in the population in the County as a result. The additional units, however, would not trigger a significant impact that would require the project to develop new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method and procedures to account the acquisition and development of parklands with discretionary subdivisions of land. This section outlines the in-lieu fee options available for residential projects of this size. For this project, a condition of approval is added to the project permit that would require the payment of park acquisition fees prior to final map recording. Park impact fees would also be assessed during the building permit review phase to offset general park facility impacts. Impacts would be less than significant. The project is located within the El Dorado Recreation District which is maintained by the El Dorado County Department of General Services Facilities Department. The development of 72 single family dwellings on high density lots would create an insignificant demand for recreational opportunities, especially in light of the fact that outdoor recreational opportunities would exist within the project development, and at other County maintained facilities in the area. The El Dorado County Department of General Services Facilities Department does not currently maintain a fee program to offset impacts to recreational facilities, although Quimby fees are required to be paid per standard conditions of approval for subdivisions. Given that the County does not maintain standards for parkland, no threshold has been exceeded and thus the impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Other Government Services:** Other local services such as libraries would experience minor impacts. No other government services would be required as a result of the rezone, development plan, and tentative map. The impacts are expected to be incremental and would be less than significant.

Finding: Adequate public services are available to serve the project and payment of impact fees, to include park acquisition fees, would help offset any impacts either direct or indirect that would result with the approval of this project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

- a. **Parks:** The approval of the applications would potentially add 72 single-family units which at 2.70 persons/occupied unit currently propose to potentially add approximately 194 persons to the neighborhood. Each of those could potentially have second dwelling units, however pursuant to El Dorado County Building Permit data, out of 10,597 building permits issued between the years of 2001 to 2006, 323 were second dwelling units which is 3 percent which could lead to the conclusion that they are an insignificant factor when looking at population impacts. The proposed rezone, development plan and tentative subdivision map would not result in a population increase that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities (see “d” in Section XIII). Park facilities are maintained by the El Dorado County Department of Services, Division of Airport, Parks and Grounds (Parks Recreation). The proposed project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on the use of recreational facilities in the area.
- b. **Recreation:** The project proposes to provide 30.87 percent common area Open Space that would be retained in a passive Open Space setting. There would be no other construction or expansion of recreational facilities proposed for this project. There would be a less than significant impact.

Finding: No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected with this proposal either directly or indirectly. For this “Recreation” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
- Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
- Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.

a, b.) **Capacity/Level of Service:** A joint Traffic Study (WO#43) was completed for the project and the adjacent project to the north (identified by Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 331-400-02) and approved by DOT. Truscott Lane is a privately maintained roadway. Union Mine Road and Solstice Circle South are County maintained roadways. Pleasant Valley Road (State Route 49) is a State (Caltrans) maintained roadway. A 100-lot version of the proposed project was reviewed in conjunction with the Pre-application stage proposal on the adjoining parcel to the north in Traffic Study WO #43 (Contract # 05-967). The traffic study recommends several conditions to mitigate the potential traffic impacts of the projects. Both projects would be required to pay their fair share for three major improvements in the vicinity. These include: 1) installing an additional approach lane for southbound traffic on Forni Road, 2) Installation of a traffic signal at Pleasant Valley and Patterson (the Capital Improvement Program for 2008 includes #73320 and 3) Installing a traffic signal at Pleasant Valley and SR 49 West. Additionally, the applicant must pay Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) fees. These requirements are included in the recommended DOT conditions of approval in the staff report.

Primary Access: The project proposes to utilize the existing private roadway of Truscott Lane as a primary access point. The project is within the Community Region of El Dorado - Diamond Springs. The project proposes to utilize the existing private roadway of Truscott Lane as a primary access point. The project is within the Community Region of El Dorado - Diamond Springs. The traffic study indicates the project would generate 1,040 Average Daily Trips (ADTs) (using 100 units x 10.4 ADT per unit as assumed in the traffic study). The traffic study anticipates 30 percent (312 ADT) of this traffic would utilize Union Mine Road. When added to the existing ADT’s on Union Mine Road of 1,692, the total would exceed 2,000 ADT. This does not take into account the through traffic using the new road from Patterson Drive, and it assumes the northern access points on the Jongordon parcel are completed. However, until the Jongordon project is built, the majority of the project would access the site via Union Mine Road. Therefore, the Design Standard Truscott Lane must be improved to County Design Std 101B, if it is not currently, at the developer’s expense. This is reflected in the recommended conditions of approval in the staff report.

Road Widths: The project proposes 28-foot wide streets curbface to curbface. Per Design Standard Plan 101B, this is considered to be a two-lane road with no parking on either side. The project includes small-lot single family parcels mostly in the range of 6,000 square feet to 8,000 square feet, which implies on-street parking would be necessary. Additionally, this would become a through road connecting Patterson Drive, and would thus accommodate more traffic than that generated by the project. Therefore, the onsite road widths must be increased to 48-feet to accommodate parking and bike lanes on both sides of the road. Bike lanes have been recommended to Planning by the El Dorado Transportation Commission. The offsite road widths (i.e., Solstice Circle South) would be built to 28 feet (curb face to curb face) with “No Parking” signs installed. The offsite road width for Truscott would be 42 feet. This requirement is reflected in recommended DOT conditions of approval in the staff report.

Secondary Access: Pursuant to the Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM), Sec 3.A.9, all development proposals must provide two connections with an existing, improved public street, or with a future street extension approved by the PC or BOS. If a secondary access is to be provided by a future street extension, a temporary exit road or acceptable alternative may be required and approved by the Planning Director with a favorable recommendation from the responsible fire agencies. The project includes an extension of the internal access road eastward to connect with Solstice Circle South. This connection must be constructed and serviceable prior to filing of the Final Map.

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

Offer of Dedication / Zone of Benefit: The proposed project includes onsite and offsite roads that would make east-west connections between existing roadways. The applicant would be responsible for constructing these improvements as part of the project. These roadways must be offered for dedication to the County. Once constructed a Zone of Benefit established as part of this project is required for the perpetual maintenance of these roadways. These conditions have been added to the DOT Project-Specific Conditions in the Conditions of Approval.

Cumulative Impacts: Included in the staff report for this project is a map entitled *Communities of El Dorado and Diamond Springs Concurrent Projects*. It is also a road connection vision map for proposed road connections to provide secondary accesses and traffic dispersal. This map is current with the time of this project being heard at the Planning Commission and otherwise is updated in an attempt to look at the cumulative impacts to those communities. The map includes 15 proposed projects that have some sort of application in with the County. In May of 2008 this map along, with project descriptions, was distributed to Caltrans, El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Irrigation District, El Dorado County Airports, Parks and Grounds, El Dorado County Water Agency and has been reviewed with the El Dorado County Transportation Commission staff as well as the El Dorado County Parks and Recreation Commission. The map led to concentration on a tentative traffic circulation plan for the project vicinity.

The projects on that map that contribute to cumulative impacts are listed as follows and are labeled with the number related to said map;

5. Harrington Business Park, Z06-0020, P05-0004, 42 industrial lots (in process).
6. Oak Highlands Subdivision, Rezone Z08-0008/Planned Development PD08-0008/Tentative Map TM08-1469, in progress, 220 single family lots, 48 condominium lots (in process).
7. Stonehenge Springs Subdivision, TM 08-1474, Z08-0024, PD08-0013, 331 single family lots (in process).
8. Diamond - Dorado Subdivision (Jongordon), submitted preliminary map with 109 lots proposed.
9. McCann Subdivision, Z07-0033/PD07-0020/TM07-144872 single family lots (in process).

The roads listed below are all related to the cumulative impacts to traffic and pedestrian circulation for the area south of Pleasant Valley Road between Union Mine Road and Fowler Lane and south to Truscott Road and Solstice Circle. The following are the draft estimated road improvements that would be part of this specific areas cumulative traffic impacts. Refer to Exhibit L in the Staff Report for road segment references:

ROAD NAME	DESIGN STANDARD PLAN	ROAD WIDTH *	RIGHT OF WAY	DESIGN SPEED	EXCEPTIONS/ NOTES
A-B Union Mine Road (Hwy 49 to Truscott Lane) Unknown	Std Plan 101 B	40 ft	60 ft	55 mph	2-Lane Regional Road on the TC-1 Map. 3,400-ft of road improvement (0.64 mile).
B-C Truscott Lane (offsite from Union Mine Road to the edge of the project property)	Modified Std Plan 101B (3"AC over 8"AB Min. or as recommended by geotechnical engineer)	42 ft	60 ft	35 mph	Curb, and gutter. A 4-ft sidewalk on the north side of roadway is required. Parking allowed on the north in an 8-foot wide paved shoulder, with a five-foot bike lane on both sides.

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

9. McCann					
C-D Truscott/ Solstice (<i>onsite</i>) 9. McCann	Modified Std Plan 101B (3"AC over 8"AB Min. or as recommended by geotechnical engineer)	48 ft (parking allowed either side)	60ft	35 mph	Curb, gutter, and 4-ft sidewalks on both sides required. A 4-ft wide bike lane on both sides of the roadway consistent with the <i>Highway Design Manual</i> . Bike lanes required on Street B north of the intersection with Road A.
D-E Solstice Circle South (<i>offsite from the edge of the project property to existing Solstice Circle South</i>) 9. McCann	Modified Std Plan 101B (3"AC over 8"AB Min. or as recommended by geotechnical engineer)	28 ft	60 ft	35 mph	Curb and gutter required. No sidewalks required. No Parking signs to be installed by applicant. (Frontage improvements by future project. Existing Solstice 24-ft).
F-G Oakdell to Argonaut Drive (<i>onsite</i>) 8. Diamond Dorado (Jongordon)	Modified Std Plan 101B (3"AC over 8"AB Min. or as recommended by geotechnical engineer)	40 ft	60 ft	35 mph	Type 2 vertical curb, gutter, and 4-ft sidewalks on both sides Applicant willing to build either G-H or F-G as Secondary Access.
G-H Argonaut Drive (<i>off site from project boundary to exist Argonaut</i>) 8. Diamond Dorado	Modified Std Plan 101B (3"AC over 8"AB Min. or as recommended by geotechnical engineer)	40 ft	60 ft	35 mph	Curb and gutter required. No sidewalks required. Applicant willing to build either G-H or F-G as Secondary Access (Frontage improvements by future project)
J-N-I Fowler Lane to Argonaut Drive 7. Stonehenge	Modified Std Plan 101B (3"AC over 8"AB Min.)	40 ft	60 ft <i>IOD required</i>	35 mph	Type 2 vertical curb, gutter, and four-foot sidewalks on one side Parallel Parking allowed both sides.
M-N Faith Lane (<i>from Pleasant Valley to H Street</i>)	Modified Std Plan 101B (3"AC over 8"AB Min.) Std Plan 103D	40 ft	50 ft <i>IOD required</i>	35 mph	Type 2 vertical curb, gutter, and 4-ft 6-inch sidewalks on both sides (allowed by design waiver). Parallel Parking allowed both sides.

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

7. Stonehenge					
K-O Wrangler Road (<i>offsite from SR 49 to Road A</i>)	Modified Std Plan 101B (3" AC over 8" AB Min.)	40 ft	50 ft IOD required	35 mph	Type 1 vertical curb, gutter, and 4-ft sidewalks on both sides (allowed by design waiver)
6. Oak Highlands	Std Plan 103D				
O-L Road A (<i>onsite to Crystal Dr</i>)	Modified Std Plan 101B (3" AC over 8" AB Min.)	40 ft	60 ft IOD required	35 mph	Type 2 vertical curb, gutter, and four-foot sidewalks on both sides (allowed by design waiver)
6. Oak Highlands					

With the inclusion of the conditions of approval recommended by DOT that are listed in full detail in the subject project staff report, for this project and then for each other project listed above, should they be approved, the direct and cumulative impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

- c. **Traffic Patterns:** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. The project would not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity. There would be no impacts.
- d. **Hazards:** All parking for future development on the newly created lots would be required to comply with Chapter 17.18 of the County Code which would be reviewed and approved at the building permit stage. As proposed, each lot should have adequate room to comply with the two spaces not in tandem requirement. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Emergency Access:** The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The proposed project would provide two points of access in accordance with Fire District requirements along Truscott Lane to Union Mine Road and the new extension of Truscott Lane to the east to Solstice Circle. The applicant would also be required to develop a Fire Safe Plan to be approved by the Fire Protection District prior to Final Map approval. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. **Parking:** No additional parking required for the residential units is anticipated to be created by the tentative map. Lot sizes would all be in excess of one acre and are expected to have adequate space for parking. There would be no impact.
- g. **Alternative Transportation:** No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected because such features are not present at or adjacent to the project site. The project would be conditioned to incorporate bike lanes on the project-related portions of the through roads as recommended by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission staff. DOT has included that condition in the project recommendations. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: As discussed above, potentially significant traffic impacts at area intersections and roadways would be mitigated to levels of insignificance with planned or completed capital improvement plan projects (CIP), and with DOT-required conditions of approval. DOT reviewed the project and submitted traffic study based on their protocols. As discussed above, and as conditioned, no significant traffic impacts can directly be expected for the proposal. For this "Transportation/Traffic" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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. **Wastewater:** The preliminary drainage study prepared for this project identified minor discharge of water runoff in the various watersheds that were included. The study also identified that there is adequate land area within each shed and/or parcel to adequately address site drainage and flow of additional water with the addition of a drainage catch basin. Project specific conditions have been added to the Department of Transportation section of the project permit that would require the project to obtain an Engineer's Report addressing the issue of drainage and maintenance. In addition, the project would be reviewed during grading permit application to ensure that the project is designed to meet the *County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. By implementing the requirements of the ordinance in the final grading and drainage design, including the implementation of pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs), this project would have a less than significant level of impact in this category because such procedures

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

are designed based on the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

b, d, e) **New Facilities:** No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required because of the project. The EID Facility Improvement Letter dated December 5, 2007 states that the project would require 70 additional equivalent dwelling Units (EDUs). The resulting lots for the current proposal would be required to establish separate domestic water service accounts with EID. The applicant would be responsible for the installation of all improvements, to the District's Water, Sewer and Recycled water Design and Construction Standards, necessary to provide these services. The exact improvements required would be determined by an applicant supplied Facility Plan Report of the system which would be given to EID to analyze to see if the proposed system is adequate to supply the domestic water at the correct pressure.

There is a 12-inch gravity fed sewer and an eight-inch force main located in Oakdell Road. A sewer lift station is located by Charles Brown School approximately 500 feet north of the project. The lift station, force main and 12-inch gravity sewer line do not have adequate capacity to serve the proposed subdivision. In order for the subdivision to receive sewer service, construction of a new District lift station, force main and gravity sewer line would need to be constructed out to Pleasant Valley Road. The required Facility Plan Report would need to explore the possibility of abandoning the Charles Brown Lift Station and existing eight-inch force main and then to utilize new facilities for the combined flow created by the subdivision. Upon satisfaction of the EID requirements for sewage and domestic water services, impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Storm Water Drainage:** On-site storm water drainage facilities would be installed and maintained on and adjacent this property in order to control, reduce, and/or eliminate run-off from this development. All storm water drainage facilities shall be designed to meet the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*, as well as the *Drainage Manual* standards in order to reduce discharge levels to County, state, and federal standards, and to maintain such flow based on the outcome identified by the preliminary drainage study prepared for this project. That study identified that the current facilities and drainages could handle the additional flow that would be generated with this project. No added improvements would be required as a result of three new parcels, homes, or driveway improvements. The Zone of Benefit section of the Department of Transportation would review a future Engineer's Report to identify maintenance and fee responsibilities associated to project drainage facilities, as a condition of the permit. Impacts would be less than significant.

f, g.) **Solid Waste:** In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) 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.

County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the proposed lots would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space is available at the site for solid waste

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

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

Finding: No significant utility and service system impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. Adequate water and wastewater connections to the public system are available and related environmental impacts necessary for the improvements would be assessed with the mitigation measures that have been developed within Biological Resource category addressing impacts to oak tree canopy and wetland features. There is a safe and reliable water source available for each lot, available capacity in the County refuse and recycling system, and associate collection areas that are available for this project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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. There is no substantial evidence contained in the project record that would indicate that his proposal to rezone the parcels and split them into either the Planning recommended 63 lots, or the applicant proposed 72-lot subdivision has the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment. The proposed project has the potential to significantly impact biological resources as well as cultural resources as discussed in this document. However, as conditioned and mitigated, and with strict adherence to County General Plan policies and permit requirements, this rezone, development plan and tentative subdivision map and the typical residential uses expected to follow, would not appear to have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project would be less than significant due to the design of the project and required standards that would be implemented with the process of the final map and/or any required project specific improvements on or off the property.

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

- b. Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as “two or more individual effects, which when considered together, would be considerable or which would compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Based on the analysis in this study, it has been determined that the project would have a less than significant impact based on the issue of cumulative impacts. The project has impacts that could be considered cumulatively significant based on- as well as off-site improvements necessary to develop the project. The primary cumulative impact on a project specific level would be to transportation and circulation. By implementing the conditions of approval and with strict adherence to County permit requirements outlined by this document in the various sections and categories listed, impacts within this category would also be reduced below a level of significant.
- c. The project does not have environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The project includes mitigations and conditions which have been incorporated into the project. The proposed project has the potential to generate potentially significant impacts to humans with respect to noise and land use as discussed in this document. However, as conditioned and mitigated, and with strict adherence to County General Plan policies and permit requirements, this rezone, development plan and tentative subdivision map and the typical residential uses expected to follow, are not likely to cause project-related environmental effects which would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Development Services Department, 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 - Response to Comment on DEIR
Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR
Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR
Volume V - Appendices

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Air Quality Report prepared by Foothill Associates on April 9, 2007

Focused Plant Survey done by Foothill Associates, dated May 29, 2007

Arborist Report, Foothill Associates, dated January 16, 2007

Revised *Oak Tree Canopy Impacts* map, Foothill Associates, dated 5/21/08.

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

Cultural Resources Inventory, dated January 2007, Ric Windmiller, Consulting Archeologist

El Dorado Irrigation District, Facility Improvement Letter FIL0607-180 dated June 25, 2007

Jurisdictional Delineation Report, Gibson and Skordal Associates, dated January 2007.

Revised Wetland Delineation Map, McCann property, Gibson and Skordal, LLC dated May 16, 2008.

On-Site Drainage Study, Timothy Schad, L.S., dated December 2007.

Environmental Noise Assessment was prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. dated March 30, 2007

Traffic Impact Analysis, Farhad and Associates, dated April 6, 2007