

Exhibit I

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FILE: Z12-0005

PROJECT NAME: Thomson Rezone

NAME OF APPLICANT: Alex Thomson

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 325-080-16

SECTION: 15 T: 10N R: 10E

LOCATION: South side of Green Valley Road, approximately 300 feet east of the intersection with Vista Lane, in the Placerville Periphery area.

- GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT:** **FROM:** **TO:**
- REZONING:** **FROM:** One-Acre Residential (R1A) **TO:** Planned Agriculture (PA)
- TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP** **SUBDIVISION TO SPLIT** **ACRES INTO** **LOTS**
SUBDIVISION (NAME):
- SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW:**
- OTHER:**

REASONS THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

- NO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS WERE IDENTIFIED DURING THE INITIAL STUDY.**
- MITIGATION HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED WHICH WOULD REDUCE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.**
- OTHER:**

In accordance with the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), State Guidelines, and El Dorado County Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, the County Environmental Agent analyzed the project and determined that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment. Based on this finding, the Planning Department hereby prepares this NEGATIVE DECLARATION. A period of thirty (30) days from the date of filing this negative declaration will be provided to enable public review of the project specifications and this document prior to action on the project by COUNTY OF EL DORADO. A copy of the project specifications is on file at the County of El Dorado Planning Services, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667.

This Negative Declaration was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on *(date).*

Executive Secretary



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

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Project Title: Z12-0005/Thomson

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

Contact Person: Aaron Mount

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owners/ Applicant's Name and Address: Alex Thomson 7000 Green Valley Road

Project Location: South side of Green Valley Road, approximately 300 feet east of the intersection with Vista, in the Placerville Periphery area

Assessor's Parcel Number: 325-080-16 **Acres:** 24.68

Zoning: One-Acre Residential (R1A)

Sections: 15T: 10N R: 10E

General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential (LDR)

Description of Project: The proposed project consists of the following request:
Zone change from One-Acre Residential District (R1A) to Planned Agricultural (PA).

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	R1A	LDR	Residential & Agricultural/Single Family Residence and Agriculture
North	AE/R1A	AL/LDR	Agriculture (grazing)/Single family residence
South	RE-10/R1	MDR	Residential/Single family residences
East	R1A	MDR	Residential/Single family residences
West	RE-10/R1A	LDR	Residential/Single family residences

Briefly describe the environmental setting: The 24.68-acre parcel is at an average elevation of 1,600 feet above sea level. Improvements include a single family residence, two small barns, a former chicken house and machine shop, and a small duplex that once housed seasonal workers and is no longer used for residential purposes. The parcel varies from flat to gently sloping, with oak grassland on the northern portion and a mixture of oak grass land and riparian vegetation in the southern area. The only permanent water on the property is a small artificial pond located downslope of the residence; the southern area contains a dense growth of willows, rushes, and other wetland species that indicate seasonal flooding. The northeastern corner of the property is currently planted in annual crops and the parcel contains greater than 50 percent choice soils.

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

1. El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
2. El Dorado County Agricultural Department

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 and Forestry Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology / Soils
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	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: 8/21/2013

Printed Name: Aaron Mount For: El Dorado County

Signature:  Date: 8/21/13

Printed Name: Peter Maurer 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 rezone project.

Project Description

Request to rezone a 24-acre parcel from One-Family Residential, (R1) to Planned Agriculture (PA). The current zoning is not consistent with General Plan land use designation of Low Density Residential. The rezone would allow existing agricultural activities to expand on the site consistent with the PA zone district and the Ranch Marketing Ordinance.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The 24.68-acre site is located on the South side of Green Valley Road, approximately 300 feet east of the intersection with Vista Lane, in the Placerville Periphery area which is within the El Dorado and Diamond Springs Community Region. The surrounding land uses are existing single family residential development in all directions except for north which is agricultural land within a Williamson Act Contract and is used for grazing.

Project Characteristics

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The northern portion of the project would be accessed from Green Valley Road, a County-maintained roadway. No new development is proposed with this project and no new encroachments or road would be required.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The developed site currently utilizes EID for public water and individual septic systems for waste water disposal. All necessary utilities are on site.

3. Population

The rezone would reduce the density potential of the parcel and therefore would not have a growth inducing potential.

4. Construction Considerations

No improvements are proposed with this 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 will be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency will also determine whether to approve the project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of Mitigation Measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the Mitigation Measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. CEQA Section 15152. Tiering- El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR

This Negative Declaration tiers off of the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 2009072001) in accordance with Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines. The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR is available for review at the El Dorado County Development Services Department located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. All determinations and impacts identified that rely upon the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR analysis and all Mitigation Measures are identified herein. The following impact areas are tiering off the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR:

Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Traffic/ Circulation

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

- a. **Scenic Vista:** The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). There would be no impacts.
- b. **Scenic Resources:** The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>)). There would be no impacts.
- c. **Visual Character:** The project does not propose any improvements other than expanding the agricultural activities. The project parcel would maintain the rural and agricultural uses and structures that exist at this time. This would continue the visual character that has existed at the site for well over 100 years. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Light and Glare:** If approved as proposed, additional lighting may be installed as uses expand on the site. Section 5.3-3 of the *Executive Summary Table* in the General Plan EIR states “the potential significant impacts would be mitigated by including design features, namely directional shielding for street lighting, parking lot lighting, and other significant lighting sources, that could reduce the effects from nighttime lighting.” All lighting would be required to meet the County lighting ordinance and must be shielded to avoid potential glare affecting day or nighttime views for those that live or travel through the area.

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

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

FINDING: It could be found that as proposed, the project would not significantly impact designated scenic highways, scenic viewpoints as well as outside-in views, and lighting impacts not normally anticipated from similar low density residential developments. As a result, there would be less than significant levels of impact.

<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by California Department of forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forrest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>					
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.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest 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. **Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program:** The United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey, El Dorado Area, California, issued April of 1974 shows that the parcel contains at least fifty percent Sierra Sandy Loam soils. This soil type is a choice agricultural soil and considered a unique soil of local importance. The rezone would ensure the continued agricultural use of this soil type. There would be no impact.

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

- b. Williamson Act Contract and Agricultural Zoning:** The project adjoins a Williamson Act parcel to the north. The project would have no effect as this project is a rezone to an agricultural zoning which would allow agricultural uses to expand on the site. There would be no impact.
- c-e. Loss of Forest land or Conversion of Forest land, Conversion of Prime Farmland or Forest Land:** Neither the General Plan nor the Zoning Ordinance designates the site as an important Timberland Preserve Zone nor the soil type and elevation are not those known to support timber production. As discussed above in Section a, there would be no loss or conversion of prime farmland as well. There would be no impact.

FINDING: This project would not negatively impact properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The project would ensure the protection of agricultural uses on the site. For this "Agriculture" category, there would be no impact.

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

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

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a. Air Quality Plan:** El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). Any activities associated to the grading and construction of this project would pose a less than significant impact on air quality because the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) would require that the project implement a Fugitive

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

Dust Mitigation (FDM) plan during any future grading and construction activities. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions below a level of significance. No improvements are proposed therefore there would be no impacts.

- b. **Air Quality Standards:** The project could create air quality impacts which may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction. Any future construction activities associated with the project may include grading and site improvements. Construction related activities would generate PM10 dust emissions that would exceed either the state or federal ambient air quality standards for PM10. This is a temporary but potentially significant effect.

Operational air quality impacts would be minor, and would cause an insignificant contribution to existing or projected air quality violations. Source emissions would be from vehicle trip emissions, natural gas and wood combustion for space and water heating, landscape equipment, and agricultural uses. This is a less-than-significant impact. Air quality impacts by the project would be less than significant.

- c. **Cumulative Impacts:** As the project does not propose any development, an air quality study was not required. Future development of the parcel will include review by the AQMD for potential air quality impacts. In addition, the General Plan DEIR Section 5.11 addresses air quality from transportation sources, specifically those generated by vehicles that travel on roadways in the County, partially from US Highway 50 as a generator. Such source emissions have already been considered with the adopted 2004 General Plan and EIR. Mitigation in the form of General Plan polices have been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels for impacts associated with air quality standards. Cumulative impacts were previously considered and analyzed. With full review with consistency with General Plan Policies as well as the consistency rezone resultant of the subject applications, impacts would be less than significant.

- d. **Sensitive Receptors:** The CEQA Guide identifies sensitive receptors as facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, and people with illnesses, or others that are especially sensitive to the affects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools and convalescent hospitals are examples of sensitive receptors. The project is identified as not being within the asbestos review area. Green Valley Community Church is adjacent to the south and contains a private school. However, by implementing ADMD Rules 223, 223 – 1, a Fugitive Dust Control Plan, as well as implementing typical conditions for the development of the site as it relates to pollutant concentrations based on Environmental Management rules, regulations, and standards, the impacts associated with this category would be less than significant.

- e. **Objectionable Odors.** Table 3-1 of the *El Dorado County APCD CEQA Guide* (February, 2002) does not list the proposed residential use as a use known to create objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: 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 and operation; however existing regulations would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Additional impacts to air quality would be less than significant. The proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts. Standard conditions of approval, as required by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD), would be included in future development of the project site. As such, the proposed rezone to PA would have a less than significant impact in this category.

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. **Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities:** The project parcel was previously developed and no physical expansion is proposed. The soil type is not known to be habitat for Pine Hill endemics and on-site wetlands would not be disturbed. There would be a low potential of impacts on special status species, therefore impacts would be less than significant.

b-c. **Riparian Habitat, Wetlands:** The site supports potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. These areas are likely regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the El Dorado County General Plan. As stated in Policy 7.3.3.4 of the General Plan, El Dorado County requires a 100-foot setback from all perennial streams, rivers, and lakes and a 50-foot setback from all intermittent streams and wetlands (El Dorado County 2004). No development is proposed within or adjacent to the known wetlands and therefore

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

impacts would be less than significant. Any future development would be reviewed to ensure consistency with all applicable requirements.

- d. **Migration Corridors.** Review of the project site determined that the habitat onsite would not be suitable for a migration corridor. The ability of wildlife to move across the site would not be unique to the other developed areas in the project area. Review of the California Department of Fish and Game California Wildlife Habitat Relationship System indicates that there are no mapped critical deer migration corridors on the project site. The project would not appear to substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Local Policies:** El Dorado County Code and General Plan Policies pertaining to the protection of biological resources would include protection of rare plants, setbacks to riparian areas, and mitigation of impacted oak woodlands. The project site is located in Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2 which is defined as lands not know to contain special status plant species, or to contain soil types capable of sustaining the Pine Hill Endemic plant species.

As discussed above, riparian and wetland areas are located on the project site. The El Dorado County General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 requires setbacks from intermittent and ephemeral riparian areas. The areas are located outside of the proposed development areas.

Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes the native oak tree canopy retention and replacement standards. Impacts to oak woodlands have been addressed in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR, available for review online at <http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm> or at El Dorado County Planning Services offices located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667. Mitigation in the form of General Plan policies has been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels. In this instance, adherence to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and measures contained within the Oak Woodlands Management Plan would mitigate impacts to oak woodland to less than significant levels.

No improvements are proposed with this project. Future development may require removal of native oak trees. The applicant would initiate compliance with that Condition during the grading and building permit processes.

- f. **Adopted Plans:** This project, as designed, would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. There would be a less than significant impact in this category.

FINDING: There would be no significant impacts to Biological resources. Any future development would be evaluated to ensure there would be no impacts to known existing resources.

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	

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X

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

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property or historic or cultural significant to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study;
- Affect a landmark of cultural/historical importance;
- Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.

a-c. Historic or Archeological Resources: The submitted cultural resource study, *Thomson Property Rezoning, Sharon A. Waechter*, reported that multiple historic structures exist on the property and that all are in use at this time. No prehistoric sites or artifacts were found within the project area. Standard Conditions of Approval would be implemented if future development is proposed which require protective measures be implemented during project construction in the event of accidental discovery of historic or archeological resources. Adherence with State and Federal laws concerning accidental discovery of cultural resources would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

d. Human Remains: There is a small likelihood of human remain discovery on the project site. During all grading activities, standard Conditions of Approval would be required that address accidental discovery of human remains. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: No significant cultural resources were identified on the project site. Standard Conditions of Approval would be required with requirements for accidental discovery during project construction. This project would have a less than significant impact 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

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
iv) Landslides?			X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

a. Seismic Hazards:

i) 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.

ii) The potential for seismic ground shaking in the project area would be considered less than significant. Any potential impacts due to seismic impacts would be addressed through compliance with the Uniform Building Code. All structures would be built to meet the construction standards of the UBC for the appropriate seismic zone. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii) El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity. The potential areas for liquefaction on the project site would be the wetlands which would be filled as part of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.