



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title/Application: Kamm Park Subdivision
Rezone Application Z 06-0025
Tentative Map Application TM 06-1419

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

Contact Person: Mel Pabalinas, Senior Planner **Phone Number:** (530) 621-5363

Property Owner's Name and Address: Kamm Ghalankar, 4930 Kingvale Road, El Dorado, CA 95682-4620

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Kamm Ghalankar, 4930 Kingvale Road, El Dorado, CA 95682-4620

Project Agent's Name and Address: Gene Thorne and Associates, Inc., 3025 Alhambra Drive, Suite A,
Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Engineer's Name and Address: Same as Agent

Project Location: Rancho Tierra Court 0.25 miles south of the intersection with Woodleigh Lane, Cameron Park.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 116-040-07 (On-Site)

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

Section: 33 **T:** 10 North **R:** 9 East

General Plan Designation: High Density Residential (HDR)

Description of Project:

The project comprise of the following requests:

1. Rezone of 5.066 acre parcel from Estate Residential District 5-acre minimum (RE-5) to One-Family Residential (R1) Zone District;
2. Tentative Subdivision Map of subject parcel creating a total of seven (7) Single Family Residential-zoned (R1) lots ranging from 9,700 square feet 1.13 acres in size; and
3. Design Waiver Request to deviate from the following standards:
 - A) Reduction of standard sidewalk width along Rancho Tierra Court from six feet to four feet;
 - B) Exceed 3 to 1 lot depth-width ratio; and
 - C) Reduction of off-site road width from 28 feet to 20 feet with 1-foot shoulders and AC curbs and without concrete curbs, gutters or sidewalk

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RE-5	HDR	Vacant Undeveloped
North:	RE-5	HDR	Vacant Undeveloped
East:	RE-5	HDR	Vacant Undeveloped
South:	RE-5	HDR	Single Family Residence
West:	R-1	HDR	Single Family Residences

Briefly describe the environmental setting: The project site is located in the unincorporated community region of Cameron Park area, north of Highway 50. Residential development occupies areas to the west, and a single-

family residence occupies a large lot to the south. Lands to the north and east are vacant and undeveloped. The approximately 5.066-acre site has terrain with moderate to steep slopes, with most of the site containing slopes from 21 to 39 percent. Site elevations vary from approximately 1,255 to 1,395 feet above mean sea level. The project site is mostly open and clear of brush, with scattered oak trees and clusters in the western portion. A gravel road, Rancho Tierra Court, traverses the western portion of the site.

The affected off-site portion of the project primarily consists of disturbed area within the existing right-of-way for Rancho Tierra Court and predominantly undisturbed future road easement through an offsite property proposing to connect to Great Heron Drive due southwest. The biological communities within this portion include mixed oak woodland and areas of gabbroic northern mixed chaparral.

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

1. Regional Water Quality Control Board: Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of Clean Water
2. Act and NPDES General Construction Permit
3. Cameron Park Community Service District: In-lieu fees and ancillary impact fees
4. El Dorado County Building Department: Building Permits
5. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Improvement Plans, Grading Permit and Encroachment Permits

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. (NEED TO CHECK THOSE THAT YOU MITIGATED)

	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	X	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Rommel Pabalinas For: El Dorado County

Supervisor: Pierre Rivas _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the rezone of a 5.06-acre site and subdivision into 7 residential lots.

Project Site

The project site is located in an infill residential area of Cameron Park, north of Highway 50. The site is surrounded by residential development to the west, and a single-family residence occupies a large lot to the south. Adjacent lands to the north and east are vacant and undeveloped. The approximately 5.066-acre site has terrain with moderate to steep slopes, with most of the site containing slopes from 21 to 39 percent. Site elevations vary from approximately 1,255 to 1,395 feet above mean sea level. The project site is mostly open and clear of brush, with scattered oak trees and clusters in the western portion. A gravel road, Rancho Tierra Court, traverses the western portion of the site.

The project would also encompass required improvements located off-site on different properties including a 5-acre property to the north and three 5-acre properties to the south.

Project Characteristics

The project would rezone the 5.066 acre property from Residential Estate 5-acre minimum (RE-5) to One-Family Residential (R1) and subdivision of the property into seven residential lots, ranging from 9,700 gross square feet to

1.98 gross acres. Design Waivers are requested modifying the required subdivision standards including maximum lot depth-width ratio, secondary access road widths, and sidewalk improvements.

Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The lots would be served via direct driveway encroachment onto the proposed extension of Rancho Tierra Court, which originates from its northerly intersection with Woodleigh Lane and is planned to be extended looping back to Woodleigh Lane to the southeast. From this extension, a secondary access off-site road is proposed to be constructed due southwest connecting to Great Heron Drive. Rancho Tierra Court, both on-site and northerly off-site portions, would consist of 36-foot wide road, curb and gutter, 4-foot sidewalk within a 60-foot right-of-way to be constructed in accordance of El Dorado County Design Improvement and Standard Manual (DISM) Plan 101B. The secondary access road would be constructed with a 20-foot wide road pavement and 1-foot shoulders based on a modified DISM Plan 101B. Based on the project traffic study, the proposed seven lot subdivision is below the threshold that would significantly impact the Level of Service (LOS) in the peripheral roads.

Parking shall be provided in accordance with Chapter 17.18 of the El Dorado Zoning Code. Specifically, each primary residential unit would be required to provide a minimum two off-street parking stalls. Additional on-street parking would be provided along Rancho Tierra Court.

Improvements

The proposed residential subdivision would be mass pad graded in preparation of developable pad area, driveway, and drainage swales for each residential lot. Development of the site would result in the removal of an Oak cluster located at the southeast corner of proposed Lot 4 and impacts to an ephemeral channels traversing Lots 1-5. On-site disturbance would comprise approximately 4,298 cubic yard of cut and 4,244 cubic yard of fill. The total off-site disturbance is comprised of 1,850 cubic yard for both cut and fill earthwork.

The subdivision is anticipated to connect to existing sewer and potable water stub lines provided by El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) in the peripheral area. Specifically, an 8-inch water line exists in Rancho Tierra Court to the north while a 6-inch sewer line is located along the southern leg of the 60-foot easement. Actual connection for these services would be facilitated through a Facility Plan Report (FPR) in accordance with EID construction standards. An EID meter award letter would be required as verification of these services prior to Final Map approval. All utilities shall be located within the existing or proposed easements.

Site improvements would include installation of fire hydrants in accordance with the local fire standards enforced by the Cameron Park Fire Department and storm drainage facilities.

Population

The proposed residential units would add approximately 20 people to the population in the vicinity, assuming 2.8 persons per household.¹ Although the project does not propose multiple units on each lot, the County allows for the construction of a secondary unit in all zones that permit single-family residences. Because County code allows primary and secondary units, the proposed project could eventually generate approximately 40 residents.

Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of on- and off-site road improvements, utility connections, and residential pad grading, subject to review and approval of requisite construction and improvement plans by the affected agencies. The project would include construction of the residences subject to review and approval of building permits.

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.

Upon completion of the written comment period, the Initial Study will be considered by the Lead Agency (El Dorado County) in a public meeting and will be adopted if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency will also determine whether to approve the project.

¹ El Dorado County General Plan, July 2004, Chapter 2 Land Use, Table 2-2, page 19.

Tiering – El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR

This Mitigated Negative Declaration tiers off of the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR (SCH#2001082030) in accordance with Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines. The El Dorado County General Plan EIR is available for review at the County website at <http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanDraftEIR.htm> or at the El Dorado County Development Services Department located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95677. All determinations and impacts identified that rely upon the General Plan EIR analysis and General Plan Mitigation Measures are identified herein. The following impact areas tier off the General Plan EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resource
- Geology/Soils
- Mineral Resource
- Mandatory Findings

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less-than-significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development;
 - Substantially change the natural landscape; or
 - Obstruct an identified public scenic vista.
- a) **Scenic Vista.** The project is approximately 2.5 miles north from an identified scenic vista, Marble Valley, as referenced in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR (p. 5.3-3 and Exhibit 5.3-1). The scenic vista is visible primarily from the south, where topography and elevations allow for clear visual access. Since the project is north of the scenic viewpoint, and not in the direction of the south-facing scenic view, the project would not adversely affect or impair views of Marble Valley. The project would have no impact on scenic vistas.
 - b) **Scenic Resources.** The nearest state scenic highway, as designated and listed by Caltrans, is U.S. Highway 50 beginning from the eastern limits of the Government Center interchange (Forni Road/Placerville Drive) to South Lake Tahoe. The scenic highway begins approximately 12 miles east of the project site. The project would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.
 - c) **Visual Character.** The project would likely involve grading and the removal of oak trees, as well as construction of residential buildings on the site. Most of the project site is open and has been cleared of brush. However, some oak trees are on the site, which provides scenic resource, would be affected. As further discussed under Section IV.C (Biological Resource), the project would be required to comply with County General Plan policies, zoning codes, and ordinances that regulate visual character, including policies to protect biological resources, height limitations to protect views, and other miscellaneous policies. The project would have less than significant impact.
 - d) **Light and Glare.** The project would facilitate the development of seven single-family residences. New sources of light and glare would result primarily from outdoor residential lighting. Section 17.14.170(C)(1) of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance requires outdoor residential lighting to be hooded or screened as to direct the source of light downward and focus onto the property from which it originates. Lighting shall not negatively impact adjacent properties or directly reflect upon any adjacent residential property. The project must comply with this Zoning Ordinance requirement; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Findings: The proposed project is not in proximity of designated scenic vista or highway. The infill residential subdivision would conform to the existing surrounding residential uses, where common effects such as glare and lighting are anticipated. Project impacts on aesthetic and scenic are considered 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
e. 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 implementation of the project would:

- Convert important agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impair the productivity of such agricultural land, or convert land 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;
 - Substantially reduce the amount of agricultural land in the County; or
 - Subject agricultural uses to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a) **Prime Farmland.** Exhibit 5.2-1 of the County General Plan EIR (El Dorado County, 2003) depicts important farmland, which includes Farmland as defined in this Initial Study (Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance). The exhibit is based on the Important Farmland Map for El Dorado County, prepared by the California Resources Agency, Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The project site is in an area designated in Exhibit 5.2-1 as Other Land. “Other Land” is land not otherwise classified by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. There would be no impact on Farmland.
- b) **Existing Zoning.** No agricultural operations currently exist on the project site. The project site is zoned for residential use, as are adjacent lands. There are no parcels zoned for agricultural uses in the immediate vicinity. The project site and adjacent lands are not under any current Williamson Act contracts, as indicated by Exhibit 5.2-2 of the County General Plan EIR (El Dorado County, 2003). There would be no impact related to agricultural zoning or Williamson Act lands.
- c) **Existing Environment.** The area surrounding the project site has been designated as Urban and Built-Up Land or Other Land (see Exhibit 5.2-1 of the County General Plan EIR). There is no designated Farmland in the vicinity, as defined by this Initial Study. Residential development is located in the area, with existing streets and other infrastructure the project would utilize. Therefore, the project would not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. There would be no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Findings: The proposed project would not result in loss of Farmland, or conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts. The project would not facilitate the loss of agricultural lands. The proposed project would have no impact on agricultural resources.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), precursors to ozone, would result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82 pounds per day (see Table 5.1 of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District Guide to Air Quality Assessment, dated February 2002);
 - Emissions of particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) would result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82 pounds per day (see p. 6-2 of the Air Pollution Control District Guide), except for industrial sources covered by Table 6.1 of the Air Pollution Control District Guide; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants that 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.** In 1994, the Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan was adopted. This is also called the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Clean Air Plan was designed to bring the Sacramento Region, which includes all of El Dorado County except for the Lake Tahoe Basin, into compliance with the federal one-hour ozone standard. The SIP includes adopted measures and commitments to adopt measures to reduce ozone emissions, along with contingency measures and a demonstration of emission reductions sufficient for attainment of air quality standards. In 2006, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District initiated a Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan Update, which would be designed to bring the region into compliance with the federal eight-hour ozone standard promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1997.

An air quality study conducted for the project by Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting evaluated potential emissions of ROG and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), two key ingredients of ozone. The Ambient study estimated the project would generate 4.56 pounds per day (lbs/day) of ROG and 0.23 lbs/day of NO_x during the winter season,

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

primarily due to emissions from wood-burning stoves and fireplaces. During the summer season, ROG and NO_x emissions would decrease to 0.63 lbs/day and 0.09 lbs/day, respectively (Ambient Air Quality, 2005a, p. 11). All estimated emissions are below the threshold of significance established by the El Dorado Air Quality Management District (AQMD) for these pollutants, which is 82 lbs/day. Therefore, the project would not significantly contribute to ozone generation, which would be consistent with the goals of the Clean Air Plan. The impact would be less than significant.

- b) **Air Quality Standard.** As of 2006, El Dorado County is in attainment status of all federal and state ambient air quality standards, except state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM₁₀. Air pollutant emission sources from the project upon completion primarily would be from consumer products and architectural coatings. In the winter season, emissions from wood stoves and fireplaces also would be significant. As noted in a) above, the project upon completion would generate emissions of ROG and NO_x that would be below the threshold of significance for both pollutants. In addition, the AQMD has determined that emissions of PM₁₀, CO and SO₂ associated with projects of less than 48 dwelling units, with fireplaces/woodstoves, would not contribute to a significant air quality impact. Since the project proposes seven dwelling units, operational air quality impacts would be considered minor. The project would not significantly contribute to existing ozone and PM₁₀ air quality violations.

According to the Ambient study, mobile-source CO is the localized pollutant of primary concern associated with the long-term operation of the proposed project. Localized CO concentrations are typically highest in the vicinity of congested roadway intersections. Based on a review of the traffic analysis prepared for the project, the Ambient study concluded that predicted localized mobile-source CO concentrations at nearby intersections would be unlikely to exceed applicable ambient air quality standards.

Construction activities associated with the project would include grading and site improvements, building pad construction, utilities, entryways and associated on-site activities. Construction-related activities could generate PM₁₀ dust emissions that could exceed state and/or federal ambient air quality standards. This is a temporary but potentially significant effect. The applicant must comply with AQMD Rule 223-1, Fugitive Dust-Construction Activities. Requirements under Rule 223-1 include the following:

- Visible emissions shall not exceed 20 percent opacity at point-of-origin and shall not extend more than 50 feet from point-of-origin, or cross the project boundary line, whichever is less.
- Vehicle speeds shall be limited to prevent visible emissions past the project boundary line, or 50 feet from the point of origin, whichever is less.
- The dust generating process must be suspended when wind causes visible emissions past the project boundary line, or 50 feet from the point of origin, whichever is less.
- Projects that require a County grading permit must submit a Fugitive Dust Plan and fee to the AQMD for approval. The Fugitive Dust Plan identifies potential dust-generating activities associated with the project and indicates measures to be implemented to control dust emissions. Notification must be made to the AQMD 10 days prior to the start of earthmoving activities.
- Applicable Best Management Practices shall be utilized throughout the project to comply with the requirements of Rule 223-1.
- Trackout from project site must be prevented and removed when exceeding 50 feet from the nearest unpaved surface exit point of the site.
- All trackout must be cleaned at the end of each workday by manually sweeping, with a rotary brush or broom with sufficient wetting, a PM₁₀-efficient street sweeper, or flushing with water if possible without causing adverse impacts on storm water drainage or potential violations of any National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program.
- Larger sites (>150 vehicle trips/day or >20 vehicle trips/day for ≥3-axle vehicles) must also install a trackout control device.
- Storage piles must have a means of dust control.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Compliance with the AQMD Rule 223-1 requirements would reduce dust emissions from construction activities to a level that is less than significant.

The use of construction equipment that emits diesel exhaust would result in the generation of ROG, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, which could adversely affect air quality. This impact is potentially significant and requires mitigation.

MITIGATION MEASURE AQ-1a

Construction equipment equal to or greater than 50 horsepower shall be limited to model years 1996 or newer. Maximum daily combined fuel use of all equipment shall not exceed 402 gallons per day. The prime contractor shall maintain a comprehensive daily inventory of all off-road construction equipment equal to or greater than 50 horsepower used during project construction. At a minimum, the inventory shall identify the horsepower rating, engine production year, date/hours of use, and daily fuel throughput for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be maintained on site, to be made available to County officials upon request. Alternatively, the contractor may implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2b.

Implementation/Timing: The above measure shall be incorporated as note on all construction plans subject to verification and prior to approval by Development Services-Planning Division.

MITIGATION MEASURE AQ-1b

The prime contractor shall provide an approved plan demonstrating that heavy-duty off-road vehicles (i.e., greater than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project, and operated by either the prime contractor or any subcontractor, will achieve at a minimum a fleet-averaged 20 percent NO_x reduction, compared to the most recent California Air Resources Board (CARB) fleet average. Use of aqueous emulsified fuel verified by CARB may be used to achieve reductions in NO_x and PM₁₀. The prime contractor would be required to submit a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment equal to or greater than 50 horsepower used that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during project construction. At a minimum, the inventory shall identify the horsepower rating, engine production year, date/hours of use, and fuel throughput for each piece of equipment. The inventory list shall be updated and submitted monthly to County officials throughout the duration of construction activity; and

The prime contractor shall ensure emissions from all off-road diesel-powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. As an enforcement component of the measure, the prime contractor shall agree to a visual survey of all in-operation equipment conducted on a periodic basis. In addition, a summary of the visual results shall be submitted to County officials throughout the duration of construction activity. The summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed and the dates of each survey. The El Dorado County AQMD and other qualified officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. If any equipment is found to exceed the opacity requirement, the equipment shall be repaired immediately and notification of non-compliant equipment shall be made to the AQMD.

Implementation/Timing: The above measure shall be incorporated as note on all construction plans subject to verification and prior to approval by Development Services-Planning Division.

Incorporation of this mitigation measure and compliance with existing AQMD rules and regulations would reduce the amount of emissions generated by project construction and operations, particularly of ozone precursors and PM₁₀. Project impacts related to local and regional air quality would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- c) **Cumulative Impacts.** As noted in b) above, the County currently is in nonattainment status for state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM₁₀. The project is likely to generate emissions of ozone precursors and PM₁₀, through both construction activities and project operations. As noted in b) above, project operations are expected to generate ROG and NO_x emissions that are below significance thresholds established by AQMD, based on the anticipated amount of square footage of commercial development. Nevertheless, the project would contribute ozone emissions in an area classified in “serious nonattainment” of federal ozone standards.

The El Dorado AQMD CEQA Guide provides guidance for assessing the cumulative impacts of a project on air quality. For ROG and NO_x, the AQMD basically determines their cumulative significance on whether the project is consistent with an approved plan or mitigation program of AQMD-wide or regional application. For western El Dorado County, the Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan is the applicable plan. Development projects are considered consistent with the Clean Air Plan if:

- The project does not require a change in the existing land use designation and projected emissions of ROG and NO_x from the proposed project are equal to or less than the emissions anticipated for the site if developed under the existing land use designation;
- The project does not exceed the “project alone” significance criteria;
- The lead agency for the project (i.e., the County) requires the project to implement any applicable emission reduction measures contained in and/or derived from the Clean Air Plan; and
- The project complies with all applicable AQMD rules and regulations.

The project would be required to comply with all AQMD rules and regulations. The project also does not require a change in the existing land use designation, which is High Density Residential. As discussed in b) above, the project by itself does not exceed thresholds of significance for ozone precursors, PM₁₀, CO and SO₂. Therefore, additional mitigation measures are not considered necessary. Based on the above criteria, the project’s cumulative contribution to ozone emissions is considered less than significant.

As discussed in b) above, construction activities associated with the project would be expected to generate PM₁₀ emissions. These emissions would be temporary and would cease when construction work is completed. In addition, AQMD rules and **Mitigation Measures AQ-1a/AQ-1b** would control PM₁₀ emissions resulting from construction activities. Project operations are expected to generate very little amounts of PM₁₀. Therefore, the project would not contribute a cumulatively considerable amount of PM₁₀. Cumulative impacts on PM₁₀ emissions are considered less than significant.

- d) **Sensitive Receptors.** Single family residences are located adjacent to and west of the project site. The most significant pollutant generated by the project would be PM₁₀ emissions during construction, and such emissions would cease after construction work ends. Also, as described in b) above, AQMD Rule 223-1 requires measures to control dust emissions during construction. Thus, the project would not expose residents in the area to substantial pollutant concentrations. Given the small amount of emissions that would be generated by the project after construction, the adjacent residences likely would not receive emission concentrations that would affect health or otherwise adversely affect residents. The impact would be less than significant.
- e) **Objectionable Odors.** The Ambient study states no sources of odors have been identified in the project site vicinity. Implementation of the project would not result in the generation of permanent or long-term objectionable odors. There would be short-term increases in pollutants associated with construction activities. Nuisance odors generated by diesel-powered construction equipment may be noticeable to some individuals. However, due to the relatively short duration of construction activities and the rapid dissipation of gases in the air, potential odor impacts are considered less than significant.

Findings: The proposed project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The project would result in increased emissions due to construction activities. However, existing regulations and

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

implementation of **Mitigation Measures AQ-1a/AQ1b** would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Additional impacts to air quality would be less than significant. With mitigation, the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts.

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

Discussion:

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

a) Special Status Species

Rare Plants

Sycamore Environmental Consultants conducted a Biological Resource Evaluation of the project site, which included a field trip to determine the existence of special-status plant and wildlife species. “Special-status” species are defined as those listed as endangered or threatened under both federal and state Endangered Species Acts, designated a Species of Special Concern by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and listed on California Native Plant Society (CNPS) plant inventory lists.

According to the Sycamore evaluation, no special status species would occur on the on-site portion of the project. The project site has suitable or marginal habitat for eleven special-status plant species (Sycamore Environmental Consultants, 2006, p. 13):

- Big-scale balsam root (CNPS list)
- Bisbee Peak rush-rose (CNPS list)
- Brandegees’ clarkia (CNPS list)
- El Dorado bedstraw (federal endangered, state rare, CNPS list)
- El Dorado County mule ears (CNPS list)
- Jepson’s onion (CNPS list)
- Layne’s butterweed (federal threatened, state rare, CNPS list)
- Pine Hill ceanothus (federal endangered, state rare, CNPS list)
- Pine Hill flannelbush (federal endangered, state rare, CNPS list)
- Red Hills soaproot (CNPS list)
- Stebbins’ morning glory (federal endangered, state endangered, CNPS list)

A field survey of the on-site project area conducted in June 2006, to coincide with the flowering season for all 11 plant species, found only one of these species on the project site. Approximately five plants of Bisbee Peak rush-rose were recorded west of Rancho Tierra Court near a drainage channel and another 25 plants were identified along the southeastern boundary of the project site (Sycamore Environmental Consultants, 2006, p. 17). The plants along the southeastern boundary would most likely be impacted given its location in one of the lots (Lot 7). A subsequent field survey of the off-site portion of the project was conducted in May 2009 found no special status plants listed above; however, this off-site area does provide for potential habitat for these plants.

Since Bisbee Peak rush-rose is not listed under either the federal or state Endangered Species Acts, actions that affect this species are not subject to the species protection provisions of these acts. Moreover, in a letter dated May 21, 2007, Sycamore indicated that the Jepson Manual, the standard reference manual for California plants, does not recognize Bisbee Peak rush-rose as a distinct species from the more common rush-rose. While acknowledging some publications consider it a distinct species, the Sycamore letter stated more current information indicate no distinction. Nevertheless, El Dorado County Ordinance Code Section 17.71.010 names Bisbee Peak rush-rose as a “rare plant” subject to the Ecological Preserve Mitigation provisions of the Ordinance Code. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 below would mitigate the impacts to these plants to less than significant:

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-1

The project shall comply with the Ecological Preserve Mitigation program set forth in the Ordinance Code Chapter 17.71; however, the election to pay the in lieu fee, as provided in Section 17.71.220.A of the Ordinance, may not be made until such time as the County has completed its intended review and update of the in-lieu fee. The project shall be subject to the updated fee at such time as it has been found to be in compliance

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

with the intent of the Ordinance. If the applicant elects to record a final map for the project prior to the completion of the update of the fee, the applicant will be required to demonstrate compliance with the Rare Plant Offsite Mitigation Program as provided in subsection 17.71.220.B, providing off-site mitigation at 1.5:1 for land area permanently impacted within the project area, in accordance with the Ordinance.

Implementation/Timing: Conformance shall be verified by Planning Services as noted in the measure.

Valley Elderberry Beetle

Survey of the site identified three elderberry shrubs located along the proposed off-site road connection to Great Heron Drive, within the oak woodland canopy. These shrubs provide potential habitat for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB), which primarily occurs in large riparian areas along perennial rivers and creeks. Though no actual VELB was identified and despite its inconsistent natural setting, project implementation would anticipate impacts on the shrubs and the habitat. In the event of any future construction activity that could impact these elderberry shrubs, implementation of measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would further reduce potential impacts on VELB through avoidance and protection of their habitat. If measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 are implemented, no further mitigation would be required. However, if these shrubs cannot be avoided by project related activities, Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 shall apply.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-2

Pursuant to the July 9, 1999 USFWS Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle, the project applicant shall establish a 20-foot buffer zone around each of the two potentially affected elderberry shrubs within which, no mining or excavation or other activities that could result in the damage to or loss of the elderberry shrubs shall occur. This buffer shall be marked with high visibility fencing during excavation so excavation crews can easily avoid them during the excavation of the site. This buffer zone shall remain in place throughout the life of the project.

Timing/Implementation: Planning Services shall verify that the above measure has been incorporated on the plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-3

The project applicant shall conduct Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training for construction crews before construction activities begin. The WEAP shall include a brief review of the special-status species and other sensitive resources that could occur in the proposed Project Site (including their life history and habitat requirements and what portions of the proposed Project Site they may be found in) and their legal status and protection. The program shall also cover all mitigation measures, environmental permits and proposed project plans, such as the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), Best Management Practices (BMPs), erosion control and sediment plan, and any other required plans. During WEAP training, construction personnel shall be informed of the importance of avoiding ground-disturbing activities outside of the designated work area.

Timing/Implementation: The project applicant shall submit evidence of compliance with the above measure to Planning Services prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-4

Prior to any ground disturbing activities within 20 feet of the dripline of any elderberry shrub, the applicant or their representative shall initiate consultation pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act with the USFWS. Section 7 Consultation will occur if the US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) is involved with this project through a Section 404 permit. Section 10 Consultation will be required if there is no ACOE involvement with this project. Specific mitigation measures for project related impacts on VELB will be developed during this process, but will generally include the following mitigation measures.

Timing/Implementation: The project applicant shall submit evidence of compliance with the above measure to Planning Services prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-5

If the elderberry shrubs cannot be avoided then those elderberry shrubs shall be transplanted to a USFWS approved location following the guidelines set forth in the July 9, 1999 USFWS Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. This location may be established on site, or at an approved mitigation bank.

In addition to transplanting the affected shrubs, the project applicant shall plant additional seedlings or cuttings in the established mitigation area following the guidelines set forth in the July 9, 1999 USFWS Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.

Timing/Implementation: The project applicant shall submit evidence of compliance with the above measure to Planning Services prior to relocation of any elderberry shrub and any construction.

Coast horned lizard (Phrynosoma coronatum frontale)

The presence of gabbroic northern mixed chaparral provides potential habitat for Coast horned lizard. Specifically, the lizard is listed as a Federal Special Concern Species and is a California Special Concern Species. No positive sighting of the lizard at the site during the site visit; however, presence of lizards was confirmed in the immediate off-site properties. It is likely that the project site would provide habitat for these species. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 above would mitigate impacts to the lizards to less than significant.

- b) The Sycamore evaluation identified three biological habitat types on the project site: gabbroic northern mixed chaparral, mixed oak woodland, and ephemeral channels (Ephemeral channels and oak woodlands are discussed under subsection c and are discussed d below). The on-site mixed chaparral habitat had been cleared of most tree and shrub vegetation within the last few years (Sycamore Environmental Consultants, 2006, p. 11). Off-site the gabbroic northern mixed chaparral is mostly confined along Rancho Tierra. The estimated total area encompassed by this type of habitat, which could be inhabited by the above listed plants and Coast horned lizard, and is considered a sensitive natural community by the Department of Fish and Game, is 5.39 acres, of which 3.87 acres could be impacted by the project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 above would mitigate impacts to Coast horned lizard to less than significant.
- c) The Sycamore evaluation included a preliminary delineation of jurisdictional waters on the project site. “Jurisdictional waters” are those subject to the Clean Water Act Section 404 permitting process of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The preliminary delineation identified two ephemeral channels on-site that potentially fall under Section 404 jurisdiction. One channel, approximately 312 feet long and 0.02 acres in size, traverses the western portion of the project site in a north-south orientation. The other channel approximately 675 feet long and approximately 0.26 acres in size crosses the northern portion of the site in an east-west orientation until just before it

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

reaches Rancho Tierra Court. At that point, it follows a channel that parallels Rancho Tierra Court, passes under the road via a culvert, and continues westward until connecting with the first channel. The off-site portion of the project consists of a series of ditches from uphill that drains into corrugated pipes along Rancho Tierra Court. No wetlands of other jurisdictional waters were identified off-site. Ephemeral watercourses are not subject to the standards under General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 and its Interim Interpretive Guideline.

The project as proposed could potentially fill or otherwise alter these channels. A fill of jurisdictional wetlands would require a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It also would require a water quality certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. The Section 404 permit and water quality certification typically have conditions attached that are designed to mitigate the loss of filled wetlands. In addition, the project would be required to obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish Game (DFG), in accordance with California Fish and Game Code Section 1602. Based on these requirements, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-6

The project applicant shall present a formal delineation to and obtain a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and a Section 401 water quality certification from the Central Valley RWQCB. The project applicant also shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of grading permit, the applicant shall provide documentation of the above permits and certifications to Planning Services.

Implementation of the mitigation measure would ensure timely compensation for the fill or alteration of any jurisdictional waters due to project construction. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

- d) The Sycamore evaluation states potential foraging and nesting habitat for migratory birds exist. As a result of recent clearing, the project site does not provide nesting habitat for raptors. However, large oak trees south of the project site provide potential raptor nesting habitat. Construction activities that occur during the typical breeding season (February through October) could disturb the breeding and nesting of raptors and migratory birds, thereby adversely affecting their numbers. Raptors and migratory birds are protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-7

If construction activities are scheduled to occur within the typical breeding season for raptors (February through October), a pre-construction survey for active nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than two weeks prior to start of development activities. The survey shall be conducted on site and within 250 feet of the site. If an active raptor nest is found within 250 feet of a construction area, the biologist shall record the location on a site map and a 250-foot buffer shall be established around the nest tree. The buffer zone shall be physically marked by the biologist, and no construction activities shall occur within the buffer area until the young have fledged. If establishment of a buffer is not practical, the California Department of Fish and Game shall be contacted for further avoidance and minimization guidelines. If no active nests are found, then no further action is required, and construction activities may proceed upon approval by Planning Services.

Implementation/Timing: The above measure shall be incorporated as note on all construction plans subject to verification and prior to approval by Planning Services.

Implementation of the mitigation measure would avoid or minimize impacts on nesting raptors. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

e) General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and its Interim Interpretive Guideline requires all new development projects (not including agricultural cultivation and activities pursuant to a Fire Safe Plan necessary to protect existing structures) that would result in soil disturbance of parcels over one acre that have at least 1 percent total canopy cover by woodlands habitats as defined in the General Plan to mitigate impacts by one of two options:

- Adherence to tree canopy retention and replacement standards (Option A); or
- Contribution to the County’s Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan conservation fund (Option B) as currently established in the Oak Woodland Management Program (OWMP)

The project site contains clusters of Interior live oaks, Blue oaks, and Black oaks. An updated arborist report conducted for the project site determined that existing healthy oak canopy covers 0.086 acres, or 1.7 percent of the on-site (5.66 acres property size) project (Mosbacher, 2009, p. 2). Of this amount, 0.05 acres of canopy would be impacted by development, accounting for 58.8% of the canopy, while 0.036 acres of canopy (41.9%) would be retained for preservation. This retention amount is below the required amount of 90% per Option A (with 10% allowed removal) of the policy. Additionally, the affected off-site canopy resulting from road and utility construction is 0.889 acres for a total affected canopy of 0.939 acres. Based on this calculation, the project canopy impacts would be eligible for Option A only if a maximum of 0.009 acres (10% allowed removal) is removed and the replacement and maintenance provisions of the Interim Interpretive Guideline are met. Otherwise, the applicant may mitigate the impacts accordance with OWMP based on an in-lieu fee payment under Option B of the policy, or a combination of both Option and B. The project shall be conditioned to meet the provisions of the policy as discussed above. Also, the project shall be conditioned to implement construction measures preventing impacts on preserved trees. Implementation of these measures would compensate for the loss of oak tree canopy that may occur as a result of the project, and would ensure protection preserved oak trees. With enforcement of condition, impact would be minimized to less than significant.

f) The project site is not currently covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: Potentially significant impacts to biological resources include potential impacts to existing Bisbee Peak rush-rose, and nesting habitat for raptors and other bird species. Implementation of provisions in the El Dorado County Ordinance Code would compensate for impacts on Bisbee Peak rush-rose and other rare plants habitat. Two ephemeral channels potentially subject to Section 404 jurisdiction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers may be altered as a result of the project. Compliance with conditions set forth in the required Section 404 permit and water quality certification, along with incorporation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1**, would minimize impacts to a level that is less than significant. Construction activities associated with the project would remove existing oak trees. Established provisions of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 to be imposed as conditions would reduce the impacts to less than significant. For the Biological Resources category, established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project with mitigations.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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 Resource.** The project site is vacant, with no buildings or features other than a gravel road. Historic Resource Associates conducted a cultural resource study of the project site, which included a review of pertinent records and a field investigation. The study concluded that the project site has no historic archaeological sites, features or artifacts. The project would have no impact.
- b) **Archeological Resource.** In its study, Historic Resource Associates found no prehistoric archeological sites, features or artifacts on the project site. The study states that, while unlikely, it is possible subsurface cultural resource deposits could be uncovered during grading and other construction activities (Historic Resource Associates, 2004, p. 10). Since such activities could damage these resources or alter their value, this is a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURE CUL-1

If any cultural resources are uncovered during grading and construction activities, work in the vicinity of the discovery shall be halted until a qualified cultural resource specialist evaluates the find. If the resource is found to be significant, the cultural resource specialist, in coordination with appropriate agencies, shall provide recommendations on the disposition of the resource that retains its cultural value. Recommendations may include, but are not limited to, excavation of the resource or covering of the resource by pavement. These recommendations shall be implemented by the contractor working at the project site prior to resumption of work in the vicinity of the find.

Implementation/Timing: The above measure shall be incorporated as note on all construction plans subject to verification and prior to approval by Development Services-Planning Division.

With the incorporation of the mitigation measure, subsurface cultural resources uncovered during project grading and construction activities would be protected until their significance is evaluated and recommendations are made as to their disposition. Impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- c) **Paleontological Resource.** No paleontological resources or unique geological features were identified on the project site. The County General Plan EIR states that paleontological resources are unlikely to be encountered in El Dorado County. Paleontological remains are found in sedimentary rock formations, which are virtually nonexistent in the County (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5-13.1). The project would have no impact.
- d) **Human Remains.** There are no known burial sites within the project site. If human remains are unearthed during construction, the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall apply. Under these sections, no further disturbance of the remains shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are identified as Native American, the County Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American, and the descendant may make recommendations for means of treating and disposing of the remains and any grave goods with appropriate dignity. Standard condition of approval would be imposed on the project. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: The project could have potentially significant impacts on subsurface cultural resources that may exist on the project site, although their presence is considered unlikely. The incorporation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce the impacts on such resources to a less-than-significant level. With mitigation, established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the Cultural Resources category.

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

Discussion:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- 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) i) **Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone.** According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, there are no Alquist-Priolo fault zones within El Dorado County. The nearest such faults are located in Alpine and Butte Counties. There would be no impact related to Alquist-Priolo zones.
- ii) **Seismic shaking.** The County General Plan EIR states there are no active faults in El Dorado County. The nearest faults to the project site are the East Bear Mountain Fault and the West Bear Mountain Fault, which are located approximately five miles to the east and west respectively. Both faults are classified as pre-Quaternary faults, types of faults considered inactive (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.9-5 and Exhibit 5.9-2). The potential intensity of seismic events varies across the County, generally increasing from west to east, with the highest potential ground shaking intensity located in the Lake Tahoe Basin (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.9-5). The project site is located within Seismic Risk Zone 3, which is a zone of increased risk for strong seismic shaking. Existing seismic safety regulations within the adopted County building code, which is based on the California Building Code, would ensure that structures and improvements on the site are safe from impacts related to seismic shaking. The impact would be less than significant.
- iii) **Liquefaction.** Seismic-related ground failure includes lateral spreading and seismically-induced landslides and avalanches. Lateral spreading occurs mainly in areas with soft, saturated clay soils and beneath fills. The project site does not contain such soils. Seismically-induced landslides and avalanches occur mainly in areas with high potential for seismic activity. El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.9-2). Liquefaction most likely occurs in areas with water-saturated silts, sands and gravels having low to medium density. No such soils are located on the project site. Therefore, the liquefaction hazard is considered low. The impacts would be less than significant.
- iv) **Landslides.** The project site contains area steep slopes, defined as 30 percent or greater. Each lot would be mass pad graded in accordance with El Dorado County Design Manual (DISM), subject to review and approval of construction plans and permit. Subject to review against applicable building codes, residential building permits would be required prior to construction of each unit. Compliance with these established standards would ensure that areas at risk from landslide are evaluated and appropriate construction and structural designs are used to reduce risks to a less-than-significant level.
- b) **Erosion.** The proposed project can result in substantial soil erosion and loss of topsoil through construction, earthmoving and grading activities. Such activities loosen the soil and expose it to wind and precipitation, which can carry away sediments. Erosion more commonly occurs during the rainy season, from approximately October 15 to May 1.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

The County Department of Transportation and the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District have developed a list of storm water management practices that all construction sites within western El Dorado County are required to implement. These include management of disturbed soil areas by implementing soil stabilization measures (e.g., mulch, hydroseeding, erosion control blanket), sediment barriers and sediment basins. They also include stockpile management measures, requirements to preserve natural features to the extent feasible, and scheduling of construction activities to avoid the rainy season. These storm water management practices would minimize the amount of soil erosion that may occur due to rainy weather.

In addition, compliance with AQMD Rule 223-1, described in the Air Quality section, would reduce the amount of wind erosion. Also, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant would be required to apply for a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit for the disturbance of over one acre of land during construction (see Hydrology and Water Quality section). Overall, erosion impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Geologic Unit.** Project impacts related to lateral spreading, liquefaction and landslides are discussed in a) above. Subsidence occurs primarily in areas with substantial withdrawal of underground liquid and gaseous resources, such as water and natural gas. The project would be connected to the local water delivery system, and would not use water wells. Therefore, it would not withdraw any water from local aquifers. No wells of natural gas or other underground liquid resources are known to exist, so no subsidence would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) **Expansive Soil.** According to the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, prepared by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service (now the Natural Resources Conservation Service), the project site contains Rescue extremely stony sandy loam. This soil type has a low shrink-swell soil potential down to 10 inches below ground surface. However, at depths greater than 10 inches below surface, the shrink-swell potential is moderate, due to the greater presence of clay (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1974). Prior to any site development, permit plans would be reviewed for conformance to applicable grading and building codes. Construction contractors are required to comply with the California Building Code (Title 24) as well as specific design and engineering standards that address seismic related impacts, including liquefaction and expansive soils, and ensure that the project is designed and constructed to meet specific minimum seismic safety and structural design requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e) **Utilities.** The project would be connected to the wastewater system of the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). The project does not involve the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. There would be no impact.

Findings: Compliance with established local standards would ensure that risks related to geologic features would be less than significant. For the Geology and Soils category, established thresholds would not be exceeded.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Places people and buildings within the safety zones of a public or public use airport as delineated by an airport land use plan, or within the approximate approach-departure area of a public airport or private airstrip;
- 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) **Transport and Use of Hazardous Materials.** Construction activities associated with the project may involve the transportation, use, and disposal of construction materials, paints and fuels that may be considered hazardous. The use of these hazardous materials would only occur during construction. Some spillages of paints and fuels may occur, but they would be minor and not pose a significant hazard to workers and adjacent land uses. The project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

proposes residential uses. Residential uses utilize very small amounts of hazardous materials, primarily household and garden products. The proposed land uses are not expected to use or store large quantities of hazardous materials. The impact is less than significant.

- b) **Release of Hazardous Materials.** Hazardous materials may be used during project construction and operations, as discussed in a) above. Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials, including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (CalOHS) requirements for worker safety.

El Dorado County is an area where naturally occurring asbestos may potentially occur. Naturally occurring asbestos is most commonly found in ultramafic rocks (rocks with a high concentration of magnesium and iron) and in serpentinite (commonly called serpentine). Earthwork that disturbs areas containing these rocks may expose people to asbestos through the inhalation of dust containing asbestos fibers. These fibers can cause lung damage; therefore, dust from naturally occurring asbestos is considered a hazardous substance. A California Geological Survey report from 2000 identified sites in western El Dorado County where naturally occurring asbestos is likely to exist. According to the report, the project site is not in an area likely to have naturally occurring asbestos. El Dorado AQMD Rule 223-1 states if naturally occurring asbestos, serpentine or ultramafic rock is discovered after commencement of project, the discovery must be reported to the AQMD no later than the next business day and the project must comply with applicable provisions of AQMD Rule 223-2 and the State of California Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations (California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93105). Among its provisions, Rule 223-2 requires an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan that must contain a description of actual and potential sources of dust emissions and Best Management Practices and other dust control measures, along with monitoring and reporting requirements. In accordance with State requirements, the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan must be submitted to the AQMD within 14 days of the discovery of naturally occurring asbestos, serpentine or ultramafic rock. Compliance with these regulations would limit any dust emissions from naturally occurring asbestos sites, thereby reducing any potential health hazards. The overall impact would be less than significant.

- c) **School Exposure.** The project would not emit any hazardous materials within 0.25 miles of schools. The nearest school, Blue Oak Elementary School, is over one mile away to the south. As noted in a) above, the project when completed is unlikely to release any significant amount of hazardous materials. There is no impact.
- d) **Cortese List.** The project site is not on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, commonly called the “Cortese list.” There are no Cortese list sites in El Dorado County. A check of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s EnviroStor mapping program indicated only one hazardous material site in the County – Promontory Elementary School in El Dorado Hills. The Central Valley RWQCB maintains a list of leaking underground storage tank sites. The most recent quarterly report, from July 2007, indicates no leaking underground tank sites in the vicinity. There is no impact.
- e) **Public Airport.** The nearest public airport (privately owned) is the Cameron Airpark, located less than two miles to the northeast of the project site. In 1986, the Foothill Airport Land Use Commission adopted the Cameron Airpark Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). The CLUP establishes policies related to height restrictions, noise, and compatibility of land uses with airport operations. Compatibility of land uses with airport operations are determined based on the location of the land use within three safety zones: clear, approach/departure, and overflight. Each zone places restrictions on the types of land uses allowed. There are no restrictions placed by the CLUP on land uses outside these three zones. The project site is not located in any of the three safety zones established by the Cameron Airpark CLUP. Therefore, the project would not experience safety hazards associated with Cameron Airpark operations. There would be no impact.
- f) **Private Airstrip.** The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There is no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- g) **Emergency Response Plan.** The project is not expected to interfere or negatively affect any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Plans for the proposed project indicate that it would not block or significantly decrease access on Rancho Tierra Court, which is the most likely evacuation route. Moreover, the project proposes to upgrade the segment of Rancho Tierra Court passing through the project site from a gravel road to a paved road in compliance with County standards. The impact is less than significant.
- h) **Wildlands.** The project is located in an area with a fire hazard classified as “High”, according to Figure HS-1 of the County General Plan. Since land north and east of the project site is vacant, the project could expose people or structures to risk of wildland fires originating on that vacant land. The project site must comply with fire safety requirements of the Cameron Park Fire Department, and with the County-adopted Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code. In a comment letter from EID, the Cameron Park Fire Department determined the required fire flow for the project to be 1,000 gallons per minute for two-hour duration while maintaining residual pressure of 20 pounds per square inch. A water line extension from an existing EID 8-inch water line beneath Rancho Tierra Court would provide the required fire flow. The project proposes connection to the EID water system. The impacts would be less than significant.

Findings: The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials. The project site is located in an area where risk of wildland fires is high. Compliance with Cameron Park Fire Department and County regulations would reduce this impact to less than significant. For this Hazards and Hazardous Materials category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed 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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA);
 - 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 proposes residential development, which would not directly discharge any wastewater or other effluent into streams. Wastewater generated by future land uses would be collected by EID’s wastewater system and treated at the Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant, located south of Highway 50. The treatment plant had been operating under Cease and Desist Order No. R5-2002-0210 issued by the Central Valley RWQCB, due to noncompliance with treated discharge standards for pH, turbidity and temperature. On January 25, 2007, the Central Valley RWQCB rescinded the Cease and Desist Order by adopting Resolution No. R5-2007-0008. Wastewater from the project site would be treated and discharged in accordance with RWQCB waste discharge requirements. The impact is less than significant.
- b) **Groundwater.** The project would not draw any groundwater from the site, as it proposes to connect to EID’s water supply system and not use wells. Site grading, paving, and construction of buildings would reduce the area available for groundwater recharge, as structures and soil compactions may make the ground less permeable to water. However, the proposed undeveloped area would be relatively large, and would allow precipitation to percolate into the ground, thereby allowing recharge of aquifers beneath the site. Since the project would not withdraw any groundwater directly, and since EID uses surface water, the reduced recharge area would not lead to a net deficit in aquifer volumes or a lowering of the groundwater table. The impact is less than significant.
- c) **Drainage Pattern.** The project would have an impact on normal drainage patterns, through site grading and the creation of additional impervious surfaces. Substantial erosion or siltation can occur without use of appropriate revegetation and erosion control measures. As discussed in the Geology and Soils section, the County Department of Transportation and the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District have developed a list of storm water management practices applicable to all construction sites within western El Dorado County. These practices include management of disturbed soil areas by implementing soil stabilization measures, which would reduce potential soil erosion.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

In addition, prior to construction of a project one acre or greater in size, the RWQCB requires a project applicant to file for a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit. The General Construction Permit process requires the project applicant to 1) notify the State, 2) prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and 3) to monitor the effectiveness of the plan. The SWPPP identifies pollutants generated by construction activities, including sediment, earthen material, chemicals, and building materials. It also describes the Best Management Practices that would be employed to reduce or eliminate contamination of surface waters by the identified pollutants. The State Water Resources Control Board, which oversees the RWQCB, currently is in the process of reissuing the statewide General Construction Permit with some modifications. The modifications would more appropriately allocate responsibilities and requirements to projects based on their relative risk to water quality, obtain better measures of performance from projects, and establish a standard that address impacts related to hydromodification (alteration of stream channel due to changes in sediment load). Since project construction would likely disturb at least one acre, the project would be required to obtain the NPDES General Construction Permit and comply with its conditions. The impact would be less than significant.

d) **Flooding.** The project would generate an increase in surface runoff, through site grading and the creation of impervious surfaces. According to the DISM, drainage facilities for areas less than 100 acres shall be designed for an average recurrence interval of a 10-year flood (El Dorado County, 1986, p. 29). The 10-year flood would occur on average once every 10 years. A preliminary drainage report, prepared by Gene E. Thorne and Associates, indicates that proposed drainage pipes would accommodate runoff from a 10-year storm event, and runoff in catchments from a 100-year storm event. Storm water would exit the site in well-defined natural swales and existing roadside ditches. The impacts are less than significant.

e) **Runoff- Water.** As noted in d) above, the proposed project would generate an increase in surface runoff, which would enter existing stormwater drainage facilities. Compliance with the provisions of the County’s Design and Improvement Standards Manual, along with construction of drainage facilities in accordance with the parameters of the preliminary drainage report, would ensure existing drainage facilities can accommodate the additional runoff.

Runoff from residential development typically contains pesticides, oil, grease, heavy metals, motor vehicle fluids, other organics, and nutrients. Because these pollutants accumulate during the dry summer months, the first major autumn storm can flush a highly concentrated load to receiving waters and catch basins. However, after the “first flush,” contaminant concentrations in runoff would be greatly reduced. Impacts would be less than significant. Also, in 2004, the County adopted the *Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County*. The *Storm Water Management Plan* contains a chapter on Post Construction Runoff Control, which contains provisions designed to reduce the water quality impacts of runoff after completion of construction work. Compliance with these provisions would reduce potential water quality impacts of runoff to a level that is less than significant.

f) **Water Quality.** All impacts to water quality are discussed within the sections above, as well as the Geology and Soils section contained earlier in this Initial Study. No additional impacts have been identified. There would be no impact.

g) **FIRM/FEMA.** FEMA prepared Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel No. 0600400725C, revised December 4, 1986. This map covers the project site, and indicates areas that part of the 100-year floodplain. The 100-year floodplain is the area anticipated to be flooded in the event of a storm that occurs on average once every 100 years, and is the basis for flood planning. According to the FEMA map, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. There would be no impact.

h) **100-Year Flood.** As discussed in g) above, the project is not located within a 100-year flood zone. There would be no impact.

i) **Dam/Levee Failure.** As discussed in g) above, the project is not located within a 100-year flood zone. The project site is not within any dam failure inundation zone, as indicated in Appendix A of the County General Plan. The project site is not within an area protected by a levee. There would be no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- j) **Tsunami/Seiche.** The project is not in any area at risk for seiche or tsunami because it is not next to or near any body of water. The project is not located in an area prone to inundation by mudflows. There would be no impact.

Findings: No significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. Implementation of County regulations and standards, along with compliance with RWQCB permit conditions, would limit potential impacts related to erosion and drainage to levels that are less than significant. For the Hydrology and Water Quality section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance 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:

- Physically divide an established residential community;
 - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community, or with conservation plans of federal or state agencies.
- a) **Established Community.** The proposed project is located on infill vacant land. Land to the north and east is also vacant, and land the south has one single family residence. Therefore, it would not physically divide an established residential community in Cameron Park. There would be no impact.
- b) **Local Plans.** The project would be consistent with the existing General Plan designation on the site, which is High Density Residential. There is no General Plan Important Biological Overlay (IBC) zone covering the site, nor are there any additional designations which require treatment for known environmental impacts. The project must comply with all existing General Plan policies and County regulations adopted for the purposes of mitigating an environmental impact. The project would have a less than significant impact.
- c) **HCP.** As discussed in the Biological Resources section, there is currently no adopted HCP or NCCP that covers El Dorado County. There would be no impact.

Findings: The project would not have significant impacts related land use and planning issues. For the Land Use Planning section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance with mitigation.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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-2a or -2b, or
 - Result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- a) **Known Mineral Resource.** There are no known mineral resources of value on the project site, according to Figure CO-1 of the County General Plan. Figure CO-1 is based on mineral land classification reports prepared by the California Geological Survey. These reports designate Mineral Resource Zones that identify the location of significant mineral resources. There would be no impact.
- b) **Locally Important Mineral Resource.** The County General Plan has not designated any mineral resource areas other than the Mineral Resource Zones designated by the state. There are no designated mineral resource recovery sites of local importance. There would be no impact.

Findings: No impacts to any known mineral resources would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. In the Mineral Resources section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			

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 60 decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (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 5 dBA, 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) **Local Noise Standards.** The most significant source of noise in the vicinity of the project site is susceptible to would be traffic noise from nearby roadways, including Cambridge Road, Bass Lake Road and Woodleigh Lane (Ambient Air Quality, 2005b, p. 3). Table 6-1 of the General Plan sets forth maximum allowable noise exposure levels for transportation noise sources. The maximum allowable noise level in outdoor activity areas of residential uses is 60 decibels (dB), and is 45 dB for interior spaces. Table 6-2 of the General Plan sets forth maximum allowable noise exposure levels for noise-sensitive land uses affected by non-transportation noise sources. For Community areas, the hourly noise level shall be 55 db in the daytime (7 a.m.-7 p.m.), 50 dB in the evening (7 p.m.-10 p.m.), and 45 dB at night (10 p.m.-7 a.m.). The maximum allowable levels are 70 dB, 60 dB and 55 dB, respectively.

Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting prepared a noise impact analysis for the project. The Ambient study indicated the proposed residences as potential noise sources. Noise typically associated with residential development includes intermittent and short-term noise associated with amplified music, adult and child voices, lawn maintenance equipment, and air conditioning units. Maximum noise levels generated by the proposed residential development would not be anticipated to exceed the 70 dB level at nearby uses. Given the character of these residential noises, the proposed development is not anticipated to exceed the County’s noise standards for non-transportation sources, nor result in an increase of ambient noise levels greater than 5 dB at nearby residences (Ambient Air Quality, 2005b, p. 6).

The Ambient study predicted noise levels associated with increased traffic by using data from the traffic impact study conducted for the project and the Federal Highway Administration Highway Noise Prediction Model. Information from the model was used to predict the location of the 60-dB noise contour for area roadways. Based on the predicted 60-dB noise contour, noise levels at nearby existing and proposed residential units would not exceed the County’s exterior noise standard of 60 dB (Ambient Air Quality, 2005b, pp. 6-7). Impacts related to noise exposure would be less than significant.

b) **Groundborne Vibration.** According to the Ambient study, while there are no state or local standards pertaining to groundborne vibration, most agencies typically suggest an architectural damage risk level of 0.2 inches per second for continuous vibration. This is one-tenth of the maximum safe level for single events, such as blasting. Project construction would not involve the use of major equipment that would generate high levels of ground vibration, such as pile drivers. Construction equipment typically required for residential construction do not usually exceed 0.2 inches per second. Operational activities associated with the proposed development would not involve the use of any equipment that would generate groundborne vibrations of sufficient duration to result in impacts on nearby structures (Ambient Air Quality, 2005b, p. 7). The impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- c) **Permanent Ambient Noise.** The project would result in some increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, due mainly to vehicle traffic generated by the proposed residential development. However, according to calculations made in the Ambient study, the proposed project would result in increased traffic noise levels of less than 0.2 dB along the most affected nearby roadways. Therefore, the increase would be minor and would not meet the standard for a substantial increase in noise (+5 dB). The Ambient study also evaluated the potential ambient noise level increase that would be generated by the residential development. It concluded that the development would not substantially increase ambient noise levels, due to the intermittent character of noise from residences and the distances to nearby residences (Ambient Air Quality, 2005b, p. 6). Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d) **Temporary Ambient Noise.** The project may generate temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity during construction periods. This noise increase would be temporary and would cease after completion of construction. However, the Ambient study estimated that outdoor receptors within 300 feet of construction sites could experience maximum instantaneous noise levels of greater than 75 dB when on-site construction-related noise levels exceed 91 dB at the project site boundary (Ambient Air Quality, 2005b, p. 6). The 75-dB noise level would exceed County exterior noise standards for non-transportation sources. The Ambient study concluded construction noise is a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURE NOI-1

Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on weekends and federally recognized holidays.

Implementation/Timing: The above measure shall be incorporated as a note on all construction plans subject to verification and prior to approval by Development Services-Planning Division.

MITIGATION MEASURE NOI-2

Motorized construction equipment shall be equipped with intake/exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. Noise-generating equipment, including portable power generators and air compressors, shall be located at the farthest distance possible from the nearest occupied residence.

Implementation/Timing: The above measure shall be incorporated as note on all construction plans subject to verification and prior to approval by Development Services-Planning Division.

Implementation of the first mitigation measure would result in no construction noise during hours when residents are more likely to be disturbed by noise, particularly nighttime hours. The second mitigation measure would reduce the amount of noise that would reach nearby residences. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

- e) **Airport Noise.** The project is within two miles of the Cameron Airpark. Figure 6 of the Cameron Airpark Airport CLUP (see Hazards and Hazardous Materials section) shows the 55 dB CNEL, 60 dB CNEL and 65 dB CNEL noise contours around Cameron Airpark. General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 states all projects within the 55 dB CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies of the applicable CLUP. The project site is outside the 55 dB CNEL area, as delineated in the Cameron Airpark CLUP. Therefore, based on General Plan policy, people working on the project site would not be exposed to excessive noise levels generated by Cameron Airpark operations. There would be no impact.
- f) **Private Airstrip Noise.** As noted in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section, the project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip, and therefore would not be exposed to noise from airstrip operations. There would no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Findings: The project would have no significant impacts related to noise, other than potential exposure of nearby residences to noise from project construction. **Mitigation Measures NOI-1** and **NOI-2** would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. For the Noise category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would occur from the proposed development, with mitigation.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a) **Population Growth.** The project would directly induce population growth in the area directly by providing seven units of residential housing. Based on the 2007 California Department of Finance estimate of 2,593 persons per household, the estimated population the project would attract would be approximately 19. This estimated Population growth would not be significant. The project is consistent with the land use designation under the County General Plan, which anticipates population growth in the County based on these designations. Therefore, anticipated population growth would not be altered by this project.

The project would utilize existing wastewater infrastructure, and would require the extension of an existing water line beneath Rancho Tierra Court. The water line extension could make the vacant land north of the project site more attractive for residential development. Such development also would be consistent with the County General Plan. Impacts related to population growth would be less than significant.

b) **Displacement of Housing.** The project site is vacant; therefore, the project would not displace any existing housing. There would be no impact.

c) **Displacement of People.** As discussed in b) above, the project site is vacant, with no residences. Therefore, the project would not displace any people. There would be no impact.

Findings: The project would not displace any housing or people. The project would directly, and may indirectly, induce population growth. However, this population growth would be consistent with the County General Plan and its land use designations. For the Population and Housing section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

Discussion:

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

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

a) **Fire Protection.** The project site would be served by the Cameron Park Fire Department, part of the Cameron Park Community Service District (CSD). The Cameron Park CSD has a cooperative agreement with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection for fire prevention and suppression and emergency medical services for the community of Cameron Park. The Fire Department maintains a fire station at Alhambra Drive, over one mile northeast of the project site. The proposed project is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for fire services. The property has been designated for residential uses, and the project is consistent with the General Plan and the analysis of impacts to fire services contained in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR indicated that Fire Department would likely need to expand an existing facility to accommodate demand generated by additional population growth. Mitigation set forth in the General Plan EIR includes review of projects for land use compatibility and siting and design considerations. Since the project is not expected to induce significant population growth, it is not expected an expanded Fire Department facility would be required. Impacts to fire services would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- b) **Police Protection.** Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department. Because of the size and scope of the proposed project, it is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for police services. The property has been designated for residential uses, and the project is consistent with the General Plan and the analysis of impacts to police services contained in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR set forth mitigation that would limit the range of appropriate land uses on with law enforcement facilities could be developed, and would subject proposed facilities to review of land use compatibility and siting and design considerations. These mitigation measures would reduce potential environmental impacts of any future Sheriff’s Department facilities. Since the project is not expected to induce significant population growth, it is not expected new or expanded Sheriff’s Department facilities would be required. The impact would be less than significant.
- c) **Schools.** School services in the Cameron Park area are provided by the Buckeye Union Elementary School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. As discussed in the Population and Housing section, the project may add approximately 19 new residents. Given the anticipated population growth, the project is not expected to generate a substantial number of new students for the affected school districts. Future residential development would be required to pay impact fees for new facilities adopted by both districts, which would mitigate any potential impacts of the project, prior to issuance of building permits. The impact would be less than significant.
- d) **Parks.** Parks services would be provided by the Cameron Park CSD. As discussed in the Population and Housing section, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly. The project would be conditioned to remit corresponding amount of in-lieu fees for the necessary dedication of land for park purposes as required under Section 17.12.090 of the El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinance. Nevertheless, the project is not expected to substantially increase park demand, thereby requiring new or expanded parks. The impact would be less than significant.
- e) **Other government services.** There are no other governmental services anticipated to be adversely impacted by the proposed project. As previously noted, the project is not expected to induce substantial population growth, which would stimulate demand for public services that could be met with new or expanded facilities. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: The proposed project would not result in any substantial increase in demand for public services, due to the lack of substantial population growth the project would induce. Therefore, no new or expanded public service facilities would be required. 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 Recreation would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- a) **Existing Parks.** As noted in the Public Services section, the project is not expected to increase demand for park and recreation services, since it is not expected to induce substantial population growth. The impact would be less than significant.
- b) **New Recreational Facilities.** The project does not include recreational facilities. As noted in a) above, the project would not generate an increase demand for park or recreation services. Therefore, the project would not require construction or expansion of additional facilities. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: No significant impacts related to parks or recreational facilities would result from the project. For this Recreation section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			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 Transportation/Traffic would occur if the implementation of the project would:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- a) **Level of Service.** As required by County policy, a traffic study was prepared to analyze the potential traffic impacts resulting from the project. The *Traffic Impact Assessment*, prepared by kd Anderson Transportation Engineers, analyzed the impacts of the project on the local road system. According to the traffic assessment, the project is expected to generate 67 total daily trips, with 5 morning (AM) peak hour and 7 evening (PM) peak hour trips (kdAnderson Transportation Engineers, 2005, p. 2).

The level of service (LOS) is a qualitative measure used to describe operating conditions of roadways and intersections. LOS utilizes a scale from A to F, with A being the best operation condition and F the worst. As a result of Measure Y, approved by County voters in 1998, the following policies have been incorporated in the County General Plan:

- Policy TC-Xa (1) – Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange, or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.
- Policy TC-Xd – Level of Service 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 or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions...
- Policy TC-Xe – For the purposes of this Transportation and Circulation Element, “worsen” is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:
 - A. A 2 percent increase in traffic during the AM peak hour, PM peak hour, or daily, or
 - B. The addition of 100 or more daily trips, or
 - C. The addition of 10 or more trips during the AM peak hour or the PM peak hour (El Dorado County, 2004, pp. 68-71).

The roads most likely to be affected by traffic generated by the project are Woodleigh Lane, Bass Lake Road and Cambridge Road. Woodleigh Lane is a local road, while the other two roads are two-lane roadways providing access to U.S. Highway 50. **Table 1** below provides traffic counts on the affected roadways.

**TABLE 1
EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES**

Location	AM	PM	Daily
Cambridge Rd at Oxford Rd	313	402	4,576
Bass Lake Rd south of Green Valley Rd	562	404	4,617
Woodleigh Lane south of Rancho Tierra Ct	71	85	944
Woodleigh Lane north of Rancho Tierra Ct	165	184	2,134

Source: *Draft Traffic Assessment for Kamm Park Subdivision*, kdAnderson Transportation Engineers, 2005.

Based on the above traffic counts and the estimated project trips, the project would not substantially increase traffic volumes on Bass Lake Road or Cambridge Road. Project traffic would increase traffic on Woodleigh Lane by approximately 2 percent (kdAnderson Transportation Engineers, 2005, p. 3). However, as discussed in b) below, the road would not experience worsening operating conditions. Standard Department of Transportation conditions would be applied including payment of traffic impact mitigation (TIM) fees. The impacts would be less than significant.

- b) **County Congestion Management Agency.** The County does not have a designated congestion management agency. The traffic assessment for the project analyzed the impacts of project traffic on the LOS of affected local

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

roads. Existing LOS on Woodleigh Lane was determined to be B, while LOS on both Bass Lake Road and Cambridge Road was determined to be C. The traffic assessment concluded the LOS on all three roadways would not change as a result of the project (kdAnderson Transportation Engineers, 2005, p. 3). The impact would be less than significant.

- c) **Air Traffic.** As previously noted, the project is located less than two miles southwest of Cameron Airpark. The project site is not within the approach/departure landing pattern of the airport, which has a northwest-southeast orientation. Therefore, the project would present no obstructions or otherwise interfere with air traffic. The project would not generate a significant increase in air traffic at Cameron Airpark, as it would not substantially add to the local population and hence the local market for air transportation. The impact would be less than significant.
- d) **Traffic Hazards/Designs.** The project would present no traffic safety hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. The project proposes to improve the segment of Rancho Tierra Court within the project site from its existing gravel to a 36-foot wide paved road, in accordance with County standards. This would increase safety for motorists traveling to and from the project site. Traffic generated by the project would be residential in character, which would be similar to the character of traffic on roads in the vicinity. The impacts would be less than significant.
- e) **Emergency Access.** Proposed improvements to Rancho Tierra Court would provide access to all proposed lots and circulation in the immediate area. As noted in d) above, Rancho Tierra Court would be improved to a paved road on and off the project site and v adequate emergency access. The impact would be less than significant.
- f) **Parking Capacity.** The residential development would be required to meet the County’s off-street parking requirements, as set forth in Chapter 17.18 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. Single family residences are required to provide two off-street parking spaces. Development Services Department-Planning Division would review subsequent plans to ensure parking requirements are met at the time of residential building permit review. The impact is less than significant.
- g) **Alternative Transportation.** The project is located in an area with relatively little density in development. Rancho Tierra Road is not a (though planned) through road, and currently is a gravel road. Therefore, the area is not conducive to alternative modes of transportation. The project applicant has requested a design waiver to the requirement of sidewalk installation. While the waiver would result in no pedestrian facility, the proposed roadway improvement would provide 5 feet of shoulder on each side. This would provide pedestrians with a place to walk off the road itself. In addition, the project applicant proposes a paved road, which would encourage bicycle traffic. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: Environmental impacts of the project related to transportation would be less than significant level. Motor vehicle traffic generated by the project is anticipated to be accommodated by existing traffic facilities. Other transportation-related impacts are considered to be less than significant. For the Transportation/Traffic category, the identified 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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

Discussion:

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

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

a) **Wastewater Treatment.** Wastewater treatment would be provided for the site by EID. The Regional Water Quality Control Board sets treatment requirements for the collection, processing, and disposal of waste, with which EID must comply. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, the RWQCB has recently rescinded a Cease and Desist Order for the Deer Creek WWTP after determining the plant is in compliance with discharge requirements. The project would not lead to the WWTP exceeding treatment requirements. The impacts would be less than significant.

b) **New Water/Wastewater Facilities.** As previously noted, wastewater service would be provided by EID, through its Deer Creek WWTP. The WWTP has a treatment capacity of 3.6 million gallons per day (mgd) average dry weather flow. A Cease and Desist Order had limited treatment capacity to 2.5 mgd, but that order was rescinded by RWQCB in January 2007. Under existing conditions at the time the General Plan EIR was prepared (2003), the Deer Creek WWTP treated approximately 2.4 mgd (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.5-75). The WWTP has adequate capacity to accept wastewater from the proposed project. The project is commercial/retail in character. Such land uses tend to generate less wastewater than uses such as residential and industrial. In a comment letter, EID noted a

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

6-inch sewer line exists in Rancho Tierra Court which has adequate capacity at this time. Therefore, no new sewer lines need to be constructed, other than connecting lines from the buildings to the existing sewer line.

EID also would provide water supply service to the project site. According to a comment letter from EID, an 8-inch water line exists beneath Rancho Tierra Court. Since these water lines currently do not extend to the project site, additional pipe would need to be installed. It is expected that the extended water line would be installed beneath Rancho Tierra Court, as is the existing line. Therefore, installation of the extended line would have no significant environmental effects. Water and wastewater facility impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **New Drainage Facilities.** The proposed project would not require construction of new or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities, of which could cause significant environmental effects. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, the project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County’s Design and Improvement Standards Manual related to storm drainage. Compliance with these provisions would ensure existing drainage facilities can accommodate the additional runoff. In addition, the preliminary drainage report for the project indicated the project site would have adequate storm water facilities. No additional offsite facilities are required to serve the project. The impacts are less than significant.
- d) **Water Supply.** As discussed in b) above, EID would provide water service to the proposed project. As of the date of General Plan EIR preparation (May 2003), existing water demand for EID was estimated to range from 37,095 to 37,806 acre-feet per year. EID had a system firm yield of 43,280 acre-feet per year. “Firm yield” was defined as the amount of water available for EID to use from a source in 95 out of 100 years with existing facilities, while incurring shortages of no more than 20 percent annually in 5 out of 100 years (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.5-75). In addition, a comment letter from EID noted the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region, of which the project site is a part, had 2,434 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of water supply available as of January 1, 2005. The project would require 7 EDUs of water supply. The proposed project is not expected to need new or expanded entitlements, as EID is able to serve the project from existing resources. A Master Facility Plan Report (FPR) would be required by EID as part of the Improvement Plans review for the implementation of the project. The impacts are less than significant.
- e) **Wastewater System Capacity.** As noted in b) above, the Deer Creek WWTP has adequate capacity to accommodate the wastewater generated by the proposed project. The impacts would be less than significant.
- f) **Landfill.** El Dorado County currently disposes its solid waste at the Lockwood Landfill in Nevada. As of 2003, the Lockwood Landfill has a total permitted capacity of 43 million tons over a 550-acre site. The remaining capacity at the landfill was approximately 33.8 million tons. The Lockwood Landfill receives approximately 1.4 million tons of solid waste per year, with a daily average of 5,700 tons. The estimated life of the currently permitted landfill is to the year 2025. The operator of the landfill, Waste Management, Inc., expects to apply for a permit for landfill use of an additional 1,000 acres at the Lockwood site, which would extend the life of the landfill by 200 years (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.6-20). This facility would have sufficient capacity to serve the additional solid waste disposal needs of the project. The impacts are less than significant.
- g) **Solid Waste.** County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the project site would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Solid waste collection and disposal within California is subject to the provisions of the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This legislation mandates a 50 percent diversion from the solid waste stream going to landfills by 2000. According to the most recent information available from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (2005), unincorporated El Dorado County currently meets the 50 percent diversion rate. The solid waste collection service provided to the project site includes a recycling program, which would ensure continued compliance with state diversion requirements. The impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Findings: No significant impacts would result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the Utilities and Service Systems section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant 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 would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X

Discussion:

a) **Degradation of Environment.** As discussed in the Biological Resources section, the proposed project would have potential impacts on special-status species and its habitats, as well as raptors and migratory bird species. Implementation of mitigation measures discussed above would reduce its effects to less than significant. Also, two ephemeral channels that may be considered jurisdictional waters may be affected by project development. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** would minimize impacts on these channels. Construction associated with the project potentially could affect unknown cultural resources, as described in the Cultural Resources section. **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce these potential impacts to a level that is less than significant.

b) **Cumulative Impacts.** The project potentially could result in cumulative considerable impacts related to traffic. The County Department of Transportation’s Traffic Impact Study Protocols and Procedures provide guidance in evaluating cumulative traffic impacts. According to the Protocols:

“Each traffic impact study must provide a review of a proposed project’s consistency with the land use designations and zoning densities of the 2004 County General Plan to determine if the project is consistent with such designation(s) as applicable within the proposed project area...If a proposed project is of a magnitude that is clearly within the amount of development which was anticipated in the traffic study conducted for the General Plan, then the General Plan’s traffic analysis will serve as the basis for the cumulative traffic analysis of the project.” (El Dorado County Department of Transportation, 2005, p.3)

The *Draft Traffic Impact and Operational Analysis* for the project states the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the site, which is High Density Residential. The General Plan EIR contains an analysis of impacts of General Plan implementation on traffic, and identified mitigation measures for significant impacts. Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) is the one mitigation measure applicable to this project. Under this mitigation measure, the County shall monitor peak-hour traffic volumes and LOS beyond 2025 and, if necessary, shall implement growth control mechanisms in any part of the County where the LOS thresholds defined in General Plan policies cannot be maintained. These growth control measures may include, but are not limited to, acquisition of development rights, incentives or disincentives not to travel during peak hours on affected roadways, and changes in

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

allowed development intensities. Given the likely impacts of the proposed project on LOS in the vicinity, as described in the Transportation/Traffic section, it is unlikely the project would lead to the implementation of this mitigation measure. However, if future development in the project vicinity warrants such a measure, it would likely reduce potential LOS impacts on roads in the area to a level that is less than significant. In addition, all residential projects in the County are required to pay traffic impact mitigation fees, the purpose of which is to provide funding for necessary projects to maintain required levels of services. Payment of traffic impact mitigation fees would further reduce any cumulative impacts of the project on traffic.

Changes in traffic conditions typically lead to changes in noise. An increase in traffic volume typically increase noise levels along affected roadways. As discussed in the Noise section, the project would not contribute to a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the area. Also, as noted in the Transportation/Traffic section, the project would contribute relatively little traffic. Therefore, it would have no cumulatively considerable impact on traffic noise levels in the area.

The Air Quality section discusses the potential cumulative effects of the project on air quality. One issue related to cumulative air quality impacts is greenhouse gas emissions and their effects on climate change. Climate change has become an issue of concern in California, as expressed through State legislation such as AB 32 and through Executive Order S-3-05, which sets greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. The primary source of greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed project would be motor vehicle traffic. No air district in California, including the El Dorado County AQMD, has identified a significance threshold for greenhouse gas emissions or a methodology for analyzing air quality impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. The state has identified 1990 emission levels as a goal through adoption of AB 32. To meet this goal, California would need to generate lower levels of greenhouse gas emissions than current levels. However, no standards have yet been adopted quantifying 1990 emission targets.

Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project were estimated using carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions as a proxy for all greenhouse gas emissions. This is consistent with the current reporting protocol of the California Climate Action Registry. Although CO₂ is not the only greenhouse gas, it is the most commonly produced in terms of both number of sources and volume generated, and it is among the easiest to measure. Other greenhouse gases, such as methane and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are not expected to be emitted in any significant amounts by the project. According to information in the traffic study for the project (see Transportation/Traffic section), the project would result in 67 vehicle trips per day. The URBEMIS air quality model, a computer program commonly used to assess air pollutant emissions generated by development projects, assumes home-based work trips ranging from 10.8 miles to 16.8 miles. For a conservative estimate, and taking into consideration the more rural character of the Cameron Park area, a trip rate of 20 miles per trip is assumed. Therefore, the project at buildout would generate an average of 1,340 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per day, or approximately 489,100 VMT annually. Assuming an emissions factor for future CO₂ emissions from vehicles of approximately 366 grams of CO₂ per mile (California Air Resources Board, 2002), approximately 197 tons of CO₂ per year would be generated as a result of project vehicle trips. This CO₂ emissions estimate assumes certain reductions in vehicle emissions due to future vehicle models operating more efficiently, but it does not take into account additional vehicle emission reductions that might take place in response to AB 1493, if mobile source emission reductions are ultimately implemented through this legislation.

CO₂ emissions in California totaled approximately 391 million tons in 2004 (California Energy Commission, 2006a). Total CO₂ emissions from the project, as estimated above, would be approximately 0.00005 percent of this statewide total. Given the relatively small size of the project (18,120 square feet), and the fact that the project would contribute approximately 0.00005 percent of the statewide total of CO₂ emissions, the project's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions is not considered cumulatively considerable.

- c) **Effects on Humans.** The Hazards and Hazardous Materials section evaluated potential hazards that could affect human health, primarily wildfire and hazardous materials, and concluded these hazards would not be significant. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, the project site is not within a 100-year flood zone. The

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Transportation/Traffic section evaluated potential hazards related to traffic and determined that none existed. As discussed in the Air Quality section, the project would not generate emissions that exceed established thresholds of significance for projects. These thresholds are based on ambient air quality standards developed in part to protect human health. Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project would not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The impacts would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

- 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.)
- California Air Resources Board. 2002. Proposed Methodology to Model Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Estimate Fuel Economy. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/downloads/pubs/co2final.pdf>>. Accessed in April 2007.
- California Climate Action Registry. 2006 (June). *California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol: Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Version 2.1. Los Angeles, CA. Available: <http://www.climateregistry.org/docs/PROTOCOLS/GRP%20V2.1.pdf>. Accessed in April 2007.
- El Dorado County General Plan (adopted July 2004)
Volume I - Goals, Objectives, and Policies
Volume II - Background Information
- El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 - County Code)
- El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinance (Title 16 - County Code)
- El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (adopted May 27, 1986, revised May 18, 1990)
- County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170)
- Interim Interpretive Guidelines for El Dorado County General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 (Option A) (adopted November 9, 2006, amended May 10, 2007)
- Cameron Airpark Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan
Foothill Airport Land Use Commission (Adopted June 4, 1986)
- Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service (April 1974)
- Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel No. 0600400725C
Federal Emergency Management Agency (revised December 4, 1986)
- Air Quality Analysis for Kamm Park Subdivision, Cameron Park, CA
Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting (August 31, 2005 – 2005a)
- Noise Analysis for Kamm Park Subdivision, Cameron Park, CA
Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting (August 31, 2005 – 2005b)
- Traffic Impact Analysis for Kamm Park Subdivision
kdAnderson Transportation Engineers (August 5, 2005)
- Arborist Report for Kamm's Park
Philip R. Mosbacher, Gene E. Thorne and Associates, Inc. (June 29, 2007) and Updated Information (June 26, 2009)
- Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for Kamm's Park
Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. (August 22, 2006) and Supplemental Information (June 10, 2009)

Cultural Resources Study for the Proposed Subdivision of APN 116-040-07, El Dorado County, California
Historic Resource Associates (May 2004)

Preliminary Drainage Report for Kamm Park Subdivision
Gene E. Thorne and Associates, Inc. (June 8, 2006)

Letter from Brian L. Cooper, P.E., Senior Engineer, El Dorado Irrigation District to Joyce Tomlinson, Gene E.
Thorne and Associates, Inc. (October 17, 2005)

Letter from Chuck Hughes, M.S., Botanist/Biologist, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. to Kamm
Ghalamkar (May 21, 2007)