



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: La Canada Residential Subdivision (Rezone Z08-0001, Planned Development PD08-0003, Phased Tentative Map TM08-1463)

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

Contact Person: Gina Hunter

Phone Number: (530) 621-3617

Property Owner's Name and Address: Betty & Melvin Jackson, 278 Cimmaron Court, Folsom, CA 95630

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Dan & Laura Parkes, 2471 Loch Way, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Agent's Name and Address: Olga Sciorelli, CTA Engineering & Surveying, 3233 Monier Circle, Rancho Cordova, CA 95742

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: CTA Engineering & Surveying (see above address)

Project Location: East side of Salmon Falls Road approximately ¾ of a mile north of the intersection with Green Valley Road, in the El Dorado Hills area of El Dorado County.

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 126-100-18 & 110-020-12 (143 acres)

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

Section: 14 **T:** 10N **R:** 8E

General Plan Designation: LDR (Low Density Residential)

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

1. Rezone from RE-5 (Estate Residential Five-Acre) to RE-5 - PD (Estate Residential Five-Acre - Planned Development)
2. Development Plan to allow clustering of lots and a reduction in the minimum parcel size of five acres in the RE-5 zone district and to allow for a density bonus.
3. Phased Tentative subdivision map to create 47 residential lots ranging in size from 1.09 to 4.04 acres and four lettered open space lots (three open space lots and one landscape lot) totaling 63.18 acres. Phase I would encompass Lots 1-3 & 26 – 46 (24 lots), Phase II would encompass Lots 4-6, 12-25, & 47 (18 lots), and Phase III would encompass Lots 7-11 (5 lots).

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

| | <u>Zoning</u> | <u>General Plan</u> | <u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences) |
|--------|---------------|---------------------|--|
| Site: | RE-5 | LDR | Vacant Land |
| North: | RE-5, RE-10 | LDR | Rural residence |
| East: | AE | LDR | Vacant land, Rural residences |
| South: | AE, RE-5 | LDR | Vacant land, Rural residences |
| West: | RE-10, RF | OS, MDR | Open Space, Rural residences |

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is currently fallow, undeveloped land and encompasses approximately 143 acres within an irregularly shaped property. The site is currently accessed via a dirt road from Salmon Falls Road approximately 1-mile north of the intersection of Salmon Falls Road and Green

Valley Road in the El Dorado Hills area of El Dorado County. Vegetation on the property is predominantly dense oak woodland with minor grassland on gently rolling to steep terrain. The project topography is dominated by three westerly flowing ephemeral drainages. A perennial creek, New York Creek, exists on the southwestern portion of the project site, adjacent to Salmon Falls Road. Ground elevations range from approximately 510 feet above mean sea level (MSL) on the west side to 810 feet above MSL on the east side of the property.

Soils on the site are derived from the underlying weathered rock formations. The entire project site is underlain by one soil series, the Auburn very rocky silt loam. This soil type is mapped on the site as two variants: Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes (AxD) and Auburn very rocky silt loam, 30 to 50 percent slopes (AxE). Minor amounts of Auburn silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes (AwD) are present in a small area located on the southeastern portion of the site. The project site is an area designated as potentially having Naturally Occurring Asbestos according to the Asbestos Review Map of El Dorado County Western Slope.

No sensitive plant or animal species were found onsite. Two cultural resource sites were identified on the project site, one pre-historic site and one historic site.

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

1. El Dorado County Building Services: Grading permit and on site road improvements
2. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District: require an approved Fugitive Dust Plan for air quality impacts during project construction.
3. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Encroachment Permits for off-site road improvements
4. El Dorado County Fire Protection District: Approval of Fire Safe Plan
5. Local Agency Formation Commission: Approval for annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

| | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|------------------------|
| | Aesthetics | | Agriculture Resources | X | Air Quality |
| X | Biological Resources | X | Cultural Resources | | Geology / Soils |
| | Hazards & Hazardous Materials | | Hydrology / Water Quality | | Land Use / Planning |
| | Mineral Resources | X | 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.
- X** 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: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

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 forty-seven (47) residential parcels.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Area. The project site is surrounded by both developed and undeveloped residential parcels.

Project Characteristics

The project would create 47 residential lots ranging in size from 1.09 to 4.04 acres and four lettered open space lots (three open space lots and one landscape lot) totaling 63.18 acres. Interior roads would be constructed within the project area for internal circulation and access onto Salmon Falls Road.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Primary access to the subdivision would be provided by an internal road system which would access Salmon Falls Road, which is a County maintained road. The project would include the development of access easements through the parcels to the south and to the east that would provide additional access to Green Valley Road. The project would create 47 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 and as part of the project, the extension of utilities services would be required. The project would be required to receive the discretionary approval of the El Dorado Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for annexation into the local water district in order to receive public utility service.

3. Population

The project would not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

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 the 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:

Air Quality
Biological Resources
Land Use/Planning
Noise
Population/Housing

Project Schedule and Approvals

This Initial Study is being circulated for public and agency review for a 30-day period. Written comments on the Initial Study should be submitted to the project planner indicated in the Summary section, above. Following the close of the written comment period, the Initial Study would be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and would be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency would also determine whether to approve the project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a. **Scenic Vista.** A review of the Important Public Scenic Views identified in the El Dorado County General Plan revealed that the only scenic vista near the project site would be from southbound Salmon Falls Road between Highway 49 and the Folsom Reservoir toward the south and west. The project site is located east of Salmon Falls Road and would not affect views at this scenic vista. The project site would not be visible from any other identified public scenic vista; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic vistas.
- b. **Scenic Highways.** The nearest state scenic highway to the project site would be Highway 50 from Placerville to South Lake Tahoe. The project site is located over 15 miles west of this portion of Highway 50 and would not be visible from the highway. The proposed project would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.
- c. **Visual Character.** The project would create 47 new low-density residential lots, ranging from 1.09 to 4.04 acres in size, and 1 landscape lot and 3 open space lots totaling 63.18 acres. The project would enable the construction of 47 new single-family residences on the newly created lots. Development of these homes and supporting infrastructure, including the removal of existing vegetation, would result in a change to the existing visual character of the site. Adjacent land uses, existing but primarily proposed land uses, include similar development consisting of homes on similarly sized parcels. Therefore, the project would be an extension of existing and proposed similar development and would not result in substantial changes to the visual character of the site and its surroundings. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- d. **Light and Glare.** The project would consist of single-family residential development on lots one to four acres in size. The large lot size would allow for buffers between homes and adjacent uses. Additionally, the project would comply with Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, which contains outdoor lighting requirements, intended to control artificial light and glare to the extent that unnecessary illumination of adjacent property would be prohibited. These requirements include the shielding and downward direction of all outdoor lighting. These requirements would also reduce project impacts on night skies. This impact would be considered less than significant.

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

Finding: The proposed project has the potential to result in the construction of future residences and other structures on medium density residential parcels. This development is entirely consistent with the character of surrounding medium and low-density development. Future building is not expected to impinge upon existing scenic vistas, and no scenic resources exist within the project vicinity. Light and glare associated with construction of new residences in previously undeveloped areas is not expected to be significant and would be required to conform to zoning ordinance requirements. For this “Aesthetics” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

- a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** The proposed project would not convert any prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or locally important farmland to non-agricultural use. The El Dorado County Resource Conservation District has reviewed the project and did not identify important Agricultural Preserves or Districts within the project area. There would be no impact.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The project site is not currently under Williamson Act Contract, nor would the site qualify for a contract under the Williamson Act. Adjacent lands currently zoned for agriculture, are also no longer enrolled in the Williamson Act. In addition, adjacent lands zoned for agriculture are currently proposed for a rezone to residential uses of a similar nature. There would be no impact.
- c. **Non-agricultural Use.** This project is located in an area designated for low-density residential use, and not agriculture. However, the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District has noted that property adjacent to the site is zoned for agriculture and as such appropriate buffers should be applied to the project. Such agriculture buffers are appropriate when there is potential for conflict between non-agricultural uses (e.g., residential uses) and agricultural activities. In this instance, said buffers are inappropriate, as land adjacent to the project site is proposed to be rezoned and developed as low-density residential property as part of the Alto LLC subdivision. As such, there would be no impact.

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

Finding: No impacts to agricultural land are expected and no mitigation is required. The rezone request, development plan and tentative parcel map is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and proposed future uses in the neighborhood. For this “Agriculture” category, there would be no impact.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and NO_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82 lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and NO_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a. **Air Quality Plan.** The project site would be regulated by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District and the applicable air quality plan is the 1994 Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan (State Implementation Plan). The updated air quality plan would be based on the growth projections and land use designations contained in the General Plans of each jurisdiction within the Sacramento region. The project would be consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan and would therefore be included in the updated air quality plan. Because growth resulting from the proposed project was anticipated and included in the air quality plan, no conflict would occur. 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. Cumulative impacts were previously considered and analyzed. In this instance, adherence to the General Plan Policy 6.7.7.1 shall mitigate impacts to air quality to less than significant levels.
- b. **Air Quality Standards.** The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of six standard conditions of approval, the project would have a less than

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

significant impact on the air quality. As part of the conditions, a fugitive dust plan application must be prepared and submitted to the AQMD prior to the beginning of project construction. These measures are included as conditions of project approval and would reduce any impacts in this category to a level of less than significant.

- c. **Criteria Pollutants.** The Mountain Counties Air Basin is designated by the California Air Resources Board as “ozone impacted.” El Dorado County is currently in federal and state severe non-attainment for ozone levels and state non-attainment for PM₁₀. Additionally, the project site would be within the boundaries of the El Dorado County portion of the area designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as the Sacramento Federal Ozone Non-attainment Area. As discussed above, the project would not exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors. The project would not result in an individual or cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. The potential impact would be considered less than significant.
- d. **Sensitive Receptors.** Sensitive receptors are considered residences, schools, parks, hospitals, or other land uses where children or the elderly congregate, or where outdoor activity is the primary land use. Sensitive receptors within the vicinity of the project site may consist of residences on adjacent lands. As noted in Response (a) above, neither the construction nor operation of the proposed project would result in substantial increases in pollutant concentrations. Once developed, the project site would contain residences that are considered sensitive receptors. However, no sources of substantial pollutant concentrations are located in the vicinity of the project site. Thus potential impacts would be considered would be less than significant.
- e. **Odors.** Future Construction activities would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel powered engines that emit exhaust fumes. Asphalt paving as well as the application of architectural coatings are also sources of construction-related odors. However, construction-related emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday, and the exhaust odors would dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity of the equipment. Operation of the proposed project would involve the use of products for home maintenance such as paints or fertilizers and other landscaping materials. Odors created by home maintenance activities would be minimal, would quickly dissipate and would not differ substantially from those created by surrounding land uses. This impact would be considered less than significant.

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

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

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

| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| 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.** The applicant has prepared several biological reports, which include the following:
- *Jurisdictional Delineation and Special Status Species: Parkes Property*, October 2007, Gibson & Skordal, LLC
 - *Results of Special-Status Plant Surveys on the Parkes Property, El Dorado Hills, El Dorado County, California*, May 22, 2008, Miriam Green Associates
 - *Evaluation of Potential California Red-Legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*) Habitat on the La Canada Project Site, El Dorado County California*, June 25, 2008, Eric C. Hansen Consulting Environmental Biologist in association with Miriam Green Associates

Gibson & Skordal initially conducted field surveys on September 11, 2007 within the study area to delineate water features, including wetlands that are potentially regulated under Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act. Gibson & Skordal also assessed the project site for the presence of special status species by conducting a record search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and including other special status species that may be present based on historic or known range data. The results of the surveys and records search found that the primarily biological community on the site was foothill oak woodland that consists primarily of live oak (*Quercus wislizenii*) and blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*). The herbaceous understory is composed primarily of soft chess (*Bromus mollis*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), and dog tail (*Cynosurus echinatus*). Additional observed species included valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus procerus*), Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum hystrix*), perennial rye (*Lolium perenne*), California buckeye (*Aesculus californica*), and ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*). The results of the survey

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

also concluded that there are approximately 6.8187 acres of water features on the site which include 6.1144 acres of the New York Creek corridor and 0.7043 acres of tributaries to New York Creek. Of the 6.8187 acres, 6.3841 acres exhibit wetland characteristics. Of these water features, only the lower portion of the New York Creek corridor exhibits riparian habitat characteristics. Dominant trees in this habitat include Fremont’s cottonwood (*Populus fremontii* ssp. *Remontii*), sandbar willow (*Salix exigua*), and arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*). Woody understory is dominated by wild grape (*Vitis californica*) and Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*).

Results of the three biological evaluations listed above conclude that there are no special status species, either plant or wildlife species currently existing on the site. The site does have the potential to provide habitat value for sensitive bird species such as the following: silver-haired bat, Cooper’s hawk, tricolored blackbird, great egret, blue heron, Swainson’s hawk, white-tailed kite, and bald eagle.

Proposed development activities associated with land clearing, tree removal, building pad development, utility placement, and road development have the potential to remove habitat and create disturbances due to human activities that would significantly disrupt roosting, breeding, and foraging activities in the short-term that may impact sensitive bird species that have the potential to exist in the area. However, with incorporation of recommended mitigation measure listed below, impacts to rare, threatened and endangered species would be mitigated to less than significant levels.

MM BIO-1: To avoid take of active raptor nests, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of proposed development activities. Pre-construction surveys shall follow protocol guidelines issued by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). If no active raptor nests are found to occur, necessary tree removal shall proceed. If active raptor nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the site, the following actions shall be taken in order to avoid impacts to nesting raptors:

1. Halt all construction within 150 feet of any trees containing active raptor nests; these areas shall be marked with fencing or tape in order to clearly delineate areas where construction is prohibited.
2. Construction shall not resume within 150 feet of any identified nest until the end of the typical nesting season; August 31. Construction may resume prior to the end of the nesting season, only if all raptor fledges have left the nest.
3. Construction shall not resume prior to consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game and determination that the proposed project would not result in a “take” of any rare, threatened, endangered or special status species.

Timing/Implementation: The applicant shall provide Development Services with a letter from a qualified Biologist verifying compliance prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

- b. **Riparian Habitat.** As discussed above (a), there are a number of water features located on the project site which include both intermittent ephemeral tributaries to New York Creek and the corridor associated with New York Creek itself. As mentioned previously, the only water feature that exhibits riparian characteristics is the lower portion of the New York Creek corridor. This area is proposed to be entirely located within an open space area with adequate (100-foot) setbacks from the edge of this riparian corridor proposed on the tentative map, as required by Policy 7.3.3.4 of the El Dorado County General Plan, Conservation and Open Space Element, which provides guidelines for buffers and setbacks for the protection of riparian areas and wetlands. As such, impacts to riparian habitat are considered to be less than significant.

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

- c. **Wetlands.** As mentioned previously, the applicant has prepared a wetland delineation report, “*Jurisdictional Delineation and Special Status Species Evaluation*, Gibson & Skordal, LLC, October 2007.” The report concluded that there are total of 6.8187 acres pf water features on the project site. These include 6.1144 acres of the New York Creek Corridor and 0.7043 acres of tributaries to New York Creek. The project proposes to avoid all wetlands and intermittent streams by incorporating them into open space areas and utilizing bridge structures that will avoid creek disturbance. The Tentative Subdivision Map has designated a 100-foot building setback from the New York Creek corridor (which will remain in open space) and a 50-foot building setback from intermittent streams as required by El Dorado County General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4. Impacts to wetlands are considered to be less than significant.

- d. **Wildlife corridors.** Migratory Deer Herd Habitats occur within some areas of El Dorado County. The project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any migratory deer herd habitats as shown in the El Dorado County General Plan. The project has been designed with open space, which allows for natural community preservation/conservation using the Density Bonus provision (Policy 2.2.4.1) to protect plant and animal species (Policy 7.4.1.5). This impact would be less than significant.

Riparian corridors also act as wildlife corridors. As mentioned above, there are several intermittent streams that are tributaries to New York Creek. New York Creek is the only corridor that maintains significant riparian and wetland characteristics, and is the only current corridor that may act as a significant wildlife corridor. No impacts are expected to occur to this wildlife corridor, however, as it is proposed to be maintained in open space. This will allow for continued wildlife migration. It is also expected that open space corridors which will be created along the other drainages will be utilized by wildlife to migrate between adjacent properties and into the New York Creek corridor.

- e. **Biological Resources.** As determined by an Arborist Report prepared by Foothill Associates (January 17, 2008) and an exhibit prepared by CTA Engineering dated December 2007 the project site is covered by 129.4 acres of Oak Canopy. The on-site canopy comprises approximately 90 percent of the project site. Oak canopy would be impacted as part of road and infrastructure improvements and future residential development of the site. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes retention and replacement provisions under “Option A” by payment of a conservation in-lieu fee in accordance with “Option A” and the Oak Woodland Conservation Ordinance. Impacts to oak woodlands would be less than significant.

- f. **Adopted Plans.** Protected and sensitive and natural resources/areas within El Dorado County include: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database. The project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. This potential impact would be considered less than significant.

Finding: Potential impacts could result to biological resources due to the proposed project. The project could impact threatened, sensitive or rare animal species. Implementation of mitigation measures identified above would reduce these potential impacts to biological resources to less than significant. Impacts to riparian habitat, wetlands, and migratory wildlife habitats, as well as conflicts with community conservation plans and habitat conservation plans have been determined to be less than significant. It has been determined that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to biological resources with the incorporation of the above mentioned mitigation measures.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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. **Historical Resources.** In September 2007, a cultural resource field investigation was performed by Historic Resource Associates to assess the potential for cultural resources to exist on the project site. The results of the investigation are included in the cultural resource report, “*Cultural Resources Study of APN 126:100:18 and 110:020:12, East of Salmon Falls Road, El Dorado County, California 95762*, September 2007, Historic Resource Associates.” The field investigation identified two cultural properties on the project site. One of the sites was considered pre-historic, and the other site was considered historic associated with the Gold Rush and post-Gold Rush era mining along New York Creek. The historic was recorded and evaluated for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). Further evaluation of the site was undertaken and documented in the following Phase I investigation, “*Archaeological Investigation Report of Parkes Temp HI (Locus B) APN 126:100:18 and 110:020:12 Near Salmon Falls Road, El Dorado County, California*, November 2007, Historic Resource Associates.” The Phase I investigation concluded that minimal diagnostic data existed at the site, and the investigation of the feature has been exhausted, and that no further archaeological investigation is warranted. The study also concludes that the site does not appear to be eligible for the CRHR or for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). As such, no mitigation is required, and impacts are less than significant.
- b. **Pre-Historic Resources.** As discussed in (a.), a cultural resource field investigation was conducted for the proposed project and resulted in the discovery of two cultural resource properties, one of these being a pre-historic resource. The pre-historic site that was identified, had previously been identified by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) pipeline/water tank project which traversed this property. The report preparer concluded that this feature is considered a significant resource per the California Register of Historic Resources Criterion 4. However, this feature(s) is located along the banks of New York Creek, in an area that is proposed for permanent open space. As such, the report preparer concluded that impacts to this resource would be less than significant and that no further mitigation is required, as no disturbance would occur to the resource as a result of the project.

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

MM CUL-1: In order to protect sensitive cultural resources, the area delineated as Open Space Lot “B” on the Tentative Subdivision Map shall be designated on the final map as an unbuildable area. No reference to specific locations of the cultural resource site shall be recorded with the final map.

Plan Requirements/Timing: A note designating Open Space Lot “B” (or the area delineated as such) as an unbuildable area shall included on the final map.

Compliance: El Dorado Planning Services shall review the final map to ensure that a note is included.

- c. **Paleontological Resources.** There are no unique paleontological or geologic features located on the project site. As such, impacts to these resources are less than significant.
- d. **Human Remains.** Based on the results of the cultural resource investigation, the project is unlikely to disturb any human remains. In the event that remains are discovered, all work shall be halted and the significance of the remains shall be evaluated in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Finding: Based upon the cultural resources reports prepared for the site, it is determined that there are no significant historic or pre-historic resources on the subject property that would be affected by the project. As such, impacts are considered to be less than significant. For this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| disposal of waste water? | | | |

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.** A land capability study conducted for the project site by Youngdahl Consulting Group found that according to the Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent areas, faults located in the proximity of the project area are a part of the Melones Fault Zone and the Bear Mountains Faults Zone, both of which are a part of the Foothills Fault System. The California Division of Mines and Geology has determined that the Melones Fault and the Bear Mountains Fault Zones were evaluated and no special seismic zoning of these areas was recommended. These zones did not warrant zoning because they are either poorly defined at the surface or lack evidence of recent displacement.

Additionally, El Dorado County does not appear on the Alquist-Priolo lists for affected counties; however, due to the large number of seismic areas in California, the project site may experience some minimal groundshaking during seismic events. Impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating structures in the project area would be offset by compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards.

Slopes of up to 50 percent occur within the project site. El Dorado County General Plan Policy 7.1.2.1 prohibits construction and grading on slopes greater than 30 percent. Requirements for an exception to this regulation include, but are not limited to, the use of design techniques that respect the natural contours, drainage patterns, and underlying geologic stability of the site. Adherence to Policy 7.1.2.1 would reduce risks of landslides to less than significant. This impact would be considered less than significant.

b. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** All grading activities must comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. The proposed project would result in approximately 73,600 cubic yards of cut, and 52,600 cubic yards of fill to be balanced onsite. This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During site grading and construction of any onsite and off site road improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

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

The Auburn Soils series dominates soil types on the project site. These soils are considered to have a moderate to high erosion potential. As the majority of the site is moderately steeply sloped, the potential for erosion and sedimentation to occur due to home and road and driveway construction is considered potentially significant. In order to address these potential impacts, the applicant has designated building envelopes in areas outside 30% slopes and surface water drainages in order to minimize grading and erosion impacts, with the exception of certain driveways. Proposed building envelopes are to be incorporated as part of the project description as a condition of approval in order to ensure that impacts to erosion and sedimentation are less than significant.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Development Services Department would review the grading plans for the required road improvements. On and off site grading would be required to comply with the Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **Slope Stability.** The project would be located on a moderately-sloping site in El Dorado County. The potential for earthquake or ground shaking activity is low in the region due to the lack of faults or geologically active sites in the area. During the site reconnaissance conducted by the Youngdahl Consulting Group, no evidence of slope instability, such as landslides or mudflows, were observed. The potential for impacts related to the stability of the soils would be low because of lack of geologic activity. Therefore, impacts resulting from potentially unstable soils are less than significant.
- d. **Expansive soils.** Geologic study of the project area conducted by Youngdahl Consulting Group determined that the materials encountered on the site were non-plastic and were considered to be relatively non-expansive. It is not anticipated that special design considerations would need to be addressed for the design or construction of the improvements associated with the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.
- e. **Septic Systems.** The project proposes individual septic systems to treat wastewater generated by the 47 potential new homes on the site. A Geologic study of the project area conducted by Youngdahl Consulting Group determined that onsite wastewater disposal facilities would be feasible for the proposed project. This was determined through the testing of 40 pits dug throughout the proposed development which yielded acceptable percolation rates. The El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management would be responsible for protecting public health and the environment from the potential adverse health and environmental impacts associated with on-site individual sewage disposal systems and will require percolation tests for all lots prior to issuance of building permits. For a more detailed discussion of these impacts refer to Section VIII Hydrology and Water Quality, Response (a). The potential impact would be less than significant.

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

| VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | X |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | | X |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, | | | X |

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

- a. **Hazardous Substances.** Hazardous materials may be used and transported to and from the project site during construction of the proposed project including construction equipment fuels, paints, debris, etc. Additionally, once constructed, residents of the site may use common household hazardous materials such as fertilizers, pesticides, paints, solvents, etc. The transport, use and storage of hazardous materials on the project site would be minimal and are strictly regulated at the federal, state, and local levels. In the unlikely event of a hazardous material leak or spill, the El Dorado Hills Fire Department would respond to manage the emergency. The closest fire station would be over one mile west of the site. The transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials resulting from project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public. The potential for impact would be less than significant.
- b. **Hazardous Materials Release.** Hazardous materials may be used during construction and operation of the proposed project; however, such use would be minimal and would be strictly regulated at the federal, state, and local levels. In the unlikely event of the release of hazardous materials, the El Dorado Hills Fire Department would respond to manage the

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

emergency. The closest fire station would be over one mile west of the site. See Section XIII, Response (a) for a full discussion of fire protection services. The potential for upset or accident conditions to occur would be considered low and therefore the potential impact would be less than significant.

- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (*California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List)*), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List, accessed 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 proposed project is not located with an airport land use plan area. The nearest airport to the proposed project site, Cameron Park Airport, is located approximately five miles east of the project site. Therefore there would be no potential impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There is no private airstrip(s) in the immediate vicinity that is identified on a U.S. Geological Survey Topography Map. There would be no impact.
- g. **Emergency Response Plan.** The proposed project would not conflict with any County-adopted emergency or disaster response or evacuation plans, as it would not change any existing roads, highways or traffic patterns. According to the Traffic Impact and Operations Analysis prepared, the proposed project would not adversely affect emergency vehicle access at the project site or study intersections. Additionally, the project design must comply with emergency access standards contained in the El Dorado County SRA Fire Safe Regulations (Title 14, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Article 2 Emergency Access) with regard to road width, surface, grade, and radius; turnouts; driveways; and gating. County review of the proposed Tentative Subdivision Map would ensure compliance with these standards. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- h. **Fire Hazards.** The site would be located within a relatively rural area, with grasslands and vegetation capable of supporting or spreading a wildland fire. CDF has established a fire hazard severity classification system, which assesses the fire potential for wildlands based on three factors: fuel load, climate, and topography. The classification system provides three classes of fire hazards: Moderate, High, and Very High. According to El Dorado County General Plan, the project site would be within an area classified as High fire hazard severity. In compliance with CDF regulations, the county requires the creation of defensible space around structures and roads. In order to comply with the state’s defensible space requirement, the project must incorporate the following design features:
 1. Clearance of 30-100 feet of flammable vegetation from around buildings; on steeper parcels, fire safe Clearance requirements are determined by the local fire protection agency;
 2. Removal of branches from within 10 feet of a chimney; and
 3. Removal of all flammable vegetation from roof tops, including dry leaves and pine needles.

In addition to the above requirements, all buildings within the project area must comply with Chapter 8.08 of the El Dorado County Code, also known as the County Fire Hazard Ordinance, which includes rules and regulations covering emergency access, signing and numbering, and emergency water. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce the potential impact to less than significant.

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

Finding: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts resulting from hazardous materials nor would the project result in exposure of schools or other sensitive areas to hazardous materials. There are no airports or dangerous intersections that would impact the project. Impacts in this category would be reduced with adherence to all existing, applicable safety regulations and policies. Identified thresholds of significance for the hazards category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- 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.** The project would include the eventual construction of 47 new homes that would be serviced by individual septic systems. The El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management would be responsible for protecting public health and the environment from the potential adverse impacts associated with on-site, individual sewage disposal systems. The proposed project’s septic system design would be reviewed by the Department to ensure compliance with County Ordinance Chapter 15.32, Private Sewage Disposal System, as well as County Resolution No. 259-99, Design Standards for the Site Evaluation and Design of Sewage Disposal Systems. Review by the Department of Environmental Management and compliance with the existing regulations would ensure that all septic systems constructed as part of the project would function properly and would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, the potential impacts are 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 as soil types on the project site are not generally conducive to groundwater recharge, especially in light of the fact that the site is moderately to steeply sloped. Also, the project would avoid major drainages where groundwater recharge is most likely to occur. The project is required to connect to the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) water line (see Utility and Services Systems category). There would be no draw from groundwater sources in the area with the approval of this project and impacts in this category would be less than significant.
- c,d. **Drainage Patterns.** The proposed project would not significantly alter or change any existing on site or off site drainage patterns. A drainage study prepared by the applicant (*Drainage Study La Canada (APN 126-100-18 & 110-020-12*, November 2007, CTA Civil Engineering) confirms this conclusion. The study identified seven separate watersheds on the site and analyzed post project conditions. The study concluded that flows would either be unchanged or that there would be negligible flow changes as a result of post-project conditions. Thus, it is not expected that post-project conditions would create significant erosion or flooding. As such impacts to drainage systems are considered to be less than significant.

The project would require coverage under the Regional Water Quality Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. Construction activities subject to this permit include clearing, grading and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Section A of the Construction General Permit describes the elements that must be contained in a SWPPP including, site map(s), Best Management Practices (BMPs), a visual and chemical monitoring program; and a sediment monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the 303(d) list for sediment. Implementation of an approved SWPPP would reduce the potential for impact to less than significant.

- e. **Stormwater Runoff.** According to the drainage study prepared for the proposed project, the carrying capacities of existing natural drainage ways would be unaffected by project implementation.

Pollutant discharges from construction activities would be minimized through the implementation of an approved SWPPP (see Response (c) above). Once the project site has been developed, pollutant discharges to waterways,

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

including automotive greases and oils, heavy metals, pesticides and fertilizers, may increase due to runoff flowing over project driveways, roads, and landscaped areas. Operational-phase stormwater pollution would not be regulated by the Clean Water Act; however, El Dorado County has developed programs to inform residents of ways to minimize polluted runoff from lawn care, septic system maintenance, auto care, and landscaping activities. The proposed project consists of 23 new residential homes and would not be expected to provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This impact would be considered less than significant.

g-j. **Flooding.** There are no 100-year flood hazard areas at or adjacent to the site. The site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is not in an area subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040-0700 D B, 060040-0679-D last updated October 18, 1995) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain. The only significant drainage onsite that may maintain high flood flows is New York Creek, and the area surrounding the creek is proposed to be maintained in Open Space. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the general plan amendment, parcel map, and rezone either directly or indirectly. Identified thresholds of significance for the hydrology and water quality category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

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 introduce housing into a partially developed area accompanied by a proposed Density Bonus for additional units. The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan Environmental Impact Report analyzed potential build-out and housing stock for the County by 2025. General Plan Policy 2.9.1.2 requires that every five years, as part of the General Plan review and update, actions be taken to decrease forecasted impacts in areas where higher intensity development is found to have a market demand. A study conducted by Bay Area Economics in June

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

2006 concluded that “Based on the actual growth rates within El Dorado County since 2002 compared to the growth projections contained in the Land Use Forecast Report, growth assumptions in the Land Use Forecast Report are still reliable, and in fact somewhat conservative from an environmental impact standpoint.” Within four years of General Plan adoption, the growth rate for second dwelling units is at 4 percent of the estimated growth rate for each alternative. The surrounding area is residential in nature and the character of land use would not be significantly altered by the proposed project. The project would not divide an established community and thus the potential impact would be considered less than significant.

- b. **Land Use Plan.** The project includes the Rezoning of the site from Estate Residential 5-Acre (RE-5) to Estate Residential 5-Acre-Planned Development (RE-5-PD) to allow for a density bonus and to take into consideration topographical constraints. The El Dorado County General Plan land use designation for the project site is Low Density Residential. The project would be consistent with this land use designation and would not require a General Plan Amendment. Additionally, the project meets General Plan Policy 2.2.3.1 requirements for a Planned Development by dedicating 62.81 acres to open space. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** Protected and sensitive natural areas within El Dorado County include: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database. The project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. Although the project is not located within the Red-legged Frog Recovery Plan Area, a survey for the Red-legged Frog conducted by the applicant resulted in negative findings for the frog. Therefore there would be no potential impact.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a,b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present (El Dorado County General Plan, Figure CO-1). Approximately 13.75 miles to the east from the proposed project are MRZ-2-classified areas, and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a

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

specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. There are no current mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect existing uses. There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this “Mineral Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

- b. **Groundborne Vibration.** Ground borne vibrations are associated with heavy vehicles (i.e. railroad) and with heavy equipment operations. All noise generation due to construction activities would be required to comply with the Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element as noted above. Vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project would be typical of traffic generated by the adjacent residential uses; passenger cars and trucks, which are not a source of significant vibration. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- c. **Ambient Noise Levels.** Subdivision of the land and construction and occupation of the 47 additional homes would result in periodic noise generation from the use of vehicles, noises generated on home sites, and landscape maintenance. The overall types and volumes of noise would not be excessive and would be similar in character to surrounding land uses. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- d. **Temporary Ambient Noise Levels.** Each construction phase of the project (there will be three phases) would result in an increase in noise levels. 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. These temporary noise levels are not expected to significantly impact existing surrounding land uses, but once Phase I of the project is constructed, it is expected that construction noise will have a potentially temporary impact on previous phases. It is therefore required that the project developer make future residents of Phases II & III aware of future construction activities and their potential to generate substantial construction noise.

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 surrounding land uses. Thus, as a result, this impact would be less than significant.

MM Noise-1: The applicant shall be required to notify property owners of potentially significant noise levels associated with future construction activities associated with home building and road construction as part of subsequent phases. This shall be included as a “Buyer Beware” clause in project CC&Rs. Planning Services shall review CC&Rs to ensure this clause has been included.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading and building permits for lot development the applicant shall prepare CC&Rs for review by Planning Services

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning Services

- e.f. **Airport Noise.** The project site is not within the airport land use plan. There would be no impact.

Finding: With the incorporation of mitigation requiring notification of future property owners of impacts associated with construction noise impacts, impacts would be less than significant. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| 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 |

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

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | X |

Discussion:

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth & Displacement.** To avoid impacts associated with an increase in population growth potential displacement of housing or residents, General Plan Policy 2.9.1.2 requires that every five years, as part of the General Plan review and update, actions can be taken to decrease forecasted impacts in areas where higher intensity development is found to have a market demand. A recent study conducted by Bay Area Economics in June 2006 concluded that “Based on the actual growth rates within El Dorado County since 2002 compared to the growth projections contained in the Land Use Forecast Report, it appears that the growth assumptions in the Land Use Forecast Report are still reliable, and in fact somewhat conservative from an environmental impact standpoint.” Potential impacts as a result of increased population and displacement of housing or residents are considered less than significant.

Finding: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to population or housing. The project would not substantially increase the population, nor displace housing or residents. Identified thresholds of significance for the population and housing category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a. **Fire Protection.** Fire protection for the project site would be currently provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire. The project site would be annexed, through discretionary approval of LAFCO, into the El Dorado Hills Fire Department and would be within the Department’s Response Zone 84b. The closest fire station to the project site would be Station 84 located at 2180 Francisco Drive just over one mile west of the project site. The development and annexation of new homes in the District would result in an increased demand for services but would not significantly impact the Department. The applicant would be responsible for the payment of development fees to the District which would help fund required capital improvements. Additionally, a portion of property taxes collected from the proposed development would fund ongoing operations of the Department. With annexation into the Department and payment of fees, this impact would be less than significant.
- b. **Police Protection.** The El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department would provide law enforcement services to the proposed development. The El Dorado Hills Satellite Sheriff Station is located at 981 Governors Drive approximately three miles southwest of the project site. The development of new homes on the project site would result in an 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. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.
- c. **Schools.** The project site would be located within the Rescue Union School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The occupancy of proposed residences may result in new enrollments at local schools. Under Senate Bill 50, school districts can levy developer fees from residential construction to pay for school improvements. Fees would be assessed as part of the County’s building permit process and are sufficient to offset any project impacts to the school district resulting in a less than significant impact.
- d. **Parks.** Park and recreation services would be provided by the County and special districts, which maintain facilities within the County. It should be noted that although the subdivision is not within the service boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Services District and no property tax increment would be allotted to the District, future residents would likely use the District’s parks and recreation facilities, creating a “free-rider” situation. There are numerous parks located within five miles of the project site with a total area of over 50 acres. Although the proposed project includes 63.85 acres of open space, this is not considered developed parkland. The applicant would be required to dedicate land or pay a fee pursuant to Section 16.12.090 of the County Subdivision Ordinance to mitigate the increased demand for parkland. Thus, this impact would be considered less than significant.

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

- e. **Other Government Services.** No other government services would be required as a result of the rezone, development plan, and parcel map. There would be no impact.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a. **Parks and Recreation.** Park and recreation services would be provided by the County and special districts, which maintain facilities within the County. It should be noted that although the subdivision is not within the service boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Services District and no property tax increment would be allotted to the District, future residents would likely use the District’s parks and recreation facilities, creating a “free-rider” situation. There are numerous parks located within five miles of the project site with a total area of over 50 acres. Using the standard of five acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents, this project would result in the demand for approximately one acre of new parkland. Although the proposed project includes 62.81 acres of open space, this would not be considered developed parkland. The project applicant would be required to dedicate land or pay a fee pursuant to Section 16.12.090 of the County Subdivision Ordinance to mitigate the increased demand for parkland. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.
- b. **Facilities Expansion.** The project includes 63.85 acres of open space that may be used for hiking and passive recreation, and would be intended only for the use of residents within the project area. This open space area would not require construction of recreational facilities. As the project does not include nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, there would be no impact.

Finding: No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected either directly or indirectly given the small increase in population and open space resources that will be created by the proposed project (Lot “A”). Identified thresholds of significance for the recreation category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | 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.

- Capacity.** A Traffic Impact and Operations Analysis was prepared for the proposed project by Kimley-Horn and Associates in January 24, 2008. According to this analysis, once fully occupied the proposed development would generate 519 total daily trips, with 43 trips occurring in the AM peak hour, and 54 trips occurring within the PM peak hour. These estimates are based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation Manual 7th Edition*. The project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load or capacity of the street system. See Response (b) below. No offsite improvements to the street system would be required based on the El Dorado County Department of Transportation letter dated August 18, 2008. This impact would be considered less than significant.
- Level of Service.** According to the traffic analysis, once fully occupied the proposed development would generate 519 total daily trips, with 43 trips occurring in the AM peak hour, and 54 trips occurring within the PM peak hour. These estimates are based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation Manual 7th Edition*. The County’s level of service standard specifies the following:

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

“Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and State highways within the unincorporated areas of the County shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions.” (Policy TC-Xd) The proposed project would be within the El Dorado Hills Community Region.

“If a project causes the peak hour level of service or volume/capacity ratio on a County road or State highway that would otherwise meet the County standards (without the project) to exceed the (given) values, then the impact shall be considered significant.”

Analysis of existing traffic conditions at the study intersections was based on peak-hour traffic counts obtained from a representative of the County. Existing counts that were not collected in 2007 were increased to represent current year (2007) conditions using a straight line growth rate from existing (1998) model conditions to year 2025 projected volumes. The following study intersections were included in the traffic analysis:

1. Salmon Falls Road @ Malcolm Dixon Road (Two-Way Stop Controlled)
2. Green Valley Road @ Salmon Falls Road/El Dorado Hills Boulevard (Signalized)
3. Green Valley Road @ Silva Valley Parkway (Signalized)
4. El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ Serrano Parkway (Signalized)
5. El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ Saratoga Way (north) (Signalized)
6. El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ Saratoga Way (south) (Signalized)
7. El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ US-50 Westbound Ramps (Signalized)
8. El Dorado Hills Boulevard @ US-50 Eastbound Ramps (Signalized)
9. Salmon Falls Road @ Project Site Access Driveway (*future*)

Existing Conditions: The weekday AM and PM peak-hour intersection turning movement traffic counts were conducted between the hours of 6:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. and 4 p.m. and 7 p.m., respectively. The existing level of service (LOS) for the study intersections are shown in Table 1 below.

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

Table 1
Existing Levels of Service

| # | Intersection | Traffic Control | AM Peak-Hour | | PM Peak-Hour | |
|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Delay (seconds) | LOS | Delay (seconds) | LOS |
| 1 | Salmon Falls Rd @ Malcolm Dixon Rd | TWSC* | 10.2 (WB) | B | 12.0 (WB) | B |
| 2 | Green Valley Rd @ Salmon Falls Rd/El Dorado Hills Blvd | Signal | 43.5 | D | 47.4 | D |
| 3 | Green Valley Rd @ Silva Valley Pkwy | Signal | 28.0 | C | 20.8 | C |
| 4 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Serrano Pkwy | Signal | 16.8 | B | 31.6 | C |
| 5 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way (North) | Signal | 38.8 | D | 23.4 | C |
| 6 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way (South) | Signal | 6.2 | A | 11.6 | B |
| 7 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 Westbound Ramps | Signal | 14.3 | B | 32.9 | C |
| 8 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 Eastbound Ramps | Signal | 44.6 | D | 18.9 | B |
| 9 | Salmon Falls Rd @ Project Site Access Driveway | TWSC* | - | - | - | - |

* Control delay for worst minor approach (worst minor movement) for TWSC.

As indicated in Table 1, the study intersections operate from LOS A through D during the AM peak hour and LOS B to D during the PM peak hour.

Existing plus Project Conditions: Peak-hour traffic associated with the proposed project was added to the existing traffic volumes and levels of service were determined at the study intersections. Table 2 provides a summary of the intersection analysis.

Table 2
Existing plus Proposed Project Levels of Service

| # | Intersection | Traffic Control | Analysis Scenario* | AM Peak-Hour | | PM Peak-Hour | |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | | | | Delay (seconds) | LOS | Delay (seconds) | LOS |
| 1 | Salmon Falls Rd @ Malcolm Dixon Rd | TWSC* | Existing | 10.2 (WB) | B | 12.0 (WB) | B |
| | | | Ex + PP | 10.2 (WB) | B | 12.5 (WB) | B |
| 2 | Green Valley Rd @ Salmon Falls Rd/El Dorado Hills Blvd | Signal | Existing | 43.5 | D | 47.4 | D |
| | | | Ex + PP | 44.6 | D | 49.0 | D |
| 3 | Green Valley Rd @ Silva Valley Pkwy | Signal | Existing | 28.0 | C | 20.8 | C |
| | | | Ex + PP | 28.0 | C | 20.8 | C |
| 4 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Serrano Pkwy | Signal | Existing | 16.8 | B | 31.6 | C |
| | | | Ex + PP | 17.5 | B | 32.0 | C |
| 5 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way (North) | Signal | Existing | 38.8 | D | 23.4 | C |
| | | | Ex + PP | 45.7 | D | 24.8 | C |
| 6 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way (South) | Signal | Existing | 6.2 | A | 11.6 | B |
| | | | Ex + PP | 6.3 | A | 11.3 | B |
| 7 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 Westbound Ramps | Signal | Existing | 14.3 | B | 32.9 | C |
| | | | Ex + PP | 14.9 | B | 32.4 | C |
| 8 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 Eastbound Ramps | Signal | Existing | 44.6 | D | 18.9 | B |
| | | | Ex + PP | 45.5 | D | 19.2 | B |
| 9 | Salmon Falls Rd @ Project Site Access Driveway | TWSC* | Existing | - | - | - | - |
| | | | Ex + PP | 9.6 (WB) | A | 9.7 (WB) | A |

* Ex. + PP = Existing plus Proposed Project.
 * Control delay for worst minor approach (worst minor movement) for TWSC.

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

As indicated in Table 2, the study intersections operate at LOS A to D during the AM peak hour and PM peak hour. Therefore, the project would not individually exceed a level of service standard established by the County. This impact would be less than significant.

Existing plus Approved Projects (2012) Conditions: Peak hour traffic volume projections for the study area roadway segments were developed and used to determine the levels of service at the study intersection under 2012 conditions. Table 3 provides a summary of the intersection analysis.

**Table 3
 Existing plus Approved Projects (2012) Levels of Service**

| # | Intersection | Traffic Control | AM Peak-Hour Delay (seconds) | LOS | PM Peak-Hour Delay (seconds) | LOS |
|---|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-----|------------------------------|-----|
| 1 | Salmon Falls Rd @ Malcolm Dixon Rd | TWSC* | 10.9 (WB) | B | 12.9 | B |
| 2 | Green Valley Rd @ Salmon Falls Rd/El Dorado Hills Blvd | Signal | 65.4 | E | 70.0 | E |
| 3 | Green Valley Rd @ Silva Valley Pkwy | Signal | 17.5 | B | 19.2 | B |
| 4 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Serrano Pkwy | Signal | 18.0 | B | 69.6 | E |
| 5 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way (North) | Signal | 32.3 | C | 34.0 | C |
| 6 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 Westbound Ramps/ Saratoga Way (South) | Signal | 28.5 | C | 22.5 | C |
| 7 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 Eastbound Ramps | Signal | 55.4 | E | 41.9 | D |
| 8 | Salmon Falls Rd @ Project Site Access Driveway | TWSC* | - | - | - | - |

* Control delay for worst minor approach (worst minor movement) for TWSC.

As indicated in Table 3, the study intersections operate at LOS B to E during AM and PM peak hours.

Existing plus Approved Projects (2012) plus Proposed Project Conditions: Peak hour traffic associated with the proposed project was added to the existing plus approved projects traffic volumes and LOS was determined at the study intersections. Table 4 provides a summary of the intersection analysis.

**Table 4
 Existing plus Approved Projects (2012) plus Proposed Project Levels of Service**

| # | Intersection | Traffic Control | Analysis Scenario* | AM Peak-Hour | | PM Peak-Hour | |
|---|---|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | | | | Delay (seconds) | LOS | Delay (seconds) | LOS |
| 1 | Salmon Falls Rd @ Malcolm Dixon Rd | TWSC* | EPAP | 10.9 (WB) | B | 12.9 | B |
| | | | EPAP + PP | 11.0 (WB) | B | 13.5 | B |
| 2 | Green Valley Rd @ Salmon Falls Rd/El Dorado Hills Blvd | Signal | EPAP | 65.4 | E | 70.0 | E |
| | | | EPAP + PP | 67.6 | E | 73.0 | E |
| 3 | Green Valley Rd @ Silva Valley Pkwy | Signal | EPAP | 17.5 | B | 19.2 | B |
| | | | EPAP + PP | 17.6 | B | 19.4 | B |
| 4 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Serrano Pkwy | Signal | EPAP | 18.0 | B | 69.6 | E |
| | | | EPAP + PP | 18.0 | B | 71.1 | E |
| 5 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way (North) | Signal | EPAP | 32.3 | C | 34.0 | C |
| | | | EPAP + PP | 32.3 | C | 33.9 | C |
| 6 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 Westbound Ramps / Saratoga Way (South) | Signal | EPAP | 28.5 | C | 22.5 | C |
| | | | EPAP + PP | 28.5 | C | 22.4 | C |
| 7 | El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 Eastbound Ramps | Signal | EPAP | 55.4 | E | 41.9 | D |
| | | | EPAP + PP | 55.7 | E | 42.7 | D |
| 8 | Salmon Falls Rd @ Project Site Access Driveway | TWSC* | EPAP | - | - | - | - |
| | | | EPAP + PP | 10.0 (WB) | A | 10.1 (WB) | B |

* EPAP = Existing plus Approved Projects, EPAP + PP = Existing plus Approved Projects plus Proposed Project.
 * Control delay for worst minor approach (worst minor movement) for TWSC.

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

As indicated in Table 4, the study intersections operate at LOS A to E during the AM peak hour and LOS B to E during the PM peak hour. Therefore, the project would not cumulatively exceed a level of service standard established by the County. This impact would be less than significant.

An additional traffic study was conducted in August of 2008 to analyze traffic related impacts at the full built out (115 units total). This study included La Canada, ALTO LLC, Diamante and Chartraw subdivisions. The proposed new connection to Green Valley will reduce existing (before projects) level of traffic to approximately 30%.

The following study intersections were included in the traffic analysis:

1. Salmon Falls Road at Malcolm-Dixon Road (two way stop control)
2. Green Valley Road at Allegheny Road/Silva Valley Parkway (two way stop control)
3. Green Valley Road at Malcolm-Dixon Road (two way stop control)
4. Salmon Falls Road at La Canada Access
5. Green Valley Road at Chartraw Road
6. Malcolm Dixon at Western Diamante Estates Access
7. Malcolm Dixon Road at Chartraw Road (South "T")
8. Malcolm Dixon Road at Chartraw Road (North "T")

**TABLE 5
 Proposed Development Area Trip Generation August 2008**

| ITE Land Use (Code) | # Units | Total Daily Trips | AM Peak Hour | | | | PM Peak Hour | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|-------------------|--------------|-----|-------|-----|--------------|-------------|-----|-------|-----|-------|
| | | | Total Trips | IN | | OUT | | Total Trips | IN | | Out | |
| | | | | % | Trips | % | Trips | | % | Trips | % | Trips |
| Single Family Detached Housing | 115 | 1,182 | 90 | 25% | 22 | 75% | 67 | 122 | 63% | 77 | 37% | 45 |

The proposed/scheduled road improvements associated with approved or pending projects would enhance area circulation as identified above, further reducing traffic impacts in the area and bringing traffic volumes to acceptable levels. Thus, impacts associated with the proposed secondary access route is considered less than significant.

- c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazards.** The project does not contain any design features that could create a hazard. The project may include road and driveway construction on grades of up to 30 percent; however, compliance with a required grading permit would ensure proper grading and safe conditions. Properties surrounding the project site are either undeveloped or developed with similar uses. No incompatibility would result from project implementation and thus this potential impact would be considered less than significant.
- e. **Emergency Access.** The project includes two access points to the project, one direct entrance into the project from Salmon Falls Road, and secondary access that would be constructed with Phase II of the project which would connect through the proposed Alto LLC subdivision. According to the Traffic Impact and Operations Analysis prepared for the proposed project, project implementation would not adversely affect emergency vehicle access at the project site or study intersections. Additionally, the project design must comply with emergency access standards contained in the El Dorado County SRA Fire Safe Regulations (Title 14, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Article 2 Emergency Access) with regard to road width, surface, grade, and radius; turnouts; driveways; and gating. County review of the

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

proposed Tentative Subdivision Map would ensure compliance with these standards. This impact would be less than significant.

- f. **Parking.** The project would comply with Section 17.18.060 of the County Code requiring two off street parking spaces not in tandem per residential unit. In addition, proposed residences would likely include garages providing additional parking spaces. This impact would be less than significant.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** There are currently no public transit services located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. The proposed project would not be of sufficient size or density to support public transit services. The project proposes no design characteristics, uses, or features that conflict with any plans, policies, or programs supporting alternative transportation and thus there would be no impact.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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;

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

- 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 Land Capability Report prepared for the proposed project by Youndahl Consulting Group, Inc (December 2007) determined that the soils of the site could support residential septic systems based on an evaluation of 40 test pits throughout the site. The El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management would be responsible for protecting public health and the environment from the potential adverse impacts associated with on-site, individual sewage disposal systems. The proposed project’s septic system design would be reviewed by the Department to ensure compliance with County Ordinance, Design Standards for the Site Evaluation and Design of Sewage Disposal Systems. Review by the Department of Environmental Management and compliance with these existing regulations would ensure that all septic systems constructed as part of the project would function properly and would not violate wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board and therefore any potential impact would be less than significant.

b. **Facilities Expansion.** Water service for the proposed development would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Prior to any provision of service from EID, the subject parcels are required to be annexed into the District’s service boundaries, which can only be granted through discretionary approval of the LAFCO Commission. However, the subject parcels are not contiguous with EID’s current service boundaries; they are separated by APN 126-100-20, a small section of Salmon Falls Road. Contiguity must be established between the subject parcel and the District prior to, or in conjunction with, LAFCO approval of the annexation, per Government Code §56119 and El Dorado LAFCO Policy 3.9.3. The District’s Salmon Falls Water Storage Tank is located near the southeast corner of the project site. The El Dorado Hills Fire Department has determined that the minimum fire flow required for the project would be 1,500 gallons per minute for a two hour duration, while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. In order to provide this fire flow and receive service, construction of a new booster pump station at the storage tank site would be required. This booster pump station would need to provide both domestic and fire flows. The project applicant would be responsible for the construction of the booster pump station as well as all other on- and off-site water supply infrastructure required for project development. EID requires that adjacent lands that will need to be served by the pump station be identified and included in the sizing of the station.

Proposed residences would be serviced by individual septic systems and would not require or result in the construction of new off-site wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities as a result, associated impacts are considered less than significant.

c. **Stormwater.** Storm drainage facilities required by the project are limited to on-site drainage ditches and culverts. Potential environmental effects of constructing these drainage facilities are considered throughout this document as part of the project. Any potential impacts would be avoided through the implementation of the County Grading Ordinance and thus this potential impact would be considered less than significant.

d. **Water Supply.** The proposed project includes the annexation of the project site into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) for the provision of domestic water and fire hydrants. LAFCO’s discretionary approval is required for annexation, and contiguity must be established prior to annexation. According to the EID Facility Improvement Letter for the project dated December 7, 2007, states, “The District has received approval for an additional 17,000 acre-feet of water to be diverted from Folsom Lake. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) approved Permit 21 112 in 2002. The

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

District has applied for and anticipates execution of a long term Warren Act Contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation for the Permit 21112 water right. Some capacity to utilize this new supply exists in the District facilities currently in place and operating. Facilities to utilize the full amount of this additional water supply are included in the District’s 5-year Capital Improvement Plan and are in various phases of planning, design and construction. Additional EDUs are expected to be available by the end of 2008.” The FIL also states that water facilities adjacent to the project site would need to be upgraded by the applicant. The upgrades include a new booster pump that would provide minimum fire flow in order for EID to serve the project.

The subject parcels are within EID’s El Dorado Hills Supply Area, which pumps water from Folsom Reservoir through US Bureau of Reclamation service contracts and State water right Permit No. 21112. According to EID’s *2007 Water Resources and Service Reliability Report*, there are 933 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of water available in this region, based on the following calculations:

The El Dorado Hills supply area has a supply-based yield of 24,550 acre feet; however the amount of water that can currently be supplied and treated is limited because of infrastructure limitations in the El Dorado Hills Water Treatment Plant (EDHWTP). The 2007 infrastructure-based firm yield for the El Dorado Hills Supply Area is 11,500 acre-feet (AF). The total potential demand as of December 31, 2006 included 8,572 AF of active demand, 331 AF of latent demand, and 1,851 AF of other system demand, for a total of 10,754 AF. The resulting unallocated water supply for the year 2007 is therefore 746 AF.

To convert the available water supply to meter availability, EID projected demand out for three years. This per EDU demand was based on a 10-year historical trend (1996-2005) in the El Dorado Hills Supply Area. The trend was extended out to 2009, resulting in 0.80 AF per EDU. The water meter availability for the El Dorado Hills Supply Area is thus a total of 933 EDUs for 2007.

However, this estimate does not take into account the 2,893 EDUs of contractual commitments for existing and future water supplies, nor does it reflect recent annexations approved by LAFCO that have not yet purchased water meters. The water meter availability based on the infrastructure-based yield is not currently sufficient to serve the existing contractual commitments or additional annexations; however, meter availability is expected to increase once the EDHWTP undergoes planned expansions. The current capacity of the EDHWTP is 19.5 million gallons per day (MGD); the expansion will increase the capacity to 24.4 MGD. This will increase the unallocated EDUs to 1,165, assuming the same number of contractual commitments as 2007 (24.4 MGD is approximately 14,000 AF, minus the same 10,754 AF of total potential demand, divided by the conversion factor of 0.80=4,058 EDUs – 2,893 EDUs of 2007 contractual commitments leaves 1,165 EDUs available). After the EDHWTP expansion occurs, additional meters will become available for purchase on a first-come first-serve basis. According to the FIL, the project as proposed would require 47 EDUs of water supply.

Pursuant to Section 15.16.050 of the El Dorado County Code, no permit shall be issued for the construction of a building having plumbing facilities therein, until proof of an adequate water supply would be provided as required by the Division of Environmental Management.

EID anticipates availability of the required water supply for the proposed project and compliance with the County Code would ensure that the project would not be approved unless this water supply actually becomes available and would be committed to the project. EID service to the proposed project would be contingent upon the project’s contiguity to EID’s service area, LAFCO approval of the annexation, the future availability of water supply, approval of the Facility Plan Report, construction of all water facilities, and acceptance of the facilities by EID. The potential impact would be considered less than significant.

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

- e. **Wastewater Facilities.** Wastewater treatment would be provided by on-site septic systems and there are no potential impacts.
- f,g. **Solid Waste.** In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) are allowed to be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal site. All other waste materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

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

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

Finding: It has been determined that there would be no significant impacts to water, wastewater, drainage, or solid waste utilities. Identified thresholds of significance for the utilities and service systems category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to biological resources. Potential impacts to biological resources include the alteration of habitat and/or direct impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species and the loss of oak woodlands. Impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species would be mitigated by **MM BIO-1**,

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

which requires surveys for raptors at appropriate times prior to construction and consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game to determine appropriate avoidance measures. Additional impacts to biological resources are less than significant.

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

- b. The project would not involve development or changes in land use that would result in increased population growth. Impacts due to increased demand for public services associated with the project would be offset by the payment of fees as required by service providers. The project would not contribute substantially to increased traffic in the area and the project would not require an increase in the wastewater treatment capacity of the County. As discussed throughout this environmental document, the project would not contribute to a substantial decline in water quality, air quality, noise, biological resources, agricultural resources, or cultural resources under cumulative conditions. Cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the project are less than significant.
- c. As outlined and discussed in this document, as mitigated and conditioned, this project proposes a less than significant chance of having project-related environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9
Appendix A
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

El Dorado County General Plan – A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief (Adopted July 19, 2004)

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Additional Resources:

CTA Engineering and Surveying, Drainage Study for La Canada, November 2007.

Foothill Associates, Arborist Report 144-Acre Parkes Property, El Dorado County, California, January 17, 2008.

Gibson & Skordal, LLC, Jurisdictional Delineation and Special Status Species Evaluation, Parkes Property, October 2007.

Historic Resource Associates, Cultural Resources Study of APN 126:100:18 and 110:020:12, East of Salmon Falls Road, El Dorado County, California 95762, September 2007

Historic Resource Associates, Archaeological Investigation Report of Parkes Temp H1 (Locus B) APN 126:100:18 and 110:020:12 Near Salmon Falls Road, El Dorado County, California, November 2007.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., Traffic Impact and Operations Analysis; Parkes Property, January 24, 2008.

Rimpo, Tim. Rimpo and Associates, Air Quality Analysis for the Parkes Property Residential Development. January 24, 2008

Youngdahl Consulting Group, Land Capability Study for La Canada Property, El Dorado Hills, El Dorado County, California. December 2007.