

**EL DORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: November 15, 2006

Item No.: 5.a.

Staff: John Heiser

PARCEL MAP

FILE NUMBER: P92-0053

APPLICANT: James Michael Juchau

REQUEST: A parcel map creating two (2) parcels of 20-acres each in size on a 40-acre site. Exhibit E

Design waiver(s) have been requested for the following:

1. Allow the dead end access road to exceed the maximum dead-end road length of 2,640 feet.
2. Reduce the width of the off-site road shoulder width from 10-feet to 2 feet;
3. Reduce the width of the on-site road from 24-feet to 18-feet, and;
4. Reduce the thickness of gravel on the on-site road from 6 inches to 4 inches.

LOCATION: At the end of Fair Pines Lane, approximately 4,200 feet south of the intersection with Highway 193 in the Garden Valley area. (Exhibit A)

APN: 060-440-13

ACREAGE: 40-acres

GENERAL PLAN: Agricultural Lands - Agricultural District Overlay (AL-A)
(Exhibit B)

ZONING: Estate Residential Ten-acres (RE-10) (Exhibit C)

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Negative Declaration Prepared

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Conditional Approval

BACKGROUND:

The project submitted in 1992 to divide a forty-acre parcel into two twenty-acre parcels with design waivers for both on-site and off-site road improvements. One of the concerns was through access to serve the project, with an attempt to connect Fair Pines Lane with Windsong Lane. In 1993 the applicant requested that the application be pulled from the Zoning Administrator agenda to resolve the circulation issue. Further research showed that legal access to Windsong Lane did not exist and developing through circulation would be infeasible. Later a revision was submitted that included a design waiver request to exceed the maximum length for a dead-end road, but the processing of that was stalled when the General Plan lawsuit writ was imposed. The map was subsequently reactivated after the County adopted the 2004 General Plan.

Prior to reactivation of the application, the Fair Pines Road Association and the property owners, with support from the Garden Valley Fire District made improvements along Fair Pines Lane to meet Fire Safe Standards for access. The improvements included additional gravel and widening of Fair Pines Lane to 18-feet from the subject property to Highway 193.

Site Description: The project site currently has two permitted residential dwellings on it, an agricultural barn, wells and septic systems. The first residential dwelling unit was finalized on April 11, 1994 and is approximately 1,718 square feet and the second residential dwelling unit is 1,200 square feet with attached garage and was finalized on January 18, 1996. The 2,880 square foot inspection exempt agricultural barn was permitted in 1987.

The predominant vegetation on the property consists of pine, oak and fir trees. Additionally, the site is not located within an area known to have rare or endangered plant species. The site is located at an average elevation of 2,300 feet above mean sea level and consists of rolling terrain with several drainage corridors with heavily riparian vegetation.

Adjacent Land Uses:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	RE-10	AL/A	Single-family residential units (2), barn and several storage sheds.
North	RE-10	AL/A	Single-family residential unit.
South	AE	AL/A	Grazing lands, no structures.
East	RE-10	AL/A/RR	Single-family residential units.
West	RE-10	AL/A/RR	Single-family residential units.

Discussion: The parcel is adjacent to Exclusive Agricultural (AE) zoned lands on its southerly border. The agricultural operation to the south is a cattle ranch. The project went before the Agricultural Commission on December 14, 2005. The Agricultural Commission found that the project would not conflict with the adjacent cattle operations and met the required 10-acre parcel size for development

buffering adjacent to AE lands pursuant to Policy 8.1.3.1 and the 20-acre minimum for parcels in the AL General Plan designation (Table 2.2 of the General Plan.)

General Plan: The 2004 General Plan land use map designates the project site as Agricultural Lands, with an Agricultural overlay. The Agricultural Lands designation is applied to lands described in Policy 8.1.1.8 which allows a maximum of two residential dwellings used to support the agricultural use and maintain a minimum of 20-acres or greater lot size within the Agricultural (A) District Overlay. Lands determined by the Agricultural Commission as unsuitable for agricultural, may be considered for a minimum parcel size of ten (10) acres.

The Agricultural Commission meeting held on December 14, 2005, found the proposed parcel map is consistent with the applicable Agricultural Element policies. The property has minimal choice soils and will not have a detrimental effect on agriculture.

Policy TC-1w requires improvements to existing rural roads necessitated by new development to be designed to minimize visual impacts and be consistent with the needs of emergency access. Fair Pines Lane has been improved to 18-foot wide, with two-foot shoulders. Fair Pines Lane is not readily visible from Highway 193, fairly level and follows the contours of the topography.

Policy 5.1.2.2 requires that new discretionary development not result in the reduction of services below minimum established standards to current users, pursuant to Table 5-1. A critical service in the area is fire protection. The parcel is within the Garden Valley Fire Protection District. The closest fire station is located in Garden Valley, which is approximately 2.8 miles away from the proposed parcel map. Additionally, the applicant is required to improve Fair Pines Lane and the on-site road to improve emergency vehicle access to the project site. The project will be conditioned to comply with Department of Transportation and Fire District requirements.

The property contains two existing permitted wells. Environmental Management reviewed the proposed parcel map and did not raise any concerns or comments. Adequate groundwater is available as required by Policy 5.2.3.4.

Conditions have been recommended to provide an approved Fire Safe Management Plan and to improve the on-site and off-site roads to satisfy the fire safety requirements of Policy 6.2.4.1 relating to development in very high fire hazard areas.

Policy 7.4.4.4 requires retention and replacement of oak tree canopy. Based on a recent aerial photography the property is within the 80-100 percent existing tree canopy coverage. Under this percentage of oak tree canopy coverage, 60 percent retention is required. This allows up to 40 percent of canopy removal. Forty percent tree canopy removal equates to 16-acres on the 40-acre parcel. Sufficient area exists on the site so that future residential development associated with the creation of a new parcel can meet the retention requirement. Reduction of the width of the required road improvements will further limit oak tree removal.

Conclusion: Staff has determined that the project as proposed is consistent with the applicable General Plan policies.

Zoning: The subject site is zoned Estate Residential Ten Acres (RE-10). Review of the submitted site plan shows that the existing buildings comply with the development standards for the RE-10 Zone District. RE-10 allows one single family detached dwelling, accessory uses and structures, and barns and other agricultural structures. The development standards require a minimum of 10-acres and minimum yard setbacks of 30-feet from all property lines. Setbacks for agricultural structures are a minimum of 50-feet from all property lines. The existing residential structures will be located on 20-acres each, more than 150-feet from the nearest property line.

The existing residential dwelling units are located over 750-feet from the adjacent Agricultural zoned property which is not currently in horticultural or timber production. There is adequate land available for future construction to meet the 200-foot agricultural setback for non-compatible structures, as required pursuant to Chapter 17.06.150.

Conclusion: Staff has determined that the project as proposed is consistent with the applicable Zoning sections.

Parcel Map Design:

The main concern with this parcel map application is access. The project is located at the end of Fair Pines Lane at a distance of 4,200 feet from its connection with Highway 193 with no secondary access points. Fair Pines Lane is privately maintained and is graded earth, with recently applied gravel and has been widened from an average width of 10-12 feet to 18-feet. An extension of the road of approximately 500 feet is proposed to serve Parcel 2. This is presently the driveway that provides access to the main house.

This is an area designated by the California Department of Forestry as having very high fire hazard. To approve further development the applicant will be required to have an approved fire safe plan demonstrating that the area can be adequately protected from wildland fire hazards and the improvements to the access and on-site roads will be made so that emergency vehicles can access the site and private vehicles can evacuate the area.

Design Waiver(s) Discussion: The applicant is requesting four design waivers to allow; 1) the development beyond the half-mile dead-end road limit; 2) to reduce the off-site road shoulder width from 10-feet to 2-feet; 3) reduce the on-site road from 24-feet to 20-feet with two-foot shoulders, and 4) to reduce the thickness of gravel for the on-site road from 6-inches to 4-inches.

A concern raised by the Department of Transportation and the Garden Valley Fire Prevention District minimum load limits for both the on-site and off-site roads. The applicant indicated that the underlying base rock near or on the surface for the off-site and on-site road would support 40,000 pound load limit and that widening Fair Pines Lane from 18-feet to 24-feet an additional 6-feet would remove numerous trees within the right-of way, not including the incurred expense.

Department of Transportation (DOT) has agreed with the Fire District determination to allow off-site and on-site road improvements to be 18-feet wide with two-foot shoulders. The reduction of surfacing requirements can be approved if a report to be provided by a Soils Engineer to determine if the surface

gravel for both off-site and on-site roads indicates the road can support the minimum 40,000 pound load limit for emergency vehicles.

In order to grant a design waiver, the approving authority must find that the following conditions exist, as required by Section 16.40.010 of the Subdivision Ordinance:

- a. There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver,
- b. Strict application of the design or improvement requirements of this article would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property,
- c. The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public.
- d. The adjustment or waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of this article or any other law or ordinance applicable to the division.

Design Waiver Request 1 - Development beyond the half mile dead-end road limit: The Design and Improvement Standards Manual allows dead-end roads up to 2,460-feet. The proposed parcel map is on a 4,200-foot dead-end road. However, the Fire Safe Regulations also adopted by the County, allow dead-end roads up to a mile, if the parcels are 20-acres or larger regardless of the number of parcels served. Since the proposed parcels are both 20-acres each and the dead-end road is less than one mile long, then the design waiver can be approved based on additional road improvements and fuel modifications.

The applicants have spent a lot of time exploring options to connecting Fair Pines Lane with other roads to provide a second connection to Highway 193. None presently exists, nor is it apparently feasible to develop such a connection.

Design Waiver Request 2- Reduction of off-site road shoulder width from 10 feet to two feet: The Design and Improvement Standards Manual Section 3(A)2(C)i-ii and 12(a) - Minor Land Divisions, allows access roads to be a minimum of 18-feet wide, all weather gravel surface with 10-foot shoulders for a total roadway width of 40-feet. Width reductions for shoulders may be reduced by the Zoning Administrator with a favorable recommendation from the responsible fire agency.

Garden Valley Fire Protection District indicated that the off-site needed to provide a minimum of two nine-foot traffic lanes (18-feet total) with two-foot shoulders, the surface shall be all weather and able to support 40,000 pounds pursuant to Title 14 of the State Fire Safe Regulations.

Fair Pines Lane serves less than 24 residential parcels, the amount of additional grading and clearing would make the parcel split infeasible if required to widen Fair Pines Lane from the project site to Highway 193. Furthermore, the applicant and the Fair Pines Road Association have made substantial road improvements to Fair Pines Lane. Additionally, the applicant will be required to improve the encroachment from Fair Pines Lane to Highway 193 as required by Caltrans. Since the road width is

18-feet and the Fire District requires a fuel modification plan, staff recommends approving the design waiver reduction from 10-foot shoulder to 2-foot shoulders.

Design Waiver Request 3 - Reduction in width for the on-site road improvements from 24 feet to 20 feet: The applicant has stated that the required amount of additional grading and tree removal needed for the on-site road improvements that would make the project infeasible. The access road is currently 20-feet wide, graveled, with 2-foot shoulders. The on-site access road terminates in a cul-de-sac to which both driveways to the residential units connect. Department of Transportation will accept a reduction to 18-feet based on favorable recommendations from the Garden Valley Fire District. Garden Valley Fire Department Chief Ted Schmidt indicated that the on-site road needed to be a minimum of 18-feet with 2-foot shoulders. Staff recommends approving the design waiver reduction from 24-foot wide road to 18-foot wide road with 2-foot shoulders.

Design Waiver Request 4 - Reduction in on-side road surface gravel thickness from six inches to four inches: The applicant believes that the base rock is more than adequate to support 40,000 pounds minimum for emergency vehicles. Department of Transportation recommends a soils engineer be retained to determine if the 4-inches of gravel will support a 40,000 pound minimum load limit for emergency vehicles. The road must be designed to support the weight of a fire truck, therefore staff recommends denial of this request. However, the recommended condition of approval provides for the alternative that if a geotechnical report supports the applicant's position that the existing surface is adequate, additional material will not be necessary.

Other Agency and Department Comments:

Air Quality Management District: The District has determined this project will have an insignificant air quality impact. However, project construction activities such as grading and excavation operations will result in temporary air quality impacts which will require compliance with District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2, 224 and 300 which address regulations and mitigation measures for fugitive dust emissions and asbestos emissions.

Environmental Management Department: The Environmental Management Department reviewed the project and had no comments.

El Dorado County Surveyor Office: The County Surveyor will require conditions prior to the recording of the map. The conditions are listed under conditions of approval.

Georgetown Divide Public Utility District: The Public Utility District reviewed the project proposal and has indicated that the parcel will be required to be assessed for water apportionment at the time of final map recording. The assessed water charges for parcel divisions are included in the recommended conditions of approval.

Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District: The Resource Conservation District in a letter dated November 27, 1992, requires an approved erosion and revegetation plan if substantial grading is involved with the road improvements.

Georgetown Divide Recreation District: The proposed parcel map project is located within the boundaries of the Georgetown Divide Recreational District (GDRD), and therefore subject to fees in lieu of land dedication for parks and recreation purposes.

Copies of their written comments are available at Planning Services office.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has prepared an Initial Study (Environmental Checklist with Discussion attached) to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, staff has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project as conditioned will have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration has been prepared.

This project is found to be de minimis (having no effect on fish and game resources). Pursuant to Resolution No. 240-93, a \$35.⁰⁰ processing fee is required by the County Recorder to file the Notice of Determination and Certificate of Fee Exemption with the State in accordance with State Legislation (California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4).

RECOMMENDATION

1. Adopt the Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff.
2. Approve parcel map P92-53 as the required findings can be made as noted in Attachment 2 and subject to the conditions itemized in Attachment 1.
3. Approve the following design waivers since appropriate findings have been made as noted in Attachment 2:
 - a. Allow the dead end access road to exceed the maximum dead-end road length of 2640 feet.
 - b. Reduce the width of the off-site road shoulder width from 10-feet to 2 feet;
 - c. Reduce the width of the on-site road from 24-feet to 18-feet, and;
4. Deny the following design waivers since appropriate findings required in Section 16.40.010 cannot be found to exist:
 - a. Reduction in roadway thickness of the gravel surface of the on-site roadway from 6-inches to 4-inches.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

Attachments To Staff Report:

Attachment 1	Conditions of Approval.
Attachment 2	Findings.
Exhibit A	Vicinity Map.
Exhibit B	General Plan Land Use Map.
Exhibit C	Zoning Map.
Exhibit D.....	Assessors Map.
Exhibit E.....	Tentative Parcel Map.
Exhibit F.....	Environmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts

ATTACHMENT 1

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

File Number P92-0053 – Jachau
November 15, 2006 Zoning Administrator Hearing

Department of Transportation

1. All improvements shall comply with “El Dorado County Minor Land Division Ordinance”, Design and Improvement Standards Manual”, Section 4290 of the Public Resources Code and the Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, except as modified by the approved design waivers.
2. The on-site road easement shall be improved to Standard Plan 101C with a reduction in width to 18-feet with 2-foot shoulders, supporting a minimum of 40,000 pound load limit. the travel surface shall be 6” of aggregate base, unless a geotechnical report is provided that certifies that the existing surface will support the required minimum of 40,000 pounds.
3. The off-site access road, Fair Pines Lane, shall be improved to Standard Plan #101-C, except that no portions of Fair Pines Lane shall be less than 18-feet in width with an approved design waiver with 14-feet vertical clearance and shall have an all weather gravel surface.
4. Improvement Plans for on-site and off-site road improvements shall be prepared by a registered Civil Engineer and shall be subject to County Department of Transportation approval.
5. A construction and grading permit shall be obtained from the Department of Transportation prior to the commencement of any road construction.
6. An irrevocable offer of dedication shall be made of 50-feet in width for proposed road easements, with slope easements where necessary.
7. The Fair Pines Lane intersection with Highway 193 shall be reconstructed to conform to current CALTRANS standards. An encroachment permit shall be obtained from Caltrans prior to construction.
8. Street signs, in conformance with Standard Plan 105 (B-1), shall be installed at the intersection of Highway 193 and Fair Pines Lane.
9. Stop signs, pursuant to Standard Plan 105-A, shall be installed at the intersection of Highway 193 and Fair Pine Lane.
10. A "Not a County Maintained Road" sign, 24" x 30", black on white, shall be located on Fair Pines Lane, at its intersection with Highway 193. On the same post, a W-53 "Not a Through Road" sign shall also be placed.

11. Any bonded road improvements shall be completed within one year of filing the parcel map.

Garden Valley Fire Protection District

12. The applicant shall submit a Fire Safe Management Plan prepared by a registered professional forester and approved by the Fire District.

Planning Services

13. The subdivision is subject to parkland dedication in-lieu fees, based on values supplied by the County Assessor's Office and calculated in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of the County Code. The fees shall be paid at the time of filing the parcel map. The subdivider shall be subject to a \$150.⁰⁰ appraisal fee payable to El Dorado County Assessor for the determination of parkland dedication in-lieu fees.
14. During all grading and construction activities in the project area, an archaeologist or historian approved by the Planning Director shall be on-call. 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 the on-call 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 appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance. The project grading plans shall include this mitigation on the plans. Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.
15. 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 project grading plans shall include this mitigation on the plans. Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Air Quality Management District

16. If grading and or excavation operations are required for road improvements, the applicant shall submit and obtain an approved Fugitive Dust Plan that is in conformance to District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2 whichever is appropriate.
17. Burning of wastes that result from "Land Development Clearing" must be permitted through the District pursuant to Rule 300.

County Surveyor

18. All Survey monuments must be set prior to filling the Parcel Map.
19. Provide a Parcel Map Guarantee showing proof of access to a State or County Maintained Road with the right to make improvements.
20. The roads serving the development shall be named by filling a complete Road Name Petition with the County Surveyors Office prior to filing the Parcel Map.
21. Prior to filing the Parcel Map, a letter to the County Surveyor will be required from all agencies that have conditions placed on the map. The letter will state that all conditions placed on the map by the agency have been met.

ATTACHMENT 2 FINDINGS

File Number P92-0053 – Jachau
November 15, 2006 Zoning Administrator Hearing

Based on the review and analysis of this project by staff and affected agencies, and supported by discussion in the staff report and evidence in the record, the following findings can be made:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1.0 CEQA FINDING

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Negative Declaration together with the comments received during the public review process. The Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and is adequate for this proposal.
- 1.2 No significant impacts to the environment as a result of this project were identified in the initial study.
- 1.3 The project will not affect wetland, watercourses, riparian lands, unique plant or animal life and habitats, or other terrestrial matters under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Fish and Game. Therefore, the project has a de minimus impact on the environment and a Certificate of Fee Exemption (DFG 753.5-5/91) is applicable.
- 1.4 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services Department - Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.

2.0 GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS

- 2.1 The proposed parcel map creating two 20-acre parcels is consistent with the AL-A, Agricultural Lands – Agricultural District Overlay land use designation of the 2004 General Plan, which requires 20-acre minimum parcel sizes.
- 2.2 The project is consistent with applicable General Plan policies including 8.1.1.8 and 8.1.3.1 relating to agricultural land protection, TC-1w regarding access for rural development, 5.1.2.2 and 5.2.3.4 regarding adequacy of services and water supply, 5.7.4.1 and 6.2.4.1 relating to fire protection, and 7.4.4.4, oak tree canopy protection.

3.0 ZONING FINDINGS

- 3.1 The proposed 20-acre parcels meets the minimum parcels size requirements of the Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) Zone District.

3.2 The proposed parcel map meets the development standards, as set forth in §17.70.110 of the El Dorado County Code.

4.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS

(Findings required pursuant to §16.44.030 of the El Dorado County Code)

4.1 The proposed parcel map creating two twenty-acre parcels, including design and improvements, is consistent with the General Plan policies and land use land use designation of Agricultural with the Agricultural District Overlay.

4.2 The site can support the proposed residential development of two twenty-acre parcels based on the topography, access, and other site constraints as described in the staff report.

4.3 The design of the parcel map and required improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or injury to fish and wildlife resources as identified in the initial study prepared for the project.

4.4 The design of the parcel map and required improvements will not cause public health hazards, related to air quality, fire safety, and access as identified in the staff report.

4.5 The parcel map has been reviewed by the Garden Valley Fire Protection District which has determined that the project, together with required improvements, conforms to the requirements of California Public Resources Code §4291 (Fire Safe Regulations.)

4.6 The map does not conflict with any existing easements.

5.0 DESIGN WAIVER FINDINGS

5.1 Approval of Design Waiver Request 1 - Allow the dead end access road to exceed the maximum dead-end road length of 2,640 feet.

5.1.1 The project site is located at the end of a 4,200-foot dead-end road without the ability to connect to other road systems in the vicinity. The Design and Improvement Standards Manual allows dead-end roads up to 2,460-feet, however, this is an existing road serving a number of large parcels.

5.1.2 Strict application of County design and improvement requirements would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property in that the additional grading for the access road improvements would require over an acre of additional tree removal if the Design Waiver is not granted.

5.1.3 The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public because the Fire Safe Regulations allow dead-end roads up to a mile, if the parcels are 20-acres or larger regardless of the number of parcels served. The off-site road has been approved to meet the minimum road width of 18-feet

with 2-foot shoulders. The on-site road will be improved to meet the minimum road width of 18-feet with 2-foot shoulders.

- 5.1.4 This waiver will provide adequate emergency vehicle access and circulation in conformance with the provisions of the State Fire Safe Regulations, and will not nullify the objectives of Title 16 of the County Code.

5.2 Approval of Design Waiver Request 2 and 3 - Reduce the width of the off-site road shoulder width from 10-feet to 2 feet; and reduce the width of the on-site road from 24-feet to 18-feet

- 5.2.1 Fair Pines Lane was recently improved by a newly-formed road improvement association to bring the road up to meet the minimum fire safe regulations. The road is 4200 feet in length and this map is creating only two parcels at its end.

Discussion: The Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM) for 101-C road improvements requires 50-foot right of way, 24-foot wide road width. Volume II, Section 3(12) (a) of the DISM requires rural subdivisions and minor land divisions – 10-foot shoulders for a total roadway width of 40-feet. The State Fire Safe Regulations allow shoulder reduction by the Zoning Administrator with a favorable recommendation from the responsible fire agency.

Garden Valley Fire Department Chief Ted Schmidt, responded and indicated that the off-site road - Fair Pines Lane to provide a minimum of two nine-foot traffic lanes (18-feet total) with two-foot shoulders, the surface shall be all weather and able to support 40,000 pounds pursuant to Title 14 of the State Fire Safe Regulations.

The reduced shoulder width meets the Fire Safe regulations and the Design Waiver can be approved.

- 5.2.2 Strict application of County design and improvement requirements would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property in that the additional grading for the access road improvements would require over an acre of additional tree removal if the Design Waiver is not granted.
- 5.2.3 The Garden Valley Fire Protection District has recommended approval of the requested waivers to road and shoulder widths based on conformity with the State Fire Safe Regulations. The reduction in road and shoulder widths would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public.
- 5.2.4 This waiver will provide adequate emergency vehicle access and circulation in conformance with the provisions of the State Fire Safe Regulations, and will not nullify the objectives of Title 16 of the County Code.

5.3 Denial of Design Waiver Request 4 - Reduce the thickness of gravel on the on-site road from 6-inches to 4-inches.

- 5.3.1 There are no special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver.
- 5.3.2 Strict application of County design and improvement requirements would not cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property. Although the on-site road was recently improved, adding additional aggregate base to provide adequate bearing strength to support a fire engine would not make the proposed land division infeasible.
- 5.3.3 The adjustment or waiver could be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public because the thickness of the road surface has been determined to be that necessary to support the weight of a fire engine. Unless additional data is provided demonstrating that the existing road improvements or a lesser standard is capable of supporting 40,000 pounds, a fire engine may not be able to access the site in an emergency.
- 4.3.4 This waiver could have the effect of nullifying the objectives of Title 16 of the County Code by allowing insufficient infrastructure to support the new development.



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: P92-0053 Juchau Parcel Map

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

Contact Person: John Heiser

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: James M. Juchau, 8335 Fair Pines Lane, Garden Valley, CA 95633

Project Applicant's Name and Address: James M. Juchau, 8335 Fair Pines Lane, Garden Valley, CA 95633

Project Agent's Name and Address: James M. Juchau, 8335 Fair Pines Lane, Garden Valley, CA 95633

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: ANDREGG GEOMATICS, 11661 Blocker Dr. Suite 200, Auburn, CA 95603

Project Location: End of Fair Pines Lane, approximately 0.8 miles to the intersection of Highway 193 in the Garden Valley area.

Assessor's Parcel No: 060-440-13

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

Section: 35 **T:** 12N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Agricultural Lands with Agricultural District Overlay (AL/A)

Description of Project: A revised parcel map proposing to create two lots with four design waivers to allow development beyond the half mile dead-end road limit, reduce the width of the off-site shoulder width from 10-feet to 2-feet with gravel surface, reduce the width of the on-site road from 24-feet to 20-feet with 2-foot shoulders and reduce the gravel thickness of the on-site road from 6-inches to 4-inches.

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-10	AL/A	Agricultural Lands with Agricultural overlay
North:	RE-10	AL/A	Agricultural Lands with Agricultural overlay
East:	RE-10	AL/A/RR	Agricultural Lands with Agricultural overlay and Rural Residential
South:	AE	AL/A	Agricultural Lands with Agricultural overlay
West:	RE-10	AL/A/RR	Agricultural Lands with Agricultural overlay and Rural Residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site consists of 40-acres, with two permitted residential dwellings units, an agricultural barn, wells and septic systems. The predominant vegetation on the property consists of pine, oak and fir trees. The site is located at an average elevation of 2,300 feet above mean sea level and consists of rolling terrain with several drainage corridors that are heavily tree canopied. The site is not located within an area known to have rare or endangered plant species.

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

1. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District: Fugitive Dust Plan required.
2. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading permit for on site and off site road improvements.
3. El Dorado County Office of the Surveyor: Standard conditions for map recording
4. Georgetown Divide Public Utility District: Water apportionment assessment at time of map recording.
5. Georgetown Divide Public Recreation District: Park in lieu fees assessment at time of map recording.
6. Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District: Erosion Control Plan required prior to grading.

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: October 13, 2006

Printed Name: Peter N. Maurer For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from a proposed parcel split creating two 20-acre lots from a 40-acre parcel with four road improvement design waivers located at 8335 Fair Pines Lane in the Garden Valley area.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The 40-acre project site is located at 8335 Fair Pines Lane, approximately 0.8 miles south of the intersection with Highway 193 and Fair Pines Lane in the Garden Valley area. The project area lies at an elevation of approximately 2,300 feet above mean sea level. The surrounding properties contain single-family residential units, accessory structures and agricultural uses. Access to the site is from Fair Pines Lane in the Garden Valley area of El Dorado County.

Project Characteristics

This proposal is to create separate parcels for the existing residential units including on-site road improvements. The new on-site access road will meet all requirements requested by the Garden Valley Fire Department and the El Dorado County Department of Transportation.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the site is provided by an existing road encroaching directly onto Fair Pines Lane. The access road to the existing residential units is to be a minimum of 18-foot wide pursuant to SRA Fire Safe Regulations requiring a fire turn-around, to maintain a minimum 13'6" vertical clearance above the access road and to support a 40,000 pound load. Current improved on-site road width is 20-foot wide with 2-foot shoulders. The project has been conditioned to comply with these requirements. Please see Item XV in the Initial Study checklist for a discussion of traffic impacts.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site contains wells and septic systems. Power utilities and telephone service have been extended to the site by local utility companies.

3. Population

The two parcel split and existing residential units will not add to the population in the vicinity.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of off site and on site road improvements including grading. Construction access to the site would be from Fair Pines Lane via Highway 193.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from the Department of Transportation and obtain an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan from the Air Quality Management District.

Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista. The project is for a two parcel land division to create two parcels for the two existing residential units that are currently located on the 40-acre parcel. A gravel road has been installed to service the two residential units and will support a 40,000 pound load limit pursuant to the fire safe regulations. The surrounding land uses include residential and agricultural related structures in the immediate vicinity.

- a. **Scenic Vista.** The project site is located on the south end of Fair Pines Lane and approximately 0.4 miles west of Highway 193. The existing tree canopy on the property and surrounding properties provide extensive screening from Highway 193. In addition, the project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.¹ There would be no impact as a result of the parcel split.
- 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.²
- c. **Visual Character.** The proposed parcel split and the existing residential units on the property will not be readily visible from an off-site public view (Fair Pines Lane and Highway 193).
- d. **Light and Glare.** There will be no additional light and glare produced from the proposed lot split or from the existing development. Therefore, the impacts of existing light and glare as seen from Highway 193 or from Fair Pines Lane would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

- a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not considered to be “Prime Farmland” however; this property is designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district. The parcel is presently not being used to graze cattle or raise agricultural crops. Adjacent parcels to the south are being used for limited cattle grazing. Based upon the soil classifications, the parcel is ill suited for cultivated agricultural due to slopes and the thin mantle of soil material. The parcel split will not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses and there would be no loss of productive agricultural land or conflict with agricultural uses. Furthermore, the Agricultural Commission discussed the parcel split request at a public hearing on December 14, 2005. The Agricultural Commission approved the parcel split request indicating that the two twenty-acre parcels will provide the necessary buffers from the cattle operations adjacent to the project site and concluded that the parcel contains minimal choice soils and will not have a detrimental affect on agricultural operation in the vicinity.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The property is not located within a Williamson Act Contract and the project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The site is classified as grazing farmland under the Farmland Mapping Program and the soil type has been classified as per the USDA Soil Survey as:

MmF: Metamorphic rock land is in areas of highly resistant schist and slate formations. Rock outcrops and stones occupy from 50 to 90% of the surface, and the rest has a thin mantle of soil material. This land type is excessively

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

drained. Surface runoff is very rapid, and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. This type of rock land has no farming value, range site and woodland suitability group not assigned.

MbE: Mariposa very rocky silt loam, 3 to 50 % slopes. Outcrops of bedrock cover 5 to 25% of the surface. Permeability is moderate, surface runoff is medium to rapid, and the erosion hazard is slight to high. This soil is used for woodland, range site not assigned; woodland suitability group 5.

BrE: Boomer – Sites very rocky loams, 9 to 50% slopes. These soils have 5 to 25% rock outcrops and slate fragments. Boomer soils make up 55% and Sites soils make up 35% percent of the complex. Surface runoff is medium and the erosion hazard is moderate. Soils of this complex are used for woodland, range site not assigned; woodland suitability group 5.

SkC: Sites loam, 30 to 50% slopes. Surface runoff is medium to rapid, and the erosion hazard is high. This soil is used for woodland, range site not assigned; woodland suitability group 2.

Furthermore, there are no agricultural operations or lands designated for agricultural uses present.³ There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the parcel split either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and agricultural uses in the vicinity. For this “Agriculture” category, the impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

³ State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map, 2002.

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

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

a-c.

Air Quality Plan and Standards. Improvements to the onsite and off site road improvements could generate short-term fugitive dust and exhaust from construction equipment. Short-term air quality impacts result from emissions generated by construction related equipment. Emissions of NO_x and ROG from construction equipment are the primary pollutants. However, short-term thresholds for these will most likely not exceed 82 pounds per day as identified as a significant threshold for air quality impacts for El Dorado County and will require conformance to District Rule 523. Construction fugitive dust emissions will be considered not significant and estimation of fugitive dust emissions is not required if complete mitigation is undertaken as part of the project (or mandatory condition of the project) in compliance with the requirements of Rule 403 of the South Coast AQMD, such that there will be no visible dust beyond the boundaries of the project. (EDC APCD-CEQA Guide, 1st Ed, 2002) In addition, the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District will require road construction activities to be in conformance with District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2 for fugitive dust prevention and track out prevention as well as Rule 300 for open burning if applicable. Prior to any road grading and road improvements, an approved Fugitive Dust Plan will be required prior to issuance of a grading permit. If road improvements meet the requirements of the District Rules, the grading and road improvements would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash or odors. The parcel split will not create additional vehicle traffic and emissions other than what currently exists for the residential units. Therefore, short-term and long-term air quality impacts would be less than significant.

d-e.

Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors. Due to the very low density residential development in the area, agricultural operations and dense tree coverage, sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, care facilities and high density dwelling units are not located within the immediate vicinity. Common types of facilities known to produce odors include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfill, transfer station, asphalt batch plant and manufacturing plants. The requested parcel split and existing residential units on the property will not generate or produce objectionable odors. Short-term heavy equipment emissions generated by the on site and off site road improvements would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash or odors based upon an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan conforming to District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2 and Rule 300 as applicable. In addition, the nearest residential unit is located approximately 200 feet west of Fair Pines Lane which may be impacted temporarily by the required off site road improvement work. Asphalt surface treatment is not being required since El Dorado County of Transportation is not requiring asphalt as a condition of approval. The proposed road improvement work will not include any features that would be a source of substantial pollutant emissions that could affect sensitive receptors or generate objectionable odors. Therefore, long-term impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-f. **Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities.** The site will be readily accessible via an existing road and on-site drive to the two residential dwelling units. Based on a recent aerial photograph of the site and submitted site and grading plans, minor grading would be required for the road improvements and will require minimal removal of trees in the direct area of the onsite road improvements. The site is not located within an area containing sensitive habitats or special-status species.⁴ There would be no impact on biological resources.

⁴ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7

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

Finding

No impacts from biological resources are expected with onsite and off site road improvement associated with the parcel split. For this “Biological” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property or historic or cultural significant to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study;
- Affect a landmark of cultural/historical importance;
- 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 archaeological survey report was prepared for the proposed project area in November 1992.⁵ The survey report indicated that three drainages flow through the property towards Irish Creek and were used for placer mining for short periods of time during the Gold Rush period and suspected as most recently as the 1930’s. Small dams were constructed out of earth and rocks to impound winter and spring runoff for the placer mining. No artifacts or cabin sites were found associated with the mining operations and features. The survey reports conclusion did not qualify the ephemeral mining site as a significant archaeological site under CEQA Criteria, Appendix K and recommended that the two earth and rock dams be protected or otherwise avoided during development of the property. Because of the common possibility that any parcel in the County may turn up archeological finds during grading, the project will be subject to the following conditions:

1. During all grading and construction activities in the project area, an archaeologist or historian approved by the Planning Director shall be on-call. 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

⁵ *Archaeological Survey Report for James M. Juchau, By: Dana E. Supernowicz, November, 1992.*

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

ensure that all such activities cease within 50-feet of the discovery until the on-call 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 appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance. The project grading plans shall include this mitigation on the plans. The Planning Department shall review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

2. 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 project grading plans shall include this mitigation on the plans. The Planning Department shall review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Finding

Based upon the archaeological survey report prepared for the site, it is determined that all feasible conditions have been incorporated in the project to reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance. For this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				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			X	

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
disposal of waste water?			

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

a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.⁶ No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.⁷ There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are two known faults within the project vicinity; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated between the Melones Fault Zones and located outside of the fault zone buffer areas. The subject parcel is approximately 0.7 miles away from the two fault zones. The Melones fault zone is associated with the Foothills fault system, previously considered inactive but re-classified to potentially active after a Richter magnitude earthquake measuring 5.7 occurred near Oroville in 1975. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.⁸

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 50 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 50 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California

⁶ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, p.5.9-29.*

⁷ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

⁸ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, p.5.9-5.*

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

Geological Survey.⁹ While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located.¹⁰ The project site where the existing dwelling units are located is relatively flat, while the rest of the property is comprised of rolling terrain; and based upon the soil survey and metamorphic rock comprising the site, there would be no risk of landslide. There would be no impact.¹¹

- b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** 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 site grading and construction of any onsite and off site road improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

The project includes on-site and off-site road widening to meet fire safe standards and the road standards width as addressed in the “Design and Improvement Standards Manual. Access to the site is provided from Fair Pines Lane to a gravel drive serving the two residential units that terminates at a cul-de-sac on the property. The onsite access road to the residential units is to be widened from 20-feet to 24-feet, graveled, have a 13’6” vertical clearance, and be capable of supporting a 40,000 lb. load. A Fire District approved turnaround at the project site will be required.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the proposed project and has placed conditions of approvals onto the proposed parcel split. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District reviewed the application in 1992 and commented that an approved erosion control plan will be required prior to any grading operations. The “plan” will also include a revegetation plan consistent with the latest El Dorado County’s Erosion Control Requirements and Specifications.” The approved erosion control and grading plan as well as the revegetation plan will address mitigation measures to reduce the amount of sediment runoff onsite as well as off site. Impacts would be less than significant with an approved erosion and revegetation plan.

- d. **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The

⁹ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002.* (<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha>)

¹⁰ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.*

¹¹ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.*

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

project site has been classified per the USDA Soil Survey as Metamorphic Rock Land. Metamorphic rock land is in areas of highly resistant schist and slate formations. Rock outcrops and stones occupy from 50 to 90 percent of the surface, and the rest has a thin mantle of soil material. At the lower elevations, it is associated with Auburn soils, and at the higher elevations it is associated with Maymen and Mariposa soils. The applicant(s) have approved building permits for the existing dwelling units on the property. No further residential development will occur until such time that an approved loop road system is improved to county standards and an approved parcel map is recorded. Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. There would be no impact related to the existing septic systems.

Finding

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

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

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

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. **Hazardous Substances.** No hazardous substances are involved with the parcel split. Temporary use of heavy equipment for road improvements will be required. A diesel fuel storage tank may be located on site for the heavy equipment. The potential storage and transport of diesel fuel in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment will require an approved hazardous material business plan issued from the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. Said hazardous material business plan will identify potential impacts to the environment and require mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Based on the amount of road improvements required and the duration of heavy equipment on site and off site to complete the road improvements, and that fuel storage will most likely not occur, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant with an approved hazardous materials business plan.
- b. **Creation of Hazards.** The project would not create the potential for the release of hazardous substances.
- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.¹² Previous placer mining activities could have resulted in releases of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater. However, since the last known placer mining on the property may have occurred in the 1930's it is unlikely that mercury or cyanide were used in the gold extraction. There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There is a private airstrip that is identified on a U.S. Geological Survey Topography map located north east to the proposed parcel split and west of Fair Pines Lane. Based on the latest aerial photographs and site visit, the airstrip is no longer in use. There would be no impact.

¹² California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List, accessed September 23, 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004.

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

- g. **Emergency Response Plan.** The parcel is accessed via Highway 193 and Fair Pines Lane. Fire response and fire safety issues have been reviewed by the Garden Valley Fire Department and have indicated that the applicants have been improving Fair Pines Lane for emergency vehicle access. (Ben Scott – Garden Valley Fire Chief) In addition, the Department of Transportation will require off-site road improvements along Fair Pines Lane to the encroachment onto Highway 193. The road improvements will be required to meet fire safe standards to support a minimum of 40,000 pound load limit. Based upon the required road improvements and onsite fire safe turn around, there would be negligible or no disruption of emergency access to and from occupied uses along Fair Pines Lane. If future land divisions occur, an approved loop road system will be required. Since the fire safe regulations allow dead end roads to not exceed the cumulative length of 5,280 feet with a fire safe turn around as long as the parcels are zoned for 20-acres or larger and will not serve more than twenty-four (24) existing or potential parcels. The property is zoned RE-10 acres minimum; however, the Agricultural Lands-land use designation requires a minimum of 20-acres. The length of the dead end road with a fire safe turn around will be approximately 4, 800 feet in length. 4, 200 feet for Fair Pines Lane from Highway 193 and approximately 600 feet for the access road to the fire safe turn around on the subject parcel. Fuel modification (thinning) may be required up to 100 feet from the edge of the roadway (on site) by the Planning Director upon favorable recommendation from the fire protection agency when the length of road is to exceed 800 feet in high fire rated areas. Based upon the conditions of approval for on-site and off-site road improvements, there would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.
- h. **Fire Hazards.** The project site located in an area classified as having a high fire hazard.¹³ The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan Policy 6.2.2.2 requires development in areas of high wildland fire hazard areas to provide and demonstrate that the area can be adequately protected from wildland fire hazard as demonstrated in a Fire Safe Plan prepared by a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) and approved by the local Fire Protection District and/or California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. General Plan Policy 6.2.3.2 requires the applicant to demonstrate that adequate access exists or can be provided to ensure that emergency vehicles can access the site and private vehicles can evacuate the area. General Plan Policy 6.2.4.1 requires discretionary development within high fire hazard areas to be conditioned to designate fuel break zones and comply with fire safe requirements to benefit the new and, where possible, existing development. As part of the conditions of approval for the parcel split, the applicants will be required to provide an approved Fire Safe Plan, be required to improve both on-site and off-site roads for emergency access and the applicants have installed a fire safe turnaround on the property. In addition, the Garden Valley Fire Station Number 1 is approximately 2.8 miles away from the subject property and Georgetown Divide Public Utility District irrigation canal which is located adjacent to the parcel is listed as an emergency source of water for fire protection purposes. The canal facility is in operation from May 1st to September 30th during the dry seasons. Based upon an approved Fire Safe Plan, improved roads, emergency response access to the site, emergency water supply from the irrigation canal and surrounding development would not be adversely affected, as discussed above. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

Finding

No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

¹³ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.8-4.

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

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

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

- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical storm water pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

- a. **Water Quality Standards.** The project is of limited scope and would not involve disturbance to water bodies or require water service, and would therefore have no effect on surface or groundwater quantity or quality. The parcel split and existing residential dwelling units would not involve any uses that would generate wastewater. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Groundwater.** There would be no increased demand on groundwater resources as a result of the parcel split and or from the existing residential units. There would be no impact.
- c. **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit storm water runoff and discharge from a site. The Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed project and finds that an erosion control plan is not warranted for the proposed parcel split. However, the Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District will require an erosion control plan prior to road grading. Mitigation measures addressed in the erosion control plan would reduce erosion to less than significant.
- d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** The parcel split is to create two separate 20-acre parcels for the two existing residential units from a 40-acre parcel. The property has three drainages which flow towards Irish Creek and have not been altered from the existing development on the property. The on site road improvements avoid the drainage areas and the El Dorado County Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed parcel map project and has determined that a drainage, erosion control and grading plans are not warranted. Therefore, there would be no impact on the existing drainage pattern.
- e. **Storm Water Run-off.** There are natural drainages on the project site that would not be affected by the parcel split or from the existing residential dwelling units. However, the Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District will require an approved erosion control plan for any grading and road improvements to mitigate any impacts of sediment runoff beyond the project boundaries. The proposed project would not involve any operations that would be a source of polluted water. Therefore, there would be no impact on drainage patterns, flooding, drainage systems, or water quality.
- g, h, i & j. **Flooding.** The level project site is situated in an area of undulating terrain at an elevation of approximately 2,300 feet above sea level. There are no 100-year flood hazard areas at or adjacent to the site. The site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is not in an area subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. There would be no impact.

FIRM. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0475 B, last updated October, 18, 1983) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a. **Established Community.** The project site is surrounded by agricultural and residential uses and is located outside of Garden Valley’s rural center boundary. The proposed parcel split and existing dwelling units would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact.
- b. **Land Use Plan.** The parcel is zoned for Estate Residential 10-Acre (RE-10) and allows single family residential use as well as a secondary residential unit. The Agricultural land use designation allows for a minimum of 20-acres. The existing use would not conflict with the adopted General Plan land use designation for the site (Agricultural Lands with an Agricultural District Overlay (AL/A)) or adjacent uses. The El Dorado County Agricultural Commission reviewed the parcel split request at a December 22, 2005 hearing and concluded that the parcel split will not have a detrimental affect on agriculture and the lands are recognized as minimal choice soils. There would be no impact.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** 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. There would be no impact.

Finding

The proposed use of the land will be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan policies for residential and agricultural uses. There will be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property. No significant impacts are expected. For this “Land Use” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			X

Discussion:

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

a & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present.¹⁴ Approximately 2,040 feet to the west from the proposed parcel split are MRZ-2-classified areas¹⁵, and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.¹⁶ There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect existing uses. There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the proposed parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Mineral Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X	

¹⁴ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.*

¹⁵ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.*

¹⁶ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.*

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

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
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-d. **Noise Standards.** The on-site and off-site road improvements would generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment, trucks, bulldozer) at a potentially significant level (greater than 60 dB L_{eq} and 70 dB L_{max} between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 GP table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in rural regions-construction noise). However, the site is located on a large parcel in an outlying area and no sensitive receptors are located within the project vicinity. Construction operations for road improvements will require adherence to construction hours between 8:00 a.m. and 6 p.m. during weekdays and will require the heavy construction equipment to install the latest noise reduction technologies available. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant. The long-term noise impacts would be related to current vehicle traffic along Fair Pines Lane which would be under the maximum noise level thresholds in the 2004 General plan table 6-1 of 60 dB L_{dn} /CNEL or less. The road improvement activities would occur weekdays during daylight hours and would not involve extensive use of heavy equipment that would be a substantial source of noise or vibration at the residence or adjacent residences. No known changes in traffic-generated noise levels along Fair Pines Lane will occur. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

e & f. **Airport Noise.** The project site is not within the airport land use plan. There was once a private airstrip in the vicinity of the project site; however, the private airstrip is no longer functioning. There would be no aircraft-related noise impacts.

Finding

No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Mineral Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth.** The project site is in an area zoned for residential and agricultural use, utility services are available at the project site. No housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required. The proposed parcel split will create two parcels for the existing residential units. Since the underlying land use designation requires 20-acres minimum, no further land division would occur without a General Plan amendment and additional land divisions will require a loop road system for emergency vehicle circulation. There would be no impact.

Finding

The project will not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>			
e. Other government services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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.

Fire Protection. The parcel is within the Garden Valley Fire Protection District. Garden Valley Fire Protection District currently has three fire stations within the district boundary. The closest fire station is located in Garden Valley, which is approximately 2.8 miles away from the proposed parcel split. The Georgetown Divide Public Utility District’s irrigation canal which is located to the east and adjacent to the project site is listed as an emergency source of water for fire protection purposes and is in operation from May 1, to September 30th. In addition, the applicant is required to improve Fair Pines Lane and the on site road to improve emergency vehicle access to the project site. The applicants have been improving Fair Pines Lane and have an approved turn-a-round at the end of the on site access road. Both the off site and onsite access road is to have a 13’6” vertical clearance and be capable of supporting a 40,000 pound load. The project will be conditioned to comply with Department of Transportation and Fire District requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

b-e. Police Protection, Schools, Parks and Other Facilities. The additional parcel created by this map would have an incremental, but limited impact on public services and facilities. The proposed parcel split is located within the boundaries of the Georgetown Divide Recreation District (GDRD), and is therefore subjected to fees in lieu of land dedication for parks. GDRD is requesting park fees to be paid to the Recreation District as determined by the County. There are no components of the proposed project that would include any permanent population-related increases that would substantially contribute to increased demand on schools, parks, or other governmental services that could, in turn, result in the need for new or expanded facilities. The impact will be less than significant.

Finding

As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-b. **Parks and Recreation.** The proposed project as determined by the Georgetown Divide Recreation District will require park in lieu fees instead of lands dedicated for parks and recreation purposes. The proposed parcel split will provide for a minor increase in permanent population that would contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. The impact will be less than significant.

Finding

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Recreation” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X

Discussion:

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

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

a&b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** Fair Pines Lane and Highway 193 are not listed in the 2004 General Plan for roads and highways needing level of service improvements. General Plan Policy TC-Xd of the Transportation and Circulation Element addresses Level of Service (LOS) thresholds. For County maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS D in Rural regions. Policy TC-Xe: Worsen is defined as a 2% increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or the addition of 100 or more daily trips, or the addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour. The proposed project consists splitting a 40-acre parcel into two 20-acre parcels for the current residential units on the property. Fair Pines Lane being a private road, currently services 21 parcels directly and indirectly from three roads that are connected to Fair Pines Lane. The proposed parcel split will add another parcel that would be accessed by Fair Pines Lane. Typical Average Daily Trips (ADT’s) for urbanized single family residential units are 10 vehicle trips per unit with lower ADT’s or 8.3 on average in rural outlying areas. (EDC-DOT traffic counts June 2005 for Greenstone Country Subdivision). Based upon 8.3 trips per residential unit multiplied by 22 parcels would equate to 182.6 or rounded to 183 vehicle trips per day along Fair Pines Lane on average. The number of vehicles associated with the parcel split would not change current vehicle trip rates and would not measurably affect traffic volumes or levels of service on a permanent basis such that County standards would be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

d. **Hazards.** The project site is readily accessible from Fair Pines Lane. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access.** The project site receives access from Fair Pines Lane which terminates on site in a cul-de-sac. On-site road improvements are being requested to increase the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to fire safe regulations and are being placed upon the conditions of approvals for the parcel map prior to final map recording. Based upon the required road improvements there would be no disruption of emergency access to and from the existing residence or those in surrounding parcels. There would be no impact.

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

- f. **Parking.** No additional parking required for the existing residential units on the subject parcel. There would be no impact.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected because such features are not present at or adjacent to the project site. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
 - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
 - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a. **Wastewater.** The creation of two parcels for the existing residential units with their own septic systems, would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. Storm water runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). There would be no impact.
- b., d., e. **New Facilities** No new or expanded water or wastewater facilities would be required for the existing residential units since both units receive onsite ground water. There would be no impact.
- c. **Storm Water Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the project proposal and has concluded that the provisions of the drainage manual will not be required. There would be no impact.
- f & g. **Solid Waste.** No anticipated increases of solid waste generated from the existing residential units once the parcel is divided into two or affect recycling goals. There would be no impact.
- h. **Power.** Power and telephone facilities are currently in place and utilized at the project site. No further expansion of power anticipated from parcel split. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion

- a. As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have no significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources as mitigated. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be no significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV).
- b. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant. The project's contribution to changes in the visual environment has been mitigated to less-than-significant levels through project design. The cumulative contribution to the view shed would not be considerable.
- c. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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