



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** P 99-0007 Crowton Parcel Map

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

**Contact Person:** Tom Dougherty, Project Planner

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

**Property Applicant/Owner's Name and Address:**

Robin & Jennifer Crowton, 5809 Johntown Creek Road, Garden Valley, CA 95633 and,  
Richard & Linda Crowton, 5811 Johntown Creek Road, Garden Valley, CA 95633

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:**

Associated Land Consultants, Collette Blomquist, 607 Riley St., Folsom, CA 95630

**Project Location:** East side of Johntown Creek Road 0.35 mile south of the intersection with Hancock Road in the Garden Valley area.

**Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 088-060-02

**Zoning:** Estate Residential Ten-Acre (RE-10)

**Section:** 4      **T:** 11N **R:** 10E

**General Plan Designation:** Low-Density Residential (LDR), Important Biological Resources (IBC\_N)

**Description of Project:** A tentative parcel map creating two parcels ranging in size from 5.05 to 5.11 acres on a 10.21-acre site.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RE-5	LDR	Single-family residence
North:	RE-5	LDR	Single-family residence
East:	RE-10	RR	Single-family residence
South:	RE-5	LDR	Single-family residence
West:	RE-5	LDR	Single-family residence

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 10.21 site is located on the east side of Johntown Creek Road and gently slopes downward in a predominately northwest to south east direction. The most level portions are located in the south west and northeast corners of the existing parcel. Vegetation on the site consists predominantly of annual grassland along with scattered mature and immature blue (Quercus douglasii), and black (Quercus kelloggii) oak trees, and mature and immature ponderosa (Pinus ponderosa) and foothill (Pinus sabiniana) pines, and a few white-leaf manzanita shrubs (Arctostaphylos viscida). Access to the site is from an existing direct encroachment onto Johntown Creek Road in the Garden Valley area of El Dorado County. Johntown Creek Road is not a County maintained road but is maintained by the Garden Valley Ranch Estates Community Service District. The driveways exist to both existing single-family dwellings.

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

El Dorado County Department of Transportation; Environmental Management-Environmental Health Division, El Dorado County Office of the County Surveyor, Garden Valley Fire Protection District.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

**DETERMINATION**

**On the basis of this initial evaluation:**

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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: May 23, 2006

Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner 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, 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.</b> <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 impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- (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>)).
- (c) The creation of these two parcels will not directly change any views from what is currently available.
- (d) The creation of these two parcels will not directly introduce any new lighting as dwellings are existing on both parcels and thus also will have no impact on nighttime views in the area, as it has been determined that no scenic views exist from the site.

**Finding**

No impacts to views and viewsheds are expected with the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding buildings in the direct vicinity. For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<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.
- (a) The two proposed parcels are located on Boomer soils, predominantly Boomer-Sites Loams (BpD) of 15-30 percent slopes, and Boomer-Sites Loams (BpC) of 9 -15 percent slopes which are not classified as either prime farmland, statewide important farmland, or unique, soils of local importance on the Important Farmland Maps prepared by the California Resources Agency using the USDA-NRCS Soil Surveys. El Dorado County has established the Agricultural District(-A) General Plan land use overlay designation 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 District (-A) General Plan land use overlay designation adjacent to the project site. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- (b & c) The creation of the two parcels will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. No existing agricultural land will be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed 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	
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) The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan.
- (b & c) Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (O3). Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM10) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to meet the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

Short-term impacts related to construction activities; and  
Long-term impacts related to the project operation.

Short-term, superficial, minor grading and excavation activities that could be associated with the paving of the short section of the driveway on Parcel 2 would be the only activity caused by the creation of these two parcels and that would only last a few days and intermittently at that.

Mobile emission sources such as automobiles, trucks, buses, and other internal combustion vehicles are responsible for more than 70 percent of the air pollution within the County, and more than one-half of California's air pollution. In addition to pollution generated by mobile emissions sources, additional vehicle emission pollutants are carried into the western slope portion of El Dorado County from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area by prevailing winds. The project parcels are accessed off of Johntown Creek Road. The parcel split, by itself, will not likely increase traffic generated emission sources from what would normally occur along Johntown Creek Road as the owners of both newly created parcel have lived on the parent parcel for many years. The parcel's remote location ensures that most surrounding traffic will be locals using it as an end destination. The project would not require grading so it would not cause criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust or dust from asbestos/serpentine rock so no asbestos dust mitigation plan is required.

- (d) Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, daycare 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 parcel sites are more than one mile from any sensitive receptors in the area, and any impacts from the project will be less than significant.

- (e) The single-family residential uses will continue after the creation of these two parcels as they have previously for years. Residential use does not under normal circumstances, any excessive objectionable odors.

**Finding:**

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the creation of the two parcels would not impact air quality. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>

**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 – c) The creation of these two parcels that have existing dwellings and driveways will not change the existing habitat or support for any of the special-status species of plants and wildlife known in the region. There is an existing pond that is approximately 280 feet from the closest existing dwelling. Further, the parcel does not fall within designated critical habitat or core areas for the Red-legged and Yellow-legged frog species.

(El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7).

- (d) Review of the Department of Fish and Game’s *Migratory Deer Herd Maps* indicate the project site lies within the range of the Yollabolly deer herd. Based on the extent of the surrounding area to support the deer herd’s range habits, and the fact that the creation of the two parcels will not directly change existing dwellings and conditions, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on deer migration patterns.
- (e & f) No trees will be removed as a result of proposed development. The project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted or approved habitat conservation plan.

**Finding**

No impacts from biological resources are expected with the creation of the two parcels either directly or indirectly. For this “Biological” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- (a-d) An Archeological Survey Report was prepared for the proposed project area in June 1999 (Historic Resource Associates). The study consisted of a records review and a field survey conducted by Dana Supernowitz and found the site contains no recorded Native American or historic-period archeological resources. Review of historical literature and maps on file in their office gave no indication of the presence of archeological sites in the immediate project area.

**Finding:**

Based upon the cultural resource survey prepared for the site, it is determined that for this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<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:				
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) There are no known faults which transect the project area or are located on the project site, however, there are faults located regionally. The project site could be expected to undergo moderate to severe ground shaking during large magnitude earthquakes, however, the occurrence of one of these events in this area has been historically rare. The impact from a major seismic event could be considered less than significant.
- (b) All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the County of El Dorado - *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88)*. This ordinance is designed to

limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use, in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During any site grading and any new construction, there is potential for minor erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions. To reduce the potential for erosion and loss of topsoil for any future construction activity, the applicant would be required to comply with the *El Dorado County Grading Ordinance*. The creation of these two parcels does not involve any substantial grading, including paving the section of the driveway as required by Garden Valley Fire.

- (c - d) Based on the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, CA, issued April 1974*, the project soil is classified as Boomer-Sites Loams (BpD) of 15-30 percent slopes, and Boomer-Sites Loams (BpC) of 9 -15 percent slopes. The soil classifications consist of well drained soils. Erosion hazard is slight to moderate, and surface runoff is medium. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. As identified in the Soil Survey of El Dorado County, the subject property has low to moderate shrink-swell potential, hence low expansivity. The impact from expansive soils for any future construction is less than significant.
- (e) The subject site is located on soils of moderate permeability that are considered “moderate” in limiting a septic system on slopes less than 10 percent, as determined by the Soil Survey of El Dorado County. There are presently existing septic systems for both single-family dwellings on the property. County regulations for the proper design and installation of on-site systems have been adopted by the County Board of Supervisors and have been reviewed and accepted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and both systems have been reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Division.

**Finding**

No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly. For this “Geology and Soils” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<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
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized				X

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

**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) The proper use and storage of any hazardous material or substances will limit exposure and the potential for explosion or spills. The creation of these two parcels will not increase any potential that the current residents would use or transport hazardous materials any more than it would before the creation.
- (b) The splitting of the parent parcel will not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- (d) There are no hazardous material sites in the project vicinity that have been identified on the Facility Inventory Data Base: Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5.
- (e & f) The project parcel is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or private airport.
- (g) The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the project area.
- (h) The project site is in an area of moderate hazard for wildland fire pursuant to Figure V.4-2 of the 1996 General Plan Draft EIR and Figure 5.8-4 of the 2004 General Plan Draft EIR. Compliance with the conditions required by the Garden Valley Fire Protection District as well as California Building Codes will reduce the impact of wildland fire on the commercial development to less than significant.

**Finding**

No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly. For this "Hazards" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<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:

- 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 & f) Human activities such as agriculture, animal husbandry, municipal, industrial, recreational, and mining uses can result in runoff that could contribute to water quality problems in surface water bodies. Water quality standards for development of the project site are governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) through the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Any construction project

affecting one acre or more of disturbed soil is required to comply with the SWRCB General Permit conditions for storm-water runoff from construction activities and is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program (NPDES) permit. A NPDES permit will not be required for this project because no grading will occur because of the creation of the parcels. There is no evidence indicating that the parcel creations or activities associated with that will violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the RWQCB.

- (b) El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. The geology of the Western Slope portion of El Dorado County is principally hard crystalline, igneous or metamorphic rock overlain with a thin mantle of sediment or soil. Groundwater in this region is found in fractures, joints, cracks, and fault zones within the bedrock mass. These discrete fracture areas are typically vertical in orientation rather than horizontal as in sedimentary or alluvial aquifers. Recharge is predominantly through rainfall infiltrating into the fractures. Movement of this groundwater is very limited due to the lack of porosity in the bedrock. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are identified in El Dorado County.
- (c – e) Compliance with the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance’s* Best Management Practices for any future grading would reduce any potential construction erosion and operational runoff to less than significant.
- (g – i) The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel No. 060040-0475B, dated October 18, 1983, establishes that the project site is within Flood Zone “C”, area of minimal flooding. Impacts from flooding will be less than significant.
- (j) A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. As the parent parcel is sited outside of the 100-year event, the potential for a mudflow is considered to be less than significant.

**Finding**

No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly. For this “Hydrology” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Physically divide an established community?				<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>	
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			<b>X</b>	

**Discussion:**

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

- Physically divide an established community
- Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;

- Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses with specific zoning designations; or
  - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, General Plan policies and goals of the community.
- (a) The proposed project will not physically divide an established community as it is all uses that currently exist on the parent parcel and surrounding neighborhood, and have been for some time will continue as before.
- (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) As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is not located in an ecological preserve mitigation area established for the Pine Hill rare plants or red-legged frog core area. The project will not conflict with any known habitat conservation plan.

**Finding**

No significant impacts are expected with the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly to any current land use policies. For this “Land Use Planning” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>

**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 parcel site is not mapped as a known Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology as shown on the Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn 15-minute Mineral Resource Zone quadrangles or by El Dorado County as depicted on the 1996 General Plan Exhibit V-7-4 and 2004 General Plan Exhibit 5.9-6.
- (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 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 do not indicate that the subject property would contain mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value, but as stated above, it can be determined that this specific site does not contain them.

**Finding**

No significant impacts are expected with the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly to any current land use policies. For this “Mineral Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i></b>				
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) The project is not listed under Table 6-1 of the General Plan as being a use subject to maximum allowable noise exposures from transportation source. As such, an acoustical analysis was not provided as part of the project application submittal. The creation of the two parcels to accommodate single-family usage will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan.

(b – d) Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the parcel 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 practicable from any residential areas. The creation of the two parcels will not directly create new construction and grading, although it may follow at which time it would be addressed during the building permit process.

- (e) General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including single-family residential, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a County owned/operated airport facility.
- (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**

No impacts to or from noise is expected with the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<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 will not induce growth directly or indirectly by providing infrastructure that would create development beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. The development area on the project site is designated on both the 1996 and 2004 General Plan Land Use Map for low-density residential development.

(b - c) The proposed parcel split will not displace people or existing housing, which will prevent the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**Finding**

The project will not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly because there currently two single-family dwellings currently habited. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<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 - b, & d - e)

General Plan Policy 5.1.2.2 establishes that the provision of public services to new discretionary development shall not result in a reduction of service below minimum established standards to current users, pursuant to Table 5-1. Table 5-1 establishes Minimum Levels of Service for public services such as schools, parks, fire districts, ambulance and sheriff. The Garden Valley Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services, however, no factual information was provided by the fire district stating that the minimum level of service would fall below the minimum response time of 15-45 minutes, as designated in Table 5-1. The current staffing within the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department is approximately 1 to 1.2 officers per 1,000 County residents compared with the statewide average of 1.8 officers per 1,000 population. The department will serve the project site with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The project site is readily accessed from Mt. Murphy and Johntown Creek Roads, and from the emergency access provided by an emergency chain-gated Hancock Road thoroughfare, so impact of the project to the level of service provided by the Sheriff’s Dept. will be less than significant.

(c) The state allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project should have no impact on local school districts.

**Finding**

As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services with the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly. 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 – b) The project would have no impact on the use of recreational facilities in the area, nor does it include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities in its proposal.

**Finding**

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected by the creation of the two parcels either directly or indirectly. For this “Recreation” category, 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)?				<b>X</b>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				<b>X</b>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				<b>X</b>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				<b>X</b>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
  - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
  - Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.
- (a - b) Access to the site is off of Johntown Creek Road, and Mt. Murphy Road is maintained by the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Comments were received from the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) indicating that the level of service (LOS) will not be significantly impacted by the proposed parcels which have an ultimate estimated traffic generation of ten Average Daily Trips (ADT) per parcel for a total of 20 ADT which does not worsen traffic pursuant to the General Plan definition of worsen.
- (c) The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns as there are no publicly or privately operated airports or landing fields in the project vicinity.
- (d) No traffic hazards such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site.
- (e) Access to the project parcel is via existing encroachments onto Johntown Creek Road which is maintained by the Garden Valley Ranch Estates CSD, of which both parcels are required to be annexed into. Encroachment permits from the County are not required. In addition, both parcels will allow sufficient room for emergency vehicle turn-around and drive thru.
- (f) The parking requirement for residential uses is two spaces per dwelling and both residences both have two spaces of the Zoning Ordinance required size.
- (g) The proposed parcel split does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**Finding**

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

<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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing				<b>X</b>

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

**Discussion:**

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

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

(a & e) The two parcels will utilize the existing on-site septic systems for wastewater. The systems have been reviewed by the Environmental Health Division to insure adequacy in meeting the standards of the El Dorado County Sewage Disposal Ordinance prior to issuance of a building permit. There is no evidence indicating the activities associated with the creation of the two parcels will violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the RWQCB.

(b) Any new water or expansions of existing well and septic facilities are reviewed by El Dorado County Environmental Management Department of any future building permit.

(c) All new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities proposed will be reviewed by El Dorado County Department of Transportation with any future grading permit.

(d) Potable water is supplied to the project by existing utilities through the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District without need for immediate capacity improvements.

(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.) are allowed to be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal site. All other waste materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.

(g) Garbage can pickup service for both existing dwellings exists.

- (h) **Power.** Power and telecommunication facilities are existing at both parcels. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding**

No significant utility and service system impacts are expected with the creation of the two parcels either directly or indirectly. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<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?				<b>X</b>
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)?			<b>X</b>	
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

- (a) This project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, including effects on animals or plants. Both short-term and long-term environmental effects associated with this project will be less than significant. Any potentially significant impacts will be reduced through compliance with existing standards and requirements.
- (b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the 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 will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly (no impacts identified, or mitigation has been included in the project design to reduce the impact).

### **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 I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report  
Volume II - Response to Comment on DEIR  
Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR  
Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR  
Volume V - Appendices

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

An Archeological Survey Report was prepared for the proposed project area in June 1999 (Historic Resource Associates). The study consisted of a records review and a field survey conducted by Dana Supernowitz.