



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** COC05-0164

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

**Contact Person:** Aaron Mount, Assistant Planner

**Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Anita Casalina and Tony Eldon 982 Las Pavadas San Rafael, CA 94903

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** Anita Casalina and Tony Eldon 982 Las Pavadas San Rafael, CA 94903

**Project Location:** On the east side of Highway 50, 87 feet southwest of the intersection with Huckleberry Road in the Phillips/Echo Lake area.

**Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 037-140-11

**Zoning:** One-half Acre Residential (R-20,000)

**Section:** 11      **T:** 11N **R:** 17E

**General Plan Designation:** High Density Residential (HDR)

**Description of Project:** Certificate of Compliance for APN 037-140-11, created by court partition and recorded on March 19, 1976.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

|        | <u>Zoning</u> | <u>General Plan</u> | <u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single-family Residences, Grazing, Park, School) |
|--------|---------------|---------------------|---|
| Site:  | R-20,000      | HDR                 | Undeveloped   |
| North: | R3A           | MDR                 | U.S. Highway 50 Corridor/Undeveloped                                    |
| East:  | R-20,000/R2A  | HDR/MDR             | Undeveloped   |
| South: | R2A           | MDR                 | Undeveloped   |
| West:  | R-20,000      | HDR                 | Undeveloped   |

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The subject parcel is at an average elevation of approximately 7,200 feet above mean sea level. Vegetation is predominately the Red Fir alliance with some small shrubs at the northern end of the parcel due to the South Fork of the American River flowing through. The portion of the South Fork of the American River on the subject parcel is a stream due to the proximity to its origin and may be seasonally intermittent. No structures or improvements exist on the subject parcel. Access to the parcel is from Huckleberry Road which is a non-County maintained road with a developed width of 15 to 20 feet.

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

El Dorado County Department of Transportation

**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          | <b>X</b> | 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: March 20, 2006

Printed Name: Aaron Mount For: El Dorado County

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| <b>I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |  |   |
| 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) No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway will be substantially affected by this project. The subject parcel is directly adjacent to U.S. Highway 50, a designated scenic highway; however development of a single family residence in a Rural Center will not have a significant impact on the visual character of the area.
- b) The proposed project will have no impact on existing scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources within a corridor defined as a State scenic highway adjacent to the project site. The subject parcel is directly adjacent to U.S. Highway 50, a designated scenic highway; however development of a single family residence in a Rural Center will not have a significant impact on the visual character of the area.
- c) The proposed project will not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The surrounding area has been developed with mainly summer cabins. The project will not introduce residential development that is out of character with the surrounding existing development.
- d) Some limited light and glare may result from the addition of residential structures on the parcel. These increases are expected to be normal, however, for One-half Acre Residential (R-20,000) Zone District and are not expected to have a significant effect or adversely affect day or nighttime views adjacent to the project site.

**FINDING:** It has been determined that there will be no impacts to aesthetic or visual resources. Identified thresholds of significance for the “Aesthetics” category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

| <b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 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.
- d) Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that no areas of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance will be affected by the project. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use map for the project 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 there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- d) The proposed project will not conflict with existing agricultural zoning in the project vicinity, and will not adversely impact any properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract.
- d) No existing agricultural land will be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

**FINDING:** It has been determined that the project will not result in any impacts to agricultural lands, or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is developed with a mix of residential and agricultural uses. For this “Agriculture” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

| <b>III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| 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 |  |

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

| III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| 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<sub>x</sub>, 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 PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, 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) El Dorado County 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<sub>x</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>). The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan.

b & c)

The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District’s *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* establishes a threshold of 48 dwelling units with fireplaces or woodstoves, which would result in potentially significant ROG and No<sub>x</sub> emissions. Vehicular emissions are based upon a trip rate of 9.53 vehicle trips per day per residence. The request for a Certificate of Compliance will result in one parcel, which may be developed with a single-family residence, would not result in a significant increase in ROG or No<sub>x</sub>. Additionally, the maximum total daily vehicle trips generated would be 9.53 trips per day. Using the thresholds in the *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*, this has been determined to be less than significant.

d) Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, day-care centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. General Plan Policy 6.7.6.1 requires that the County “Ensure that new facilities in which sensitive receptors are located (e.g., schools, child care centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, and hospitals) are sited away from significant sources of air pollution.” It has been determined that the proposed site and use will not substantially impact any sensitive receptors in the area.

e) R-20,000 Zone District does not permit activities that could generate objectionable odors. Those activities, which might result in objectionable odors, dust, or smoke, require the review and approval of a special use permit. This subsequent

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

discretionary permit would require further environmental review addressing the potential impacts resulting from the proposed activity.

**FINDING:** It was determined that a less than significant impact will result from the project because it will not: obstruct implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan; violate any air quality standard; result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

| <b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 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;

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

- 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) Development of the parcel with a single family residence will not 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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Building setbacks of 50 to 100 feet from the South Fork of the American River will be implemented at the building permit stage.

b & c)

The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Map for the project area (Echo Lake, CA Quadrangle, 1995) was reviewed to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project site. This review indicates that there are mapped wetlands and riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project. The South Fork of the American River bisects the northern portion of the subject parcel. Building setbacks of 50 to 100 feet from the South Fork of the American River will be implemented at the building permit stage.

d) Review of the Planning Department GIS *Deer Ranges Map* (January 2002) indicates that there are no mapped deer migration corridors on the project site. The project will not 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.

e) Limited tree removal will result from the development of a single-family residence on the parcel.

d) The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to the draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

**FINDING:** It has been determined that all potential biological resource impacts as a result of the proposed project are less than significant. Therefore, the established thresholds for significance in the “Biological Resources” category will not be exceeded.

| <b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> <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 |   |   |

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

**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 & b)

The applicant supplied a Record Search completed by the North Central Information Center (NCIC). This Record Search indicated a moderate possibility of identifying Native American and historic-period cultural resources in the project area. Therefore, further archival and field study by an archaeologist was recommended by the NCIC. Due to the subject parcel being covered with snow for the history of the project, no field study was possible and no sub-surface testing was completed. As such, there is a potentially unknown significant impact to historic or archaeological resources that might be located on the surface or sub-surface. In order to limit any impact the following mitigation measures are recommended:

**(a/b.1) In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until an archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. If the find is determined to be significant and authenticated, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item. Grading and construction activities may resume after the appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance. The Planning Department shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit.**

- c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil locales.
- d) Earth disturbance and grading on the project site may potentially result in the disturbance of human remains interred outside a formal cemetery. As such, the following mitigation measure is required to reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level:

**(d.1)In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The Planning Department shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit.**

**FINDING:** Although the project has the potential to create significant impacts to surface and sub-surface cultural or historic resources, or disturb human remains located outside of a designated cemetery, the incorporation of the required mitigation measures will reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. Established thresholds of significance will not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
  - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
  - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) As shown in the Division of Mines and Geology’s publication Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, there are no *Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones* mapped in El Dorado County. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any

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

potential impact caused by locating buildings in the project area will be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.

- b) All grading activities shall comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which will reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- c) According to the *Soil Survey of Eldorado National Forest Area*, the property contains the Gerle-Tallac complex, 5 to 30 percent slopes. This soil type is not characterized as an unstable soil on slopes lower than 15 percent. Compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance will reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
- d) The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has mapped soils on the site as Gerle-Tallac complex, 5 to 30 percent slopes. (*Soil Survey of Eldorado National Forest Area, California, 1984*) Review of the *Soil Survey of Eldorado National Forest Area* indicates that the mapped soil types for the proposed project area have a low shrink-well potential. Based upon this review, the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.
- e) Prior to the approval of a building permit, the property owner will be required to comply with all Environmental Management Department requirements for an on-site septic disposal system. Any impacts from the installation of the proposed septic system for the project have been determined to be less than significant.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts will result from geological or seismological anomalies on the project site. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that will result in significant impacts. For the “Geology and Soils” category, established thresholds will not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

| <b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 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 |

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

| <b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>   |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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? |  |  | <b>X</b> |

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
  - Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
  - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a) Any hazardous materials utilized at the project site shall comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*.
  - b) No significant amounts of hazardous materials will be utilized for the project. The project will not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
  - c) As proposed, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
  - d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there will be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.
  - e) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There are less than significant impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations and the over-flight of aircraft in the vicinity of the project.
  - f.) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights in the vicinity of the project site.
  - g) The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County.

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

h) The Lake Valley Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and stated that the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area.

**FINDING:** The proposed project will not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance will not be exceeded by the proposed project.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

- a) No erosion control plan is required for the grading associated with development of a single-family residence.
- b) There is no evidence that the project will substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The proposed well location was approved by El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management.
- c) There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances associated with the project will substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply to this project.
- d & e)  
 Compliance with the standards and requirements contained within the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* will limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site, and limit erosion and siltation to a less than significant level.
- f) The project will not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site.
- g & h)  
 The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0605B, panel not printed) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain.
- i) The subject property in the Phillips/Echo Summit area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters.
- j) The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. Potential for a mudflow is also considered to be less than significant.

**FINDING:** For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and therefore no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

| <b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING.</b> <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:

- a) The project will not result in the physical division of an established community.
- b) The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the 2004 General Plan, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.
- c) The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

**FINDING:** For the “Land Use Planning” section, the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

| <b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> <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) The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan.

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

b) The Western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a & c)

The project will not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. As proposed, the project is not located in an area exposed to existing noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1.

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

- b) Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration because of project construction or upon completion of the project. The subject site is adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 but due to topography and density of vegetation it would be a less than significant effect on any future single family residences built on the site. The required stream setback insures that any residence will be at least 50 feet from the property line adjacent to U.S. Highway 50.
- d) Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the project vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. All storage, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas are required to be located as far as possible from any residential areas.
- e) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards contained within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport.
- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport.

**FINDING:** For the “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will occur from the proposed development.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a) The proposed project has been determined to have no growth-inducing impact as the project does not include any proposal to extend, or expand infrastructure or roads, and does not include any school or large scale employment opportunities that lead to indirect growth.
- b. No substantial numbers of existing housing stock will be displayed by the proposed project.

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

c) No substantial numbers of people will be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**FINDING:** The project will not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project will not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or expanding infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a) **Fire Protection:** The Lake Valley Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Fire Department from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The Lake Valley Fire Protection District will review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards including, but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking lots, fire sprinklers within buildings, building identification and construction phasing. Fire Department fees are collected prior to building permit issuance.

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

- b) **Police Protection:** The project site will be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. No specific minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The development of a single-family residence will not significantly impact the achievement of this goal, or significantly impact the current response times to the project area.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Lake Tahoe Unified School District. Impact to the affected school district from the proposed residential development will be less than significant. School district fees are collected prior to building permit issuance.
- d) **Parks:** The proposed project will not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. Provisions to provide parkland were not included as part of the project design in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of County Code. The conditions that can be applied to this project are those applicable in 1984. Therefore, the current park ordinance is not applicable as it was not effective until 1987.
- e) No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the project.

**FINDING:** Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the development of the subject parcel either directly or indirectly. No significant public service impacts are expected. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| <b>XIV. RECREATION.</b>  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| 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? |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?                        |  |  | <b>X</b> |

**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) The proposed project will not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
  - b) The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing recreation facilities.

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

**FINDING:** No impacts to recreation or open space will result from the project. For this “Recreation” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| <b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 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) Access to the subject parcel is from Huckleberry Road which is a non-County maintained road with a 15 to 20-foot wide graveled surface. Huckleberry Road encroaches onto U.S. Highway 50. Lake Valley Fire Protection District will visit the site to confirm if the current road is to California Fire Safe requirements. The approval of the Certificate of Compliance will allow the construction of a single family residence in an area that is mainly seasonally in use and will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.
- b) The issuance of a certificate of compliance to one parcel and the subsequent development of a single-family residence will not significantly impact the existing level of service of Huckleberry Road and surrounding roadways.

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

- c) The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity.
- d) The proposed project does not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that will substantially increase hazards. No traffic hazards will result from the project design.
- e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access to any of the proposed commercial structures.
- f) The submitted site plan was reviewed to verify compliance with the Zoning Ordinance on-site parking requirements. *Section 17.18.060 of the Zoning Ordinance* lists the parking requirements by use. A single-family residence requires two on-site parking spaces not in tandem. Parking will be reviewed at the time of building permit plan check.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**FINDING:** For the “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
  - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
  - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a) No significant wastewater discharge or surface run-off will result from the development of a single-family on the parcel.
  - b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required because of the project.
  - c) On-site stormwater drainage facilities are required on-site so as to reduce runoff to discharge levels that do not exceed site discharge levels, which existed prior to development of the site. All such drainage facilities shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the *County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*.
  - d) The El Dorado County Environmental Management Department has approved the location of a well to provide a water supply for the subject parcel.
  - e) In this case, septic disposal for the parcel will be provided by an on-site septic disposal system.
  - f) 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. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.
  - g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. For residential development, curbside trash and pick-up of recyclable materials is provided by a local provider contracting to the property owner for the service.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts will result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the “Utilities and Service Systems” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects will result from the project.

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

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

**Discussion:**

- a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the whole record that the project will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project will be less than significant due to existing standards and requirements imposed in the conditioning of the project.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in *Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* as *two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts*. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not result in cumulative impacts.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

### **Project Specific Reports and Supporting Information**

*Record Search Results for #1 Huckleberry Road, Twin Bridges, CA 95735*  
North Central Information Center CSU- Sacramento. November 14, 2005.