



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Z09-0007 Cornell Rezone

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

Contact Person: Jonathan Fong, Planning Services	Phone Number: (530) 621-5355
---	-------------------------------------

Property Owner's Name and Address: Charles and Kyleen Cornell.
5314 Marigold Mine Way. Garden Valley, CA95633

Project Applicant's Name and Address: same

Project Agent's Name and Address: same

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: n/a

Project Location: The property is located On the West side of Greenwood Road, 0.7 miles North of the intersection with Marshall Road in the Garden Valley area.

Assessor's Parcel No: 060-190-41

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

Section: 28 **T:** 12N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Rural Residential (RR)

Description of Project: The proposed Zone Change would Rezone the project parcel from Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) to Select Agricultural (SA-10).

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	RE-5	RR-A-IBC-MR	Residential/ agricultural
North	RE-5	RR/I-A-IBC-MR	Residential
South	RE-5	RR-A-IBC-MR	Residential/Single-family residences
East	RE-10	RR-A-MR	Residential/Single-family residences
West	RE-5/ RE-10	RR-AL-A-IBC-MR	Residential/ Single-family residences

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is located within designated Mineral Resources (MR) and Important Biological Corridor (IBC) General Plan Overlays. The site has been previously developed with a single-family residence and garage. Agricultural improvements include goat pens, barns, and feeding areas. Portions of the site have been disturbed in preparation for additional barns and cheese making facilities. The residential portion of the site is accessed via Marigold Mine Way and the agricultural portions of the site are

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature:  Date: 11/3/2009

Printed Name: Jonathan Fong For: El Dorado County

Signature:  Date: 11-4-09

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. The project would Rezone the project parcel from Estate Residential Five-Acre to Select Agricultural (SA-10) Zone District.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

On the West side of Greenwood Road, 0.7 miles North of the intersection with Marshall Road in the Garden Valley area. The project site is bounded by parcels designated as Rural Residential (RR) by the General Plan and within the Garden Valley Agricultural District. The adjoining parcels to the north and east are smaller parcels with residential development.

Project Characteristics

The project would include a Rezone of the parcel only. No development would occur as part of the project. As discussed in the Land Use Category, the proposed Rezone to SA-10 would allow for an expanded range of agricultural uses to occur on the property by right. The allowed uses would include those enumerated in the Ranch Marketing section of the County Code and the adopted Winery Ordinance.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The residential portion of the project site is accessed via Marigold Mine Way which is a privately maintained road. Marigold Mine Way is a gravel, dead-end road which provides access to five additional parcels to the west of the project site. The parcel also fronts Greenwood Road which is a County Maintained Road. An existing permitted encroachment has been constructed onto Greenwood Road which provides access to a permitted barn which is under construction. Future expanded agricultural uses are anticipated to utilize the encroachment onto Greenwood Road. All parking would be provided on-site. Any Ranch Marketing or Winery activities would be reviewed during the building permit process to ensure adequate parking in accordance with the Off-Street Parking chapter of the County Code.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site is located within the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District (GPUD) boundaries. The GPUD provides water service to the project site. The existing residence is served by an on-site septic system for wastewater services. Any future agricultural uses or expansion of the residence would require either an expansion of the existing septic system or an installation of an additional septic system subject to permitting by the Environmental Health Department.

3. Population

The Rezone would allow for an expanded range of agricultural uses. The proposed SA-10 Zone District would allow similar residence uses by right as the existing RE-5 Zone District. The proposed Rezone would not increase the population in the project area beyond what is currently allowed.

4. Construction Considerations

No construction is proposed with the project.

Project Schedule and Approvals

This Initial Study is being circulated for public and agency review for a 30-day period. Written comments on the Initial Study should be submitted to the project planner indicated in the Summary section, above.

Following the close of the written comment period, the Initial Study would be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and would be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency would also determine whether to approve the project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a. **Scenic Vista.** The project site is located along Greenwood Road in the Garden Valley area. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.⁶ There would be no impact.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is not adjacent or visible from a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site.⁷ There would be no impact.
- c. **Visual Character.** The project site is located within the Garden Valley Agricultural District. Agricultural Districts are designated areas that are suitable for expanded agricultural uses. The proposed Rezone to SA-10 would be consistent with goals of the Agricultural Districts and would not impair the visual character of the area. There would be no impact.
- d. **Light and Glare.** Prior to approval of any development of the site, Planning Services would review the proposed lighting plan to determine any future outdoor lighting sources comply with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the impacts of existing light and glare created by the project would be less than significant.

Finding

No impacts to aesthetics are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Aesthetics” category, the impacts would be less than significant.

⁶ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1.

⁷ California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>).

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

- a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is within the Garden Valley Agricultural District. The proposed Rezone to SA-10 would allow expanded agricultural uses and would not allow conversion of farmland to other uses. The proposed Rezone would preserve the agricultural potential of the site, there would be no impact.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The property is not located within a Williamson Act Contract and the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. There would be no impact.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The proposed Rezone would allow for expanded agricultural uses. Any proposed non-agricultural uses beyond residential development would be inconsistent with the proposed SA-10 zoning. There would be no impact.

Finding

The proposed Rezone to SA-10 would allow for expanded agricultural uses. Any land uses that would be incompatible to agricultural operations would be inconsistent with the SA-10 Zone District. For this “Agriculture” category, there would be no impact.

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

a-c.

Air Quality Plan and Standards. No construction would occur as part of the project. Future development would be required to comply with Air Quality Management District (AQMD) rules during project construction. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a Fugitive Dust Plan would be required. Adherence to District rules during project construction would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

d-e.

Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors. No development would be proposed in conjunction with the project. Future development would be required to comply with District rules during project construction. Compliance with District rules would reduce short term potential impacts to a less than significant level. Potential uses would be required to be consistent with the SA-10 zone district development standards. Adherence to District rules would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the proposed project would not impact air quality. For this “Air Quality” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a. Biological Resources. The project site is located within an Important Biological Corridor (IBC). The County General Plan establishes that lands within an IBC contain unique habitat values. However, lands within Agricultural Districts are exempt from any provisions that would reduce the viability of agricultural operations on-site. Because the site is located within the Garden Valley Agricultural District, any additional restrictions of the IBC would not be applicable to the site. The project site is not located within any Rare Plant Mitigation Areas and is not known to have soil types capable of sustaining the Pine Hill Endemic Plant Species. There would be no impact to biological resources.

b-c Riparian Area. The project site does not contain any riparian areas or perennial waterways that would be subject to Federal or State jurisdiction. Due to the lack of riparian areas onsite, there would be no riparian habitat that would be

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

impacted as a result of development of the site. As required by the General Plan, because the project site is located within the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) all development would require submittal of a General Plan Consistency Checklist which would ensure that applicable General Plan Policies, including riparian policies, are adhered to during development. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d. Migratory Patterns:** The project site is not located within any mapped migratory corridors. The project site is located within the IBC which is designated areas with higher potential for wildlife and other biological resources. The location within the IBC would increase the potential for wildlife to be located in the project area. The proposed Rezone would allow for an expanded range of agricultural uses. These uses would not be significantly different than the currently allowed uses within the RE-5 zone district. The potential for the entire 13-acre parcel to be disturbed is remote. The western portions of the site would likely be undeveloped and would remain for any potential movement of wildlife. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. Local Conservation Policies:** The project site contains native vegetation consisting of primary pine and grasslands with scattered oak canopy. Prior to issuance of any building permit, the applicant would be required to submit a General Plan Consistency Checklist which would require consistency with applicable conservation policies related to oak canopy impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. Habitat Conservation Plans:** El Dorado County currently does not have any HCP's or NCP's that would be affected by the proposed Rezone. There would be no impact.

Finding

For this "Biological" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

In general, significant impacts are those that diminish the integrity, research potential, or other characteristics that make a historical or cultural resource significant or important. A substantial adverse effect on Cultural Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property or historic or cultural significant to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study;
- Affect a landmark of cultural/historical importance;

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

- Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.

a-d. **Cultural Resources:** The Cultural Resources Study prepared for the site determined that no cultural resources or sensitive archeological resources are located on-site. The site has been previously disturbed with the existing residence and agricultural development. The portion of the site that would likely be utilized for future agricultural development has been graded under permit for an inspection exempt barn. The area is currently accessed by an existing driveway via Greenwood Road. All land disturbance has occurred and the likelihood of identifying cultural resources is remote. Any future development would be required to comply with standard conditions of approval including protective measures to be implemented in the event any cultural resources are discovered during project construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

For this “Cultural Resources” category, impacts would be less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
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 offsite 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 ground shaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.⁸ No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.⁹ There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are two known faults within the project vicinity; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is located within the West Bear Mountain Faults Zone. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.¹⁰

Earthquake activity on the closest active could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey.¹¹ While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located be no risk of landslide.¹²

⁸ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003*, p.5.9-29.

⁹ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

¹⁰ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003*, p.5.9-5.

¹¹ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002.* (<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha>)

¹² El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003*, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.

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

There would be no significant impacts that could not be mitigated through proper building design, as enforced through the County building permit process, which requires compliance with the Uniform Building Code, as modified for California seismic conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** No grading would occur as part of the project. Any future development would be required to obtain a grading permit prior to project construction. The proposed grading would be required to adhere to the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. Adhere to the County Grading Ordinance would reduce the potential impacts to less than significant.
- d. **Expansive soils.** No development is proposed as part of the project. All future development would be required to comply with the County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Septic Systems.** The project site is currently served by a private on-site septic system. Any future development would require an additional septic system which would be reviewed and permitted by the Environment Management Department in accordance with adopted standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Geology and Soils” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X

Discussion:

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

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

a-b. **Hazardous Substances.** The proposed Rezone would allow a range of agricultural uses. Typical agricultural uses would not likely include storage of hazardous substances. Any future storage of any hazardous substances would require submittal of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan which would be subject to review and approval by the Department of Environmental Health. There would be no impact.

c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The project would not generate any hazardous emissions. There would be no impact.

d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.¹³ There would be no impact.

e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.

f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There is no private airstrip(s) in the immediate vicinity that is identified on a U.S. Geological Survey Topography Map. There would be no impact.

g. **Emergency Response Plan.** No development is proposed as part of the project. Future development would be subject to review by the Garden Valley Fire Protection District. The District would review the proposal and recommend conditions of approval to comply with Fire Safe Regulations and to reduce potential impacts to any response plan. There would be no impact.

¹³ California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List, accessed September 23, 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004.

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

h. **Fire Hazards.** The project site located in an area classified as having a moderate fire hazard.¹⁴ The Garden Valley Fire Protection District would review future development plans to recommend conditions to reduce the impacts to fire hazards. There would be no impact.

Finding

No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, there would be no impact.

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 -offsite?			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 offsite?			X
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

¹⁴ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.8-4.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & f. **Water Quality Standards.** The project would be served by GDPUD public water and private septic systems. The project would not impact water quality. All drainage from the project site would be done in accordance with the County Drainage, Erosion Control and Sedimentation Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Groundwater.** The site receives water from GDPUD. The proposed Rezone would allow for a range of expanded agricultural uses. Any future development of the site would not substantial increase the local water demand beyond the currently permitted uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Erosion Control Plan.** No development is proposed as part of the project. Prior to approval of any future development, El Dorado County Development Services would require a Grading Plan. The Grading Plan would be required to be in conformance with the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*. Adherence to the standards of the Ordinance would reduce potential erosion impacts to a less than significant level.

d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** No development is proposed as part of the project. Future development would require a drainage, erosion control and plan for the required road improvements and any onsite grading. Adherence to the plan would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

e. **Storm Water Run-off.** Based on the soil types, surface runoff has been characterized as being slow to moderate. Erosion control plans would be required for any future road improvements. Adherence to the erosion plans would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

g, h, & i. **Flooding.** The project is outside of mapped flood plains, impacts would be less than significant.

j. **Seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.** The potential impacts due to a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow are remote. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Hydrology” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a. **Established Community.** The project site is surrounded by Rural Residential (RR) parcels within the Rural Region. The proposed Rezone to Select Agricultural (SA-10) would not divide an established community. There would be no impact.
- b. **Land Use Plan.** The current RE-5 zoning is inconsistent with the current Rural Residential (RR) land use designation. The proposed SA-10 zoning would bring the parcel zoning into conformance with the General Plan. The land use designation includes the IBC General Plan overlay which would require the submittal of a General Plan Consistency checklist prior to approval of any development permits. Adherence to the checklist would ensure that no conflicts with applicable General Plan policies would occur with development of the site.

The project site is located within the Garden Valley Agricultural District and includes the Ag District General Plan overlay. The proposed Rezone to SA-10 would be consistent with the General Plan objectives for the RR land use designation and the Ag District overlay. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), prior to development of the site, the applicant would be required to submit biological studies to identify any natural resources located on the site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

The proposed rezone would be consistent. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property. No significant impacts are expected. For this “Land Use” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

a & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site includes the Mineral Resources (MR) General Plan Land Use Designation. The proposed zone change would allow for expanded agricultural uses and would not impede the potential for mineral extraction or other mining activities to occur on-site. There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this “Mineral Resources” category, impacts would be less than significant.

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose			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 60dBA CNEL;
- Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
- Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.

a-d. **Noise Standards.** The El Dorado County General Plan establishes noise thresholds for short and long term impacts generated by stationary and vehicular sources. The proposed Rezone would allow for expanded agricultural uses including the potential for ranch marketing and winery uses as enumerated in the County Code. No activities would be authorized on-site which would have the potential of exceeding the noise thresholds established by the General Plan. Any use which would potentially exceed the threshold would require approval of a Special Use Permit which would include acoustical analysis to determine if mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce noise levels to established standards. Short term noise impacts would be related to temporary construction activities on-site but would be limited to hours of operation established by the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Finding

Potential short and long term noise sources would be required to comply with established noise standards and policies. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth.** The project site is in an area zoned for residential and agricultural use and is designated as Rural Residential land use under the 2004 General Plan. The proposed project would allow for agricultural and residential land uses which are consistent with both the General Plan and General Plan EIR. No further land division would occur without both a General Plan and Zoning amendment. Utility services are available at the project site. No housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

- a. **Fire Protection.** The Garden Valley Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. Prior to development of the site the District would review the plans to determine the adequacy of fire protection services in the area. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Police Protection.** The proposed Rezone would not likely increase the demand police services in the area. Impacts to police protection services would be less than significant.
- c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** The proposed project is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Service District. The project would allow for commercial development of the site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a-b. **Parks and Recreation.** The proposed project would not increase population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. The proposed Rezone would allow for a expanded agricultural uses to occur on the site by right. The potential range of uses would not increase the demand on parks and recreation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Recreation” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** .

c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.

d. **Hazards.** No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access.** The project site is accessed off of Greenwood Road and Marigold Mine Way. Any proposed expanded agricultural activities are likely to access Greenwood Road which is a County Maintained Road. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the Garden Valley Fire Protection District would review for consistency with applicable Fire Safe Regulations including adequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- f. **Parking.** Prior to development of the site, the applicant would be required to submit site plans demonstrating compliance with the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. There would be no impact.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** Prior to development of the site, the El Dorado Transit Authority would be distributed the project and would determine if additional alternative transportation improvements are necessary. There would be no impact.

Finding

As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?		X	
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		X	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		X	
h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.			X

Discussion:

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;

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

- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate onsite 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 onsite wastewater system; or
- Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.

a. **Wastewater.** The project site is served by an on-site private septic system. All future agricultural activities would be required to construct new septic systems in accordance with Environmental Management Standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

b., d., e. **New Facilities** There would be no impact to existing water or wastewater facilities. The project site is served by public and septic systems. The limited increase in permitted uses based on the proposed Rezone would not increase the local water demand to require the expansion of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities.

c. **Storm Water Drainage.** Any drainage facilities for the project would be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual,*” as determined by the Department of Transportation. Impacts would be less than significant.

f. **Solid Waste Disposal.** In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

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

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

g. **Solid Waste Requirements.** County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting and loading of solid waste and recyclables. Onsite solid waste collection would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space would be available onsite. All containers would be located within the garage area or within fenced enclosure areas. Impacts would be less significant.

h. **Power.** Power and telephone facilities are currently in place and utilized at the project site. No further expansion of power anticipated from project. There would be no impact.

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

Finding

No significant utility and service system impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- a. As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be a less than significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV). The project site is not located within any mapped migratory corridors or contains any riparian features. Due to the project location within the Important Biological Corridor (IBC), all development would be required to comply with applicable General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. There would be less than significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project’s contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant.
- c. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly. The proposed Rezone would be consistent with the objectives of the General Plan and would not substantially increase potential impacts beyond the existing range of permitted uses under the current project zoning.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume II - Response to Comment on DEIR
Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR
Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR
Volume V - Appendices

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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