



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

Project Title: S08-0024/Cool RV, Boat and Self-storage

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

Property Owner's Name and Address: Roger Musso, 1301 Lighthouse Road, Greenwood, CA 95635

Project Agent/Applicant's Name and Address: Bill Dalton, P.O. Box 444, Cool, CA 95614

Project Engineer's Name and Address: William Rothaus, P.O. Box 571, Coloma, CA 95613

Project Location: East side of State Route 49 approximately 500 feet north of the intersection with State Route 193 in the Cool area, Supervisorial District IV.

Assessors Parcel No: 071-500-45

Parcel Size: 3.76 acres

Zoning: General Commercial - Design Control (CG - DC)

Section: 18 **T:** 12N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: Commercial (C)

Description of Project: The applicant is proposing a phased project, to consist of eight buildings totaling 21,050 square feet for a self-storage facility. The first four phases would occur on the north side of the parcel, and the final two phases on the south side. Unenclosed RV and boat storage would be available during Phases 1-5, but would be eliminated during Phase 6. The north side of the parcel is surrounded by chain link fencing. During Phase 1 brown slats and a landscaping buffer would be added to that section. During Phase 4 the chain link fencing with brown slats and landscape buffering would be added to the portion of the parcel south of Northside Drive. Two, four-foot by eight-foot signs are proposed to be added to the existing chain link fence, both facing Northside Drive. The business is proposed to operate from sunrise to sunset, seven days a week. There would be one off-site manager. The project phasing would occur as detailed in the following table:

Phase	Buildings	Square Footage	Storage Units	Details/Components of Each Phase
Project portion of the parcel north of Northside Drive is below:				
1	Building A	3,400	26	Installation of the two, 4 ft x 8 ft signs. The landscape improvements on the north side of the parcel. Required road improvements for Northside Drive. Striping of 2 parking spaces, one handicap accessible for customers, and 18 RV spaces.
2	Building B	3,400	26	Retain all previous parking.
3	Building C	2,700	24	Retain all previous parking.
4	Building D Building E	2,000 1,875	13 14	Stripe one parking space for customers. Move 13 RV spaces to the south side of the parcel.
Project portion of the parcel south of Northside Drive is below:				
4				Add 6-ft tall chain link fencing with 2 access gates and brown slats, and landscaping along the south side of the parcel. Fenced area would be graveled.
5	Building F Building G	3,400 2,000	26 10	Striping of 2 parking spaces for customers, stripe 1 handicap accessible. Retain the 13 RV parking spaces.
6	Building H	2,275	24	Stripe the final parking spaces for customers. Eliminate all RV parking.
Totals	8	21,050	163	

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	CG	C	Commercial. Vacant
North	CP	C	Planned commercial. Vacant.
South	CG	C	Commercial. Vacant and cellular communications facility.
East	CG	C	Commercial. Mini – storage units.
West	CG	C	Commercial. Post office, cellular communications facility.

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 3.76-acre site is located at a 1,620-foot elevation above the mean sea level. The northern portion of the parcel has been previously been graded flat, graveled, and is surrounded by a six-foot tall chain link fence with barbed wire atop. The southern portion of the parcel has been rough graded and is not fenced or graveled. There are groups of native oak and pine trees at the eastern edges of the parcel and in the southwest corner that are located outside of the proposed development area. Northside Drive has an asphalted surface and terminates at a cul-de-sac at the easternmost portion of the parcel.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): Building Services, El Dorado Fire Protection District, El Dorado County Resource Conservation District, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, El Dorado County Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife, Caltrans.

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described in attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, pursuant to applicable standards; and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____ Date: _____
Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____
Printed Name: Pierre Rivas, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

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

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within the Cool Rural Center and is surrounded by existing developed and undeveloped commercial parcels.

Project Characteristics

Project Description: This would be a six phase project. Eight buildings would be constructed totaling 21,050 square feet. The buildings are proposed to be used for the storage of boats, RVs, and miscellaneous storage. Two signs are proposed to be added to the existing chain link fence, both facing Northside Drive.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Site access would be provided via Northside Drive from an encroachment on State Route (SR) 49. Northside Drive terminates at a cul-de-sac approximately 800 feet east of the SR 49 encroachment. Northside Drive is a private roadway. SR 49 is a State-maintained roadway. Caltrans would be recommending the access road be widened 30 feet back from State Route 49 by adding an extra ten feet in width to Northside Drive. The project requires five spaces and six would be provided. No impacts to parking would occur as part of the project.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

A portion of the site has been previously graded and enclosed by a chain link fence. The project would require the remainder of the development area to be graveled and fenced to match. The extension of utility services would be required. Potable water is not to be provided to the site; however a water meter would be required from the GDPUD for landscape purposes. A septic service is not necessary for the site.

3. **Population**

The proposed project would not increase the population as it is a commercial storage project.

4. **Construction Considerations**

Construction of the project would consist of both on and off-site road improvements including minor excavation for building foundations and for off-site roadway improvements.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from Development Services. An approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan would be required from the Air Quality Management District.

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.

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 is not located within 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 project has been designed to blend in with the surroundings. Landscape buffering has been added to enhance the site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Light and Glare:** Sconce lighting would be located on each building. Each light would be controlled by motion sensors. All lighting would conform to Section 17.14.170, of the County Code requiring all the lights to be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America’s (IESNA) full cut-off designation. As designed and conditioned, impacts from outdoor lighting would be less than significant.

Finding: It could be found that as conditioned, the project would not significantly impact visual resources. For this “Aesthetics” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

a, 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 shows that the parcel contains Delpiedra (DeE) very rocky loam with 3 to 50 percent slopes, moderate permeability and medium to rapid surface runoff and slight to high erosion hazard. This soil type is not classified as Prime Farmland, Statewide Important Farmland, or Unique and Soils of Local Importance. This property is not under, and would not conflict with an adjacent Williamson Act Contract. There would be no impact.

Finding: For this “Agricultural” category, impacts would be less than significant.

III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is 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 application materials 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 would be implemented as part of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) and would be reviewed and approved by the AQMD prior to and concurrently with the grading, improvement, and/or building permit approvals. With full review with consistency with General Plan Policies, 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. No sensitive receptors were identified in the vicinity of the subject parcel. 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 mini-storage development as an odor generating use. The proposed addition of eight commercial storage buildings to the area would not generate or subject the surrounding properties with odor. There would be no impacts.

Finding: Standard conditions of approval, as required by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD), would be included as part of the project permit. There would be a less than significant impact on air quality from this project.

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

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

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

a. **Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities:** Review of the County GIS soil data demonstrates the project site is not located on lands shown to contain Serpentine Rock or Gabbro soils. Search of the California Natural Diversity database indicates there are none of the rare, threatened, or endangered species on the site. The project is not located within a County Rare Plant Mitigation Area and would not be subject to payment of a mitigation fee. 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 does not support potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S.

d. **Wildlife corridors:** The project proposes to preserve all areas of the parcel that have existing trees and shrubs and are presently used by wildlife. Review of the Deer Herd map indicates the project is not located within a mapped deer herd area. Therefore, 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. The submitted *Tree Preservation Plan* map prepared determined that the parcel had an oak tree canopy coverage of 30 percent and that no oak tree canopy would be impacted by the project proposal. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires retention of 85 percent of the indigenous oak tree canopy on the subject parcel as a whole. 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 on that map. Because the areas containing oak trees are shown to be preserved as they exist today, impacts would be less than significant.

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. No jurisdictional wetlands are present on the site. With strict adherence to applicable County Codes, impacts on Biological Resources would be less than significant.

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

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 Study of Assessor's Parcel Number 071-500-35*, dated October 2008 by Historic Resource and Associates, 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 would be required:

If human remains are discovered at any time during the improvement phase, the County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted per Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.89 of the Public Resources Code. The procedures set forth in Supplementary Document J, Section VIII, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines concerning treatment of the remains shall be followed. If archaeological sites or artifacts are discovered, the subdivider shall retain an archaeologist to evaluate the resource.

If the resource is determined to be important, as defined in Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures, as agreed to by the subdivider, archaeologist, and Planning Services shall be implemented. Treatment of Native American remains and/or archaeological artifacts shall be the responsibility of the subdivider and shall be subject to review and approval by Planning Services.

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 conditions outlined in the project permit, impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			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 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. The parcel contains Delpiedra (DeE) very rocky loam with 3 to 50 percent slopes, moderate permeability and medium to rapid surface runoff and slight to high erosion hazard (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). Project grading and improvements would occur on site and off-site. Improvements include the access road, driveway, water and sewer line connections. 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, the project is not located on expansive soil. 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 does not include septic facilities. There would be no impact.

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 project. All grading would be designed to meet *County of El Dorado Grading and Drainage* standards. All construction would be designed to meet the *Uniform Building Code (UBC)* Seismic Safety Zone 3 construction standards. For “Soils and Geology,” impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
 - Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
 - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a, b) **Hazardous Substances:** The project does not include the use of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials are not expected, however, if necessary for construction purposes, compliance with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan* would be required. All diesel powered construction equipment and other combustible material must be used under the County's Air Quality Management District (AQMD) and Environmental Management guidelines. The project would not be expected to release hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than 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. Impacts would be less than 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 a less than significant impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards:** *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed for the project site. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards:** *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed for the project site. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. There would be no impact.
- g. **Emergency Response 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. This project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan.
- h. **Fire Hazards:** The El Dorado County Fire Protection District reviewed the project and would require project conditions to reduce fire hazards at the site. The project is located within a high fire hazard area. As conditioned, the project would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in rural center area. The impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: Fire hydrants, access road improvements, and the water line infrastructure would address overall fire safety and reduce impacts associated with wildland fires. Impacts from Hazards would be less than significant.

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

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

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

a. **Water Quality Standards:** 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 with all final designs. Grading and drainage designs would be designed in accordance with the Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SWMP). This would address Storm Water Prevention and Pollution Program (SWPPP) standards to adhere to the state requirements, as well as the federal, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for water quality and water discharge. 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 would be required to connect to the GDPUD water line. There would be no draw from groundwater sources in the area. Impacts 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 would reduce and/or eliminate run-off pre-and post construction. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Stormwater Runoff:** The project would alter drainage patterns due to grading activities and road improvements. Stormwater runoff has the potential to increase due to the introduction of impervious surfaces not previously developed. 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. The project would be conditioned to comply with the County SWPPP Standards. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- 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* would be implemented for the project. The project would be designed in accordance with the Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SWMP), the state's Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Program (SWPPP) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES). The designs would include pre- and post- construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) and permanent drainage facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g, h, i) **Flooding:** The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0175 B, October 18, 1983) for the project area indicates that the project is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain. The site is not located downstream from any dam or protected by levees. The Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) maps designate this site as Flood Zone Category C. There would be no impact.
- 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 site run-off. All grading, drainage and BMPs for pre-and-post-construction for erosion and sediment controls would be incorporated into the project. Impacts on Water Quality would be less than significant.

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

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
 - Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
 - Result in conversion of undeveloped Open Space to more intensive land uses;
 - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a. **Established Community:** The project area is part of the Cool Rural Center and is designated by the General Plan for Commercial land uses. The project is for a min-warehouse facility that would serve the neighboring Cool/Pilot Hill residents and commercial uses. The project site is surrounded by commercial uses and would be accessed by SR 49. The project would not create any physical divisions of an established community. The project would be compatible with the adjoining commercial uses. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Land Use Plan:** The parcel is zoned General Commercial (CG) which is consistent with the Commercial land use designation. The proposed storage facility, as conditioned, would be consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, and would be consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan:** There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community plans within the project vicinity. 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. There would be no impact.

Finding: The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan policies for commercial uses. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property. For this “Land Use” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- a, b.) **Mineral Resources:** The 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. 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. 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:** The proposed use is not listed in General Plan Table 6 – 1 as a use classified as one considered a sensitive receptor to noise from transportation sources. There would be no impact.

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 Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. Vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project would be that of passenger cars, RVs and trucks, which are not sources of significant vibration. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **Ambient Noise Levels:** This project would not significantly add to the existing ambient noise. Temporary construction noise would result from the project. The hours of construction would be limited. Impacts would be less than significant impact.
- d. **Temporary Increases in Noise Levels.** The construction phases of the project would result in an increase in noise levels as the individual storage buildings were built. 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 commercially designated area. Impacts 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. For this “Noise” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

- a. **Population Growth:** The proposed project would not induce growth directly or indirectly. The General Commercial zoning allows the use with an approved Special Use Permit. There would be no impact.
- b, c) **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.

Finding: There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed project directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

a. **Fire Protection:** The El Dorado County 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 has required for the project to comply with fire safe requirement conditions of approval. 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. The impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection:** If approved as proposed, the proposed project would create eight storage buildings. The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office (EDSO) with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. EDSO compiles data on the number of calls and the average response time for each of its Sheriff's Office zones, as shown in Table 5.7-2 of the General Plan D.E.I.R contains the data for 2001 and 2002. Response time is the amount of time that elapses between the time the call is made and the time the first officer responds to the call. As shown, the number of calls and the average response times in most zones are similar for 2001 and 2002 and response times are similar across all zones. EDSO does not have an established countywide goal for response time for either rural or urban areas, because the ideal response time varies by priority and by the area of the call (Friedl, pers. comm., 2002). However, the average call response time was shown on that table to be between 12 to 19 minutes Countywide. The Sheriff's Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents in the unincorporated area. The creation of the storage facility would not significantly impact current Sheriff's response times to the project area. The impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Schools:** The project is for commercial purposes. There would be no impact.

d. **Parks:** The project is for commercial purposes. There would be no impact.

e. **Other Government Services:** Other local services such as libraries would experience no impacts. No other government services would be required as a result of the project. 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 would help offset any impacts either direct or indirect. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

a. **Parks:** The project is for commercial purposes. There would be no impact.

b. **Recreation:** The project is for commercial purposes. There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected with this project. For this “Recreation” category, there would be no impact.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

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

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

a, b.) **Capacity/Level of Service:** Site access would be provided via Northside Drive from an encroachment on State Route (SR) 49. Northside Drive terminates at a cul-de-sac approximately 800 feet east of the SR 49 encroachment. Northside Drive is a private roadway. SR 49 is a State-maintained roadway. El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) determined the project, at full buildout, would be expected to generate approximately 52 Average Daily Trips (ADT), 6 A.M. Peak Hour Trips (AM PHT), and 6 P.M. Peak Hour Trips (PM PHT), utilizing the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, Land Use Code 151, 8th Edition. Based on these trips, the project would not require the completion of a Traffic Study. Impacts would be less than significant.

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:** Caltrans has recommended that the project be required to widen the westbound approach of Northside Drive onto SR 49 by ten feet on the north side to attempt to permit a safer turn for RVs and trucks with trailers. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access:** DOT and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District have conditioned the project to comply with the 2007 California Fire Code for the adequacy of the access road. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

f. **Parking:** All parking for future development would be required to comply with Chapter 17.18 of the County Code which would be reviewed and approved at the building permit stage. The project proposes three customer parking spaces on both sides of Northside Drive which bisects the parcel, at project buildout, which would meet County Code parking requirements. One of those spaces on each side would be required to be handicap accessible and van accessible. There would be no impact.

g. **Alternative Transportation:** No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected. There would be no impact.

Finding: 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.

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

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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 proposed development would not require septic facilities. There would be no impact.

b, d, e) **New Facilities:** The applicant would be responsible for the installation of all improvements related to obtaining GDPUD metered domestic water service, to the District's design and construction standards, necessary to provide these services. No septic facilities are proposed or required. Upon satisfaction of the GDPUD requirements for 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 would 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. 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. Adequate space is available at the site for solid waste collection and storage of trash, recycling and related refuse containers. 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, 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 this proposal to construct eight self – storage buildings has the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment. The proposed project does not have the potential to significantly impact biological resources as well as cultural resources as discussed in this document. As conditioned, and with strict adherence to County General Plan policies and permit requirements, this storage facility and the typical commercial 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.
- 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 impacts based on the issue of cumulative impacts. 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 be reduced below a level of significant.
- c. As conditioned, and with strict adherence to County General Plan policies and permit requirements, this project and the typical commercial 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.

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.)