

**EL DORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: December 20, 2006

Item No.: 5.c.

Staff: Daniel Hamilton

PARCEL MAP

FILE NUMBER: P05-0009

APPLICANT: Jeffrey and Cassandra Lafazan, 1348 Lower Lake Drive, Placerville, CA 95667

REQUEST: A tentative parcel map creating four parcels ranging in 5.0 acres to 5.6 acres on a 20-acre site.

Design waivers have been requested for the following:

1. Improvement of a privately-maintained roadway to extend beyond the County's established limit of 2,650 feet.
2. Construction of on-site roads to 20 feet wide and off-site roads to 18 feet wide, smaller than the County standard of 24 feet wide.

LOCATION: On the west side of Lower Lake Drive, approximately 1,000 feet south of the intersection with Hidden Lake Drive in the Luneman area. (Exhibit A)

APN: 105-200-21

ACREAGE: 20.06 acres

GENERAL PLAN: LDR (Exhibit B)

ZONING: Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5) (Exhibit C)

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Negative Declaration

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Conditional Approval

BACKGROUND: The application for this project, P05-0009, was submitted on October 4, 2005. A Technical Advisory Committee meeting was held on January 30, 2006 to address issues with the application and associated materials. Various revisions to maps and corresponding conditions related to the proposed changes have occurred in the intervening time period.

In 1990, the property owner applied for a tentative parcel map to subdivide the property into four lots, with similar orientation and sizes to those proposed in this application. No map was recorded, and the subject property remained as a single 40.6 acre parcel.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Project Description: The project is the subdivision of a single parcel, 20.6 acres in size, into four (4) lots ranging from 5.0 to 5.6 acres in size. The project includes design waivers for roadway improvements, including construction of a privately-maintained roadway to extend beyond the County’s established limit of 2,650 feet, as well as construction of on-site roads to 20 feet wide and off-site roads to 18 feet wide, smaller than the County standard of 24 feet wide. The proposed land use division is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance designations for the site.

Site Description: The site is a moderately sloping, heavily vegetated area within the Lotus/Cool area. Improvements to the site include an existing roadway along the southern boundary of the property, and a single-family residence along the eastern side of the site. A well and septic system are also in place on the eastern portion of the site. The site is generally surrounded by rural residential development, with five-acre lots typical for surrounding development. Access to the site is provided by a gravel driveway from Lower Lake Road. This driveway is proposed for improvement into Snow Creek Drive.

Adjacent Land Uses:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	RE-5	LDR	Rural residential, Single-family residence, roadway, well, septic
North	RE-5	LDR	Rural residential, Single-family residence
South	RE-5	LDR	Rural residential, Single-family residence
East	RE-5	LDR	Rural residential, Single-family residence
West	RE-5	LDR	Rural residential, Single-family residence

General Plan: The General Plan designates the subject site as LDR, IBC-W, and PL, which permits a minimum parcel size of five acres. The proposed five-acre parcels therefore conform to the General Plan land use designation. The following General Plan policies apply to this project:

Policy 2.2.1.2: Low-Density Residential (LDR): This land use designation establishes areas for single-family residential development in a rural setting. In Rural Regions, this designation shall provide a transition from Community Regions and Rural Centers into the agricultural, timber, and more rural areas of the County and shall be applied to those areas where infrastructure such as arterial roadways, public water, and public sewer are generally not available. This land use designation is also appropriate within Community Regions and Rural Centers where higher density serving infrastructure is not yet available. The maximum allowable density shall be one dwelling unit per 5.0 acres. Parcel size shall range from 5.0 to 10.0 acres. Within Community Regions and Rural Centers, the LDR designation shall remain in effect until a specific project is proposed that applies the appropriate level of analysis and planning and yields the necessary expansion of infrastructure.

Discussion: This subdivision provides a minimum parcel size of 5.0 acres. This is consistent with the minimum lot sizes specified in the policy.

Policy 2.2.2.3 The purpose of the Platted Lands (-PL) overlay designation is to identify isolated areas consisting of contiguous existing smaller parcels in the Rural Regions where the existing density level of the parcels would be an inappropriate land use designation for the area based on capability constraints and/or based on the existence of important natural resources. The -PL designation shall be combined with a land use designation which is indicative of the typical parcel size located within the Platted Lands boundaries. The existence of the -PL overlay cannot be used as a criteria or precedent to expand or establish new incompatible land uses.

The -PL overlay designation may also be applied to lands historically zoned with a commercial zone district combined with the Commercial (C) land use designation.

- A. Parcels within the -PL overlay designation shall not be permitted to subdivide to a size smaller than the minimum parcel size allowed by the base land use designation.
- B. -PL district boundaries shall not be modified to include additional parcels for the purpose of allowing subdivision of those additional parcels.

Discussion: The Platted Lands overlay designation is designed to identify areas where existing densities are greater than the environmental constraints would normally allow. The base land use designation for the property, LDR Low Density Residential, establishes a minimum parcel size of five acres, implemented through the Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5) zoning designation. The proposed site is a single parcel in common ownership, and the site is surrounded on all sides by existing five-acre rural residential lots. The proposed subdivision of the property would not establish any inappropriate land uses or lot sizes to the area. The project is consistent with the -PL policy of the General Plan.

Policy 2.2.5.21: Development projects shall be located and designed in a manner that avoids incompatibility with adjoining land uses that are permitted by policies in effect at the time the development project is proposed. Development projects that are potentially incompatible with existing adjoining uses shall be designed in a manner that avoids any incompatibility or shall be located on a different site.

Discussion: As discussed above, the subject site is surrounded by residential uses. The proposed subdivision will fit within the context of these existing residential uses.

Policy 5.2.1.2: An adequate quantity and quality of water for all uses, including fire protection, shall be provided for with discretionary development.

Discussion: The project can be served either by individual wells or by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). EID issued a Facility Improvement Letter on November 30, 2005 indicating that the project would require 4 EDUs of water supply. An existing 8” water line is located in Lower Lake Road, to the southeast of the site. In order to ensure adequate fire protection, the Rescue Fire Protection District has indicated that the minimum fire flow for the site is 1,000 gallons per minute for a two-hour duration, with a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi. The extension of the water line from Lower Lake Road will provide sufficient water supply and fire protection for the site.

Policy 5.7.1.1: Prior to approval of new development, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that adequate emergency water supply, storage, conveyance facilities, and access for fire protection either are or will be provided concurrent with development.

Discussion: The Rescue Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and stated that the proposed access and on-site roadways are adequate for the development.

Policy 7.4.2.9 The Important Biological Corridor (-IBC) overlay shall apply to lands identified as having high wildlife habitat values because of extent, habitat function, connectivity, and other factors. Lands located within the overlay district shall be subject to the following provisions except that where the overlay is applied to lands that are also subject to the Agricultural District (-A) overlay or that are within the Agricultural Lands (AL) designation, the land use restrictions associated with the -IBC policies will not apply to the extent that the agricultural practices do not interfere with the purposes of the -IBC overlay.

- *Increased minimum parcel size;*

Discussion: The project is within an area already developed with five acre parcels. The site is completely surrounded by such development, and the habitat value of the site is limited by existing constraints posed by surrounding development. The five-acre parcel sizes proposed in the project are warranted given the site location and conditions.

- *Higher canopy-retention standards and/or different mitigation standards/thresholds for oak woodlands;*

Discussion: The site is approximately 80 percent covered by existing canopy. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires the retention of 60 percent of the canopy. The proposed project includes 94 percent retention of existing vegetation and canopy cover. This increase in retention is consistent with the requirement of the policy.

- *Lower thresholds for grading permits;*

Discussion: Grading is proposed only for improvements to Snow Creek Drive and the proposed building and driveway locations. The buildings and improvements have all been located at the southern end of the project parcel to reduce overall site disturbance and preserve the greatest amount of continuous vegetation. This will result in an overall reduction in grading. A grading permit will still be required as a result of proposed grading operations.

- *Higher wetlands/riparian retention standards and/or more stringent mitigation requirements for wetland/riparian habitat loss;*

Discussion: No wetlands or riparian habitats are located on the project site. There are no impacts to these areas, thus mitigation and habitat loss of this variety will not occur on the site.

- *Increased riparian corridor and wetland setbacks;*

Discussion: See discussion above. No wetlands or riparian habitats exist on the site. Thus, no increase in setbacks is necessary to ensure the protection of these habitat types.

- *Greater protection for rare plants (e.g., no disturbance at all or disturbance only as recommended by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/California Department of Fish and Game);*

Discussion: The driveway and building pad locations have been placed at the southernmost possible location, resulting in the least site disturbance feasible for development of the site. The impact to rare plants is limited given these conditions

- *Standards for retention of contiguous areas/large expanses of other (non-oak or non-sensitive) plant communities;*

Discussion: See discussion above. The improvements to the site have been designed to ensure the greatest potential preservation of contiguous open space on the site. This will ensure the retention of any existing plant communities on site.

- *Building permits discretionary or some other type of “site review” to ensure that canopy is retained;*

Discussion: Canopy retention is part of this staff report, as well as the CEQA Negative Declaration and Conditions of Approval. Building permit issuance is contingent upon the fulfillment of these conditions, ensuring canopy retention called out on application exhibits.

- *More stringent standards for lot coverage, floor area ratio (FAR), and building height; and*

Discussion: The LDR land use designation does not have a floor area ratio requirement. The implementing Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5) zoning designation also has no FAR limitation. Building heights are limited to 45 feet under the Zoning Ordinance. Building heights are not

proposed within the parcel map application, although typical residential structures in the area are well below this height as well.

- *No hindrances to wildlife movement (e.g., no fences that would restrict wildlife movement).*

Discussion: The proposed project does not indicate fence construction for the proposed improvements. There are no identified wildlife movement corridors through the site, as existing five-acre developments surrounding the site limit potential routes for migrating animals.

Policy 7.4.4.4: For all new development projects (not including agricultural cultivation and actions pursuant to an approved Fire Safe Plan necessary to protect existing structures, both of which are exempt from this policy) that would result in soil disturbance on parcels that (1) are over an acre and have at least 1 percent total canopy cover or (2) are less than an acre and have at least 10 percent total canopy cover by woodlands habitats as defined in this General Plan and determined from base line aerial photography or by site survey performed by a qualified biologist or licensed arborist, the County shall require one of two mitigation options: (1) the project applicant shall adhere to the tree canopy retention and replacement standards described below; or (2) the project applicant shall contribute to the County's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) conservation fund described in Policy 7.4.2.8.

Option A

The County shall apply the following tree canopy retention standards:

Percent Existing Canopy Cover	Canopy Cover to be Retained
80–100	60 percent of existing canopy
60–79	70 percent of existing canopy
40–59	80 percent of existing canopy
20–39	85 percent of existing canopy
10–19	90 percent of existing canopy
1–9 for parcels > 1 acre	90 percent of existing canopy

Discussion: The applicant submitted a tree canopy analysis which determined that existing tree canopy at the site is approximately 80 percent. Estimated tree canopy retention after road improvements and lot development is 94 percent. The project will include the removal of limited trees on the southern boundary of the site. Building envelopes identified on project application materials confirm that the project is consistent with General Plan tree canopy retention policies.

Conclusion: Staff finds after review of the above policies that the project, as conditioned, conforms to the General Plan.

Zoning: The project site is zoned Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5). The project is consistent with the existing zoning on the site.

Design Waivers: Two design waivers have been requested by the applicant for this project.

1. Improvement of a privately-maintained roadway to extend beyond the County's established limit of 2,650 feet.
2. Construction of on-site roads to 20 feet wide and off-site roads to 18 feet wide, smaller than the County standard of 24 feet wide.

Discussion: The proposed design waivers have been reviewed and approved by the Department of Transportation (DOT) and Rescue Fire Protection District with findings listed in Attachment 2 of the staff report. Planning staff concurs with DOT and the Fire District recommendation for approval as the 18 feet and 20 feet roadways, as well as the distance from a publicly-maintained road, will provide sufficient access and fire protection to the site and other properties accessed from Lower Lake Road and Snow Creek Drive.

Other Issues: The following agencies commented on the project:

Water Supply and Fire Suppression: The project can be served by either wells or El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Fire suppression requirements necessitate that EID serve the project, as fire flow requirements cannot be met by wells. Both EID and the Rescue Fire Protection District have commented on the project and are able to serve the project, as designed.

Air Quality: The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District reviewed the project and determined that the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality.

Cultural Resources: As previously discussed, no significant cultural resources exist at the site.

Drainage and Grading: The El Dorado County Resource Conservation District reviewed the project and had no comments.

Surveyor's Office: The Surveyor's Office reviewed the proposed project and noted that survey monuments must be set and roads named through the Surveyor's Office prior to final map filing.

Utilities: Pacific Gas and Electric Company reviewed the proposal and had no comments.

Wastewater: As proposed, the Environmental Management Department - Environmental Health Division, has commented that an adequate area for sewage disposal shall be identified for the proposed undeveloped parcels and recorded on the final map. A site evaluation and soils report will be required by a registered professional capable of determining site specific soil properties, geologic factors, and hydrologic conditions.

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 fair argument that the proposed project could create a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration has been prepared.

NOTE: This project is located within or adjacent to an area which has wildlife resources (riparian lands, wetlands, watercourse, native plant life, rare plants, threatened and endangered plants or animals, etc.), and was referred to the California Department of Fish and Game. In accordance with *State Legislation (California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4)*, the project is subject to a fee of \$1,285.⁰⁰ after approval, but prior to the County filing the Notice of Determination on the project. This fee, less \$35.⁰⁰ processing fee, is forwarded to the State Department of Fish and Game and is used to help defray the cost of managing and protecting the State’s fish and wildlife resources.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Zoning Administrator take the following actions:

1. Adopt the Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff;
2. Approve Tentative Parcel Map P05-0009, as the required findings can be made as noted in Attachment 2 based on the analysis in the staff report and the modification of the project to include conditions itemized in Attachment 1.
3. Approve the following Design Waivers, as findings have been made as noted in Attachment 2:
 - a. Allow improvement of a privately-maintained roadway to extend beyond the County’s established limit of 2,650 feet.
 - b. Allow construction of on-site roads to 20 feet wide and off-site roads to 18 feet wide, smaller than the County standard of 24 feet wide.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

Attachments To Staff Report:

Attachment 1Conditions of Approval
 Attachment 2Findings
 Exhibit AVicinity Map
 Exhibit BGeneral Plan Land Use Map
 Exhibit CZoning Map
 Exhibit DTentative Parcel Map
 Exhibit EEnvironmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts

ATTACHMENT 1 CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

**File Number P 05-0009 - Lafazan
December 20, 2006 Zoning Administrator Hearing**

1. This Tentative Parcel Map approval is based upon and limited to compliance with the project description, dated December 20, 2006, and Conditions of Approval set forth below. Any deviations from the project description, exhibits or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the County for conformity with this approval. Deviations may require approved changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.

The project description is as follows:

The "Project" is for a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide a 20.6 acre parcel into four lots ranging from 5.0 to 5.6 acres in size. The project includes design waivers for roadway improvements, including construction of a privately-maintained roadway to extend beyond the County's established limit of 2,650 feet, as well as construction of on-site roads to 20 feet wide and off-site roads to 18 feet wide, smaller than the County standard of 24 feet wide.

STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Department of Transportation

1. The road preparation and graded access road width shall be to minimum County road standards, but the minimum width of surfacing shall not be less than eighteen (18) feet, with 2 foot shoulders, and must have a stable all-weather gravel or paved surface, per Standard Plan 101C.
2. The following Fire Safe Standards apply to this project:
 - Access Routes – recommends at least two different public ingress/egress routes on all roads.
 - Road width – shall be a minimum of two nine foot traffic lanes.
 - Road surface – shall support 40,000 pounds load
 - Roadway grades – shall not exceed 16 percent
 - Roadway radius – shall have a minimum inside radius of 50 feet. Additional 4 feet of road surface for 50-100 foot radius and 2 additional feet for 100-200 foot radius.
 - Turnarounds required on driveways and dead end roads. Minimum radius 40 feet, 60 foot minimum length of hammerhead tee.
 - Turnouts – shall have minimum 25 foot tapers on each end of the taper.
 - Roadway structures – shall carry at least the maximum load and clearance required by Vehicle Code 35550, 35760 and 35250. One way bridges must have unobstructed visibility from one end to the other, and must have turnouts at each end.

- One way roads – minimum of one 10 foot traffic lane. Shall connect to a two lane roadway at both ends. No more that 10 dwelling units, and shall not exceed 2640 feet. A turnout is required at middle.
 - Driveways – minimum 10 foot traffic lane, maximum 800 feet long; turnout for over 150 feet in length, and at all building sites when over 300 feet long.
 - Gate entrances – shall be two feet wider than the width of the traffic lane, shall be located at least 30 feet from the roadway.
 - Bridges – shall have minimum load of 40,000 lb, no narrower than the driving portion of the road. Major ingress/egress bridges minimum 80,000 lb.
3. Applicant shall submit an improvement plan prepared by a professional civil engineer to the Department for review and approval for, and construct onsite roads for an 18 foot roadway and 50 foot right of way per Standard Plan 101C, prior to occupancy of any parcel. The 50 foot right of way width may include the 15 foot right of way on the adjacent property, however if the road diverges from the property boundary it must still be in a minimum 50 foot right of way.
 4. Applicant shall submit an improvement plan prepared by a professional civil engineer to the Department for review and approval for, and construct offsite roads to Lower Lake Drive and to Hidden Lake Drive for a 20 foot roadway and 50 foot right of way per Standard Plan 101C, prior to occupancy of any parcel.
 5. As the distance to the property from a County maintained road exceeds 2,650 feet, the applicant shall obtain a waiver from the Director of Development Services prior to the filing of the parcel map.
 6. Applicant shall create or an entity, acceptable to the County, to maintain roads that are not already in the Hidden Lake Zone of Benefit.
 7. Applicant shall pay traffic impact fees effective at the time of building permit application.
 8. If site grading exceeds the requirements of the County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, applicant shall submit a site improvement/grading plan prepared by a professional civil engineer for review and approval. The plan shall be in conformance with the County of El Dorado “Design and Improvement Standards Manual”, the “Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance”, the “Drainage Manual”, the “Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance”, and the State of California Handicapped Accessibility Standards.
 9. If blasting activities are to occur in conjunction with grading or improvements, applicant shall ensure that such blasting activities are conducted in compliance with state and local regulations.
 10. If burning activities are to occur during the construction of the project improvements, applicant shall obtain the necessary burning permits from the California Department of Forestry and air pollution permits from the County prior to said burning activities.

11. The location of fire hydrants and systems for fire flows are to meet the requirements of the Rescue Fire Protection District.
12. The emergency vehicle circulation requirements for roads and driveways, and the location of hydrants, shall be shown on the improvement plans, which shall be subject to the approval of the Rescue Fire Protection District. The Department of Transportation will require plans to meet Fire Safe Standards, but only the Fire Protection District may waive or relax those Fire Safe Standards.
13. If human remains are discovered at any time during the grading or improvement phase, the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted per Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.89 of the Public Resources Code. If archaeological artifacts are discovered, the developer shall retain an archaeologist to make recommendations for the treatment of the artifacts. Treatment of Native American remains or archaeological artifacts shall be the responsibility of the developer and shall be subject to the review and approval of the County Planning Director.
14. The applicant shall provide a soils report at time of grading permit application addressing, at a minimum, grading practices, compaction, slope stability of existing and proposed cuts and fills, erosion potential, ground water, pavement section based on TI and R values, and recommended design criteria for any retaining walls.
15. Any import to be borrowed, or export to be deposited, within El Dorado County, shall require an additional grading permit for that offsite grading.
16. The applicant shall provide a drainage report at time of grading permit application, consistent with the Drainage Manual and the Storm Water Management Plan, which addresses storm water runoff increase, impacts to downstream facilities and properties, and identification of appropriate storm water quality management practices to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation.
17. Upon completion of and required improvements, and prior to acceptance of the improvements by the County, the developer will provide a CD to DOT with the approved drainage and geotechnical reports in PDF format and the approved record drawings in TIF format.

Fire District

18. A fire hydrant shall be installed on the north side of Lower Lake Dr., in compliance with the provisions of the U.F.C. Section 10.301(c), in a location with type and size acceptable to the Rescue Fire Protection District and E.I.D.. A letter of compliance with the condition shall be submitted by the fire district to the Surveyor's Office at the time of filing the parcel map.
19. A Fuel Modification and Wildland Fire Safety Plan by a registered forester, acceptable to the fire district and the California Department of Forestry, shall be implemented. A letter of compliance with this condition shall be submitted by the fire district to the Surveyor's Office at the time of filing the parcel map.

20. A 20 foot through road meeting D.O.T. standards shall be installed from Lower Lake Dr. to Hidden Lake Dr. without gates
21. Must meet all requirements of the California SRA Fire Safe Regulations and California Fire Code 2001 Edition.

Planning Services

22. The subdivision is subject to parkland dedication in-lieu fees. The fees shall be \$150.⁰⁰ and shall be paid to the County Surveyor's Office for CSA 9, Zone of Benefit.
23. Pursuant to Resolution 205-98, a rare plant mitigation fee of \$386 per single family residential parcel shall be paid. There are four parcels, and a fee of \$1544 shall be paid.
24. Domestic water shall be supplied by EID with a minimum six-inch water line to the property being divided, and a water meter award letter or similar assurance from the water purveyor, guaranteeing water service upon demand to each of the parcels created, shall be submitted to the County Surveyor at the time of filing the parcel map.

Environmental Management

25. Show all drainages on the parcel map that may have an effect on the location of septic systems.
26. Subject to Environmental Health approval as required in the Minor Land Division Ordinance.
27. All existing wells and individual septic systems shall be identified on the tentative map.
28. Prior to the final map, the applicant shall provide for the following:
 - 1) A safe and reliable water supply for each parcel, and an adequate area for sewage disposal
 - 2) An adequate area for sewage disposal shall be identified for the proposed undeveloped parcels and recorded on the final map. A site evaluation and soil description report shall be submitted to this office prior to recording the final map. The report will only be accepted from registered engineers, registered geologists, or registered environmental health specialists qualified to perform soil and site evaluations and capable of determining site specific soil properties geologic factors and hydrological conditions.

County Surveyor

29. The access road serving the development shall be named by filing a completed Private Road Name Petition with the County Surveyor's Office prior to filing the parcel map.
30. The applicant shall provide proof of access to a State- or County-maintained road as defined by Section 16.44.120(B)(2) with the legal right to improve that access as required by the County Design Manual. A Guarantee of Record provided by a title company shall be presented to the County Surveyor's Office prior to filing the final or parcel map.
31. The developer shall enter into an agreement with the School Districts to pay the sum of \$8,288.⁰⁰ per residential unit constructed within the boundaries of the subdivision. The agreement shall provide for an annual adjustment in the fee by the increase in the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index. This annual adjustment is based upon a base amount of \$8,288.⁰⁰ as of January 1, 1997. The increase shall be calculated by the Districts as of January 1 of each year and implemented on July 1 of each year. The applicant should contact the County Office of Education prior to the issuance of any building permits to verify the applicable fee at the time of building permit issuance. The fee shall be payable by the owner of record at the time the building permit is issued and the agreement or a notice of restriction shall be recorded on the property to alert subsequent owners of this obligation. (NOTE: Not applicable unless application includes a zone change)
32. Prior to the filing of a parcel map, if the subject property is subject to liens for assessment or bonds, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 66493, the owner or subdivider shall do one of the following: (a) Pay the assessment or bond in full; (b) File security with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors; or (c) File with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors the necessary certificate indicating that provisions have been made for the segregation of bond assessment responsibility, pursuant to Government Code Section 66493(d).
33. All survey monuments must be set prior to the filing the Parcel Map.
34. Prior to filing the Parcel Map, a letter to the County Surveyor will be required for all agencies that have conditions placed on the map. The letter will state that all conditions placed on the map by that agency have been met.

Public Utilities

35. The road and utility easements must be locatable by means of a survey.
36. This specific language shall be put on the parcel map and make references to that easement:

"We the undersigned, as Owner's of the land shown hereon, do hereby state that we are the only persons whose consent is necessary to pass clear title to said land and do hereby consent to the preparation and recordation of this map and offer for dedication and do hereby dedicate for public uses the Public Utility Easements (PUE) shown on this map for public utility purposes including electric, gas, communication facilities, and all other public

utility purposes; together with any and all appurtenances thereto, including the right from time to time to trim and to cut down and clear away or otherwise control any trees or brush. The PUE's hereby offered for dedication are building, structure and well restricted and the construction thereof is prohibited."

Wildland Fire Safety

37. Lots shall be landscaped to Firescaping Standards Zones I and II (100 feet). Homeowner shall be responsible for meeting this requirement within one year of occupancy of the structure.
38. Driveways over 150 feet shall provide for a turnout near the midpoint of the driveway. Vertical clearance for the entire length of the driveway will be 15 feet. The homeowners shall be responsible for fulfillment of this requirement.
39. Decks that are cantilevered over the natural slope shall be enclosed. The homeowners shall be responsible for fulfillment of this requirement.
40. Firescaping standards will be implemented to the building front and side yard to the lot lines, regardless of the distance to these lines.
41. Rock outcroppings are part of the firescaping.
42. Windows on the site of the structure, less than 30 feet from a property line, shall have tempered metal framed glass.
43. Doors on the sides of the structure, less than 30 feet from the property lines, shall be self closing and one hour rated.
44. Rafter tails shall be enclosed with noncombustible material on the sides of the structure which are less than 30 feet from the property line.
45. Exterior wall sheathing shall be one hour rated noncombustible sheathing on the sides of the structure less than 30 feet from the property line.
46. Gutters and downspouts shall be noncombustible.
47. Attic and floor vents shall be covered with one-quarter inch of less noncombustible mesh and horizontal with the ground.
48. At least every five years the Fire Department may review the Wildfire Fire Safe Plan at the request of HOA to determine if additional fuel hazard reduction work is necessary.
49. A Notice of Restriction shall be filed with the final subdivision map which stipulates that a Wildfire Fire Safe Plan has been prepared and wildfire mitigation measures must be implemented.

50. The project shall meet all the Public Resources Codes 4290 as amended by the 1991 SRA Fire Safe Regulations, and County and Fire Department Ordinances.
51. A legal entity (HOA, CSD, etc) shall be created with authority for maintaining and enforcing all fuel treatment mitigation measures if homeowners fail to implement or maintain. Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions must be developed to ensure the enforcement of structure Fire Safe regulations.
52. The fire hydrant system shall meet the California Fire Code specifications for water volume and pressure.
53. The fire hydrant location shall be approved by the Rescue Fire Protection District prior to installation.
54. The homeowner/property owner is responsible for any future fire safe or building code changes adopted by the State or local authority when a new building permit is issued.
55. Driveways over 16 percent grade shall be paved.
56. All driveways must be a minimum of 12 feet wide.
57. All gates must be at least two (2) feet wider than the driveway they gate and inset from the road at least 30 feet.
58. Brushing of the road shoulders shall be maintained annually by June 1.
59. The new road name shall be posted to County DOT standards upon completion of the road.
60. There shall not be any gate on the new road.

ATTACHMENT 2 FINDINGS

File Number P 05-0009 - Lafazan December 20, 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 and considered 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. A de minimis finding on the project's effect on fish and wildlife resources cannot be found and the project is therefore subject to the payment of State Fish and Game fees pursuant to State Legislation (California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4).
- 1.2** The County finds that through feasible conditions placed upon the project, impacts on the environment have been eliminated or substantially mitigated.
- 1.3** 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 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS

2.1 Tentative Parcel Map

The tentative parcel map consists of subdividing a 20.6 acres parcel into four lots ranging from 5.0 to 5.6 acres in size.

2.1.2 The proposed tentative map, including design and improvements, is consistent with the General Plan policies and land use map.

As proposed, the tentative map conforms to the Medium-Density Residential General Plan land use designation and applicable General Plan policies including access, tree canopy retention, water service, wetland setbacks, grading, transportation, fire protection, and wastewater disposal.

2.1.3 The proposed tentative map conforms to the applicable standards and requirements of the County's zoning regulations and the Major Land Division Ordinance.

As proposed and with the approval of the requested design waivers, the tentative map conforms to the development standards within the One-acre Residential (R1A) Zone District and the Major Land Division Ordinance.

2.1.4 The site is physically suitable for the proposed type and density of development.

As shown on the Development Constraints Map (Exhibit F), adequate building areas for each lot are available considering the required septic replacement area, wetland setbacks, tree canopy retention, zoning setbacks, and fire safe standards. As such, the site is physically suitable for the proposed type and density of development.

2.1.5 The proposed subdivision is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage.

The proposed subdivision is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage with the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Attachment 1.

3.0 Design Waiver Findings

A Design Waiver has been requested to allow for roadway improvements, including construction of a privately-maintained roadway to extend beyond the County's established limit of 2,650 feet, as well as construction of on-site roads to 20 feet wide and off-site roads to 18 feet wide, smaller than the County standard of 24 feet wide.

3.1 There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver.

The applicant is requesting to waive the county standard 24 feet wide roadways, per standard plan 101C. Applicant requests 20 feet wide on-site road and 18 feet off-site road surfaces to reduce the removal of trees. The land is designated as important biological corridor. Reducing the removal of trees by reducing the width of the roadway fulfills County goals of environmental protection. The applicant is also requesting a waiver to allow for private roads to extend beyond the 2,650 feet limit from county roads. The closest county maintained road, Luneman Road, is more than 2,650 feet away from the current owner access road, Snow Creek Drive. The private road runs along the south side of the parcel. That private road needs to be updated to current standards, and expanded. Granting a design waiver will allow for improvement of the on-site and off-site roadways while reducing overall tree removal and ensuring adequate public safety access to the site.

3.2 Strict application of County design and improvement requirements would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property.

Strict application of the design and improvement requirements would require a wider sidewalk resulting in an increased amount of project grading and potential tree removal. The Department of Transportation and Rescue Fire Protection District have reviewed the design waiver request and have no objections.

3.3 The adjustment or waivers would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public.

The waiver will not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public as the requested waivers will reduce project impacts to visual resources, such as tree canopy, and earth disturbances. As proposed, the reduced roadway width and distance from a publicly maintained roadway will allow the subdivision to operate effectively without limiting emergency access or public use.

3.4 The waivers would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of Article II of Chapter 16 of the County Code or any other ordinance applicable to the division.

The granting of the design waivers requested would not result in the nullifying of Article II of Chapter 16 of the County Code, nor any other ordinance applicable to this division.



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Parcel Map P05-0009

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

Contact Person: Daniel Hamilton

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Jeffrey and Cassandra Lafazan, 1348 Lower Lake Drive, Placerville

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Same as owner

Project Agent's Name and Address:

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Designtech, 5461 Starkes Grade Road, Pollack Pines

Project Location: 1348 Lower Lake Drive, Placerville, CA

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 105-200-21

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

Section: 27 **T:** 11N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: LDR - Low Density Residential

Description of Project: The project is for a Parcel Map to subdivide a 20.6 acre site into four (4) parcels ranging in size from 5.0 to 5.6 acres. The project includes design waivers for roadway improvements along the southern boundary of the property. These design waivers would include private maintenance of Snow Creek Drive, construction of a private roadway more than 2,650 feet from a public road, and reduction in road widths to 20 feet onsite and 18 feet offsite.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

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

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The site is a moderately sloping, heavily vegetated within the Lotus/Cool area. Improvements to the site include an existing roadway along the southern boundary of the property, and a single-family residence along the eastern side of the site. A well and septic system are also in place on the eastern portion of the site. Soils located on the site are Auburn silt loam and Delpiedra loam, both found commonly throughout the area.

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

El Dorado County Department of Environmental Health, El Dorado County Building Department

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

	Aesthetics		Agriculture 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: November 15, 2006

Printed Name: Gina Hunter, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, 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) The project site is not visible from a scenic vista. No scenic vistas are identified in the General Plan within the immediate vicinity. There is no impact.
- (b) The project site is not located within or near a state scenic highway. The site would not result in the creation of any structures or changes which could impact views from a state scenic highway. There is no impact.
- (c) The proposed project would create four (4) residential lots in a rural area, each approximately five acres in size. With existing development on the eastern most lot, it is likely that the project would result in the construction of three additional single-family residences on the newly created lots. The home locations, placed on the southern end of the new lots to minimize site disturbance and avoid steep slopes, minimizes visibility of the new homes from the surrounding area. Building envelopes and improvement locations are shown on the Tentative Parcel Map. The impact is less than significant.
- (d) The development of proposed homes and supporting infrastructure would represent a slight change to the existing visual environment, introducing new sources of lighting within and around the home sites. The removal of vegetation for home sites would also represent a slight change to existing visual conditions. The impact would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

- (a) The site is currently zoned as RE-5, which is a residential designation. The site is not actively used in agriculture, nor is any adjacent property. Soils on the site are not identified by the California Department of Conservation as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland. There would be no impact.
- (b) There is no active agricultural use on the property, and no Williamson Act contracts are in place for the property. There would be no impact.
- (c) The project would result in the creation of additional single-family residential lots in an area characterized by rural residential land uses. The project would not create any additional pressures on adjacent or nearby agricultural lands to convert to a non-agricultural use. There would be no impact.

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

Discussion:

The project would result in the creation of lots allowing the construction of three new single-family homes. Construction would include supporting infrastructure, including extension of utility lines, expansion of roads, construction of driveways, and related improvements.

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

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

The project involves the subdivision of the property into four lots, allowing the development of three additional homes on the site. Additional improvements such as roadway improvement and grading would also require the use of construction vehicles. Construction and operational emissions from potential home development on the site could produce minor amounts of air pollutants, including PM₁₀, CO, SO₂, and NO_x, although not at levels near the thresholds listed above.

- (a) The approval and construction of the project would not affect the implementation of any regional air quality attainment plan or program. The project is required to follow the standard rules of the El Dorado Air Quality Management District, which provide for basic and reasonable mitigation of air quality impacts generated by the project. The impact would be less than significant.
- (b) The project would not create air quality impacts which could cause a significant contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation. Construction activities associated with the project include grading and site improvements for roadway expansion, driveway, home, and building pad construction, and associated on-site activities. The project's impacts to regional air quality violations would be less than significant.
- (c) The cumulative contribution to air quality pollutant levels is expected to be minor. The El Dorado Air Quality Management District has noted that there are existing cumulative air quality problems within El Dorado County, which can be exacerbated by construction activities. The scale of construction required for this project is considered small, and the potential impacts generated by these activities are minor. The impact would be less than significant.
- (d) The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No schools, hospitals, parks, or other land uses with high usage levels by children and those with adverse health impacts are located within the immediate vicinity. The impact would be less than significant.
- (e) The project would not result in the creation of objectionable odors for residents in the area. Construction odors can be considered objectionable by some residents in the area. These odors would be sporadic and temporary, and their potential to impact residents or visitors to the area is limited and unlikely. The impact would be less than significant.

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	

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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. – e. The site is located within the Lotus/Coloma area of western El Dorado County, which contains a variety of sensitive habitats and species. The El Dorado County General Plan designates this site as an Important Biological Corridor (IBC), and the site is also located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2. The area is characterized by gently to heavily sloping lands with significant vegetative cover, ranging from large oak and pine trees to scattered low brushes and shrubbery.

The -IBC overlay designation was developed specifically to protect biological resources in the foothill region where they are most threatened by urban development. The -IBC overlay designation identifies core areas important for wildlife forage, cover, and migration, and areas of relatively intact native vegetation in more urbanized areas of the County. The intent of this overlay designation is to provide continuous corridors of vegetation and to provide connectivity between areas of more extensive natural vegetation or greater environmental protection (e.g., to/from areas having Natural Resources, Open Space, and/or Agricultural base land use designations). The -IBC designation covers a total of approximately 70,210 acres, including approximately 11,600 acres of annual grassland, 7,450 acres of blue oak woodland, and 900 acres of blue oak-foothill pine habitat.

The location of the site within an -IBC overlay zone adds additional land use considerations to the consideration of entitlements approvals, including the increasing of the minimum parcel size, higher canopy retention of tree cover, and additional building location criteria to preserve wetland, forest, and rare plant areas. Building envelopes have been placed on the southern end of the site, closer to the existing roadway, to minimize site disturbance and preserve larger expanses of undisturbed land on the northern portion of the site. No wetlands exist on site, thus no additional conditions are necessary to ensure preservation of wetlands. Because the site is located within both the -IBC zone and the Platted Lands (-PL) zone, increasing the minimum parcel size is not appropriate, and would not serve to add significant preservation aspects to the site.

The site is also located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2. This area corresponds to the service area for the El Dorado Irrigation District, and represents areas known to contain rare plants. A regional fund has been established to mitigate the impacts of development, and fees have been determined to ensure adequate funding of the program. The current fee of \$386 per residential unit would apply to this project, as specified in Resolution 205-98, passed by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors. Payment of this fee is sufficient to offset impacts to rare plants, as identified in the County General Plan.

f. There is no Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan covering the site. There is no impact.

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		X	

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
unique geologic feature?			
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X	

Discussion:

The project may have a significant impact on cultural resources if it causes substantial adverse changes in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as set forth by the California Register of Historic Places and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; directly or indirectly destroys a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturbs any human remains, including those interred in formal cemeteries. No cultural, paleontological, or archeological resources were identified in a cultural records search of the property. Existing regulations are sufficient to ensure that any unknown artifacts identified in construction of improvements to the site would be mitigated. The impacts to cultural resources are less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
 - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) The project site is not located within the vicinity of a major fault zone, according to maps contained in the El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR. The closest major fault to the site is the inferred portion of the Bear Mountain Fault, located to the west of the project site. The California Department of Conservation does not list the site or nearby areas as within any Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, nor is El Dorado County listed as one of the counties affected by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Without the potential for major geologic activity in the vicinity of the project, there is a very low potential for earthquake, strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslide. Proposed grading and site improvements would not sufficiently alter the site to create additional impacts. The impacts would be less than significant.
 - b) Erosion and loss of topsoil are caused by site grading, removal of vegetation, altering of drainage patterns, and other activities which have the potential to cause soil to loosen at the ground surface and exit the site, either through winds or carried by water. There is no extensive grading proposed for the project, nor is there a significant removal of vegetation necessary to subdivide and develop the lots. Drainage patterns have been preserved, thus no additional areas of the site would be subject to new drainage patterns which may increase runoff and erosion. The impacts would be less than significant.
 - c) The soils on the site consist of Auburn silt loam (AxD) and Delpiedra loam and clay loam (DeE). Both soil types are considered stable, and the lack of fault activity in the area results in a very low probability for changes in soil resulting from geologic activity. The impact would be less than significant.
 - d) Auburn silt loam and Delpiedra loam are not classified as expansive soils, according to the Uniform Building Code. A small portion of the site is Delpiedra clay loam, which has a moderate potential for expansiveness. No construction is planned for the areas of the site shown to contain this soil type, and existing building code requirements would ensure that adequate fill material is placed on any site where expansive soils are shown to exist during construction. The impact would be less than significant.
 - e) The soils on the site are appropriate and able to accommodate septic systems. The El Dorado County Department of Environmental Health has existing regulations in place to ensure that soil types, leach field areas, and slopes are appropriate for the type of system proposed. The impact would be less than significant.

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

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	

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) through h) The site is not located on a known hazardous materials property, as identified on State and Federal databases. The site has been in use as rural lands and rural residential property for its known history. There are no school sites within one-quarter mile of the site, nor are there public or private airports or air strips within two miles of the site.

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

Hazardous materials would be used in the construction of the homes and improvements associated with the project. Fuels for vehicles, landscaping chemicals and herbicides, and similar small-scale hazardous chemicals are typically used in some construction and roadway construction. The safe use and storage of these materials is required by federal law, and safety information for all such products is included on packaging materials and labels. The routine use of these materials by construction personnel and homeowners does not result in significant adverse health impacts in typical circumstances.

The site is located within a relatively rural area, with grasslands and vegetation capable of supporting or spreading a wildland fire. The County General Plan has assigned a Fire Hazard Rating of High to the site, indicating a high risk of damage from wildland fire. A Wildfire Fire Safe Plan, approved by the Fire District, is required to ensure that proposed home sites and construction activities are designed to reduce this risk. A Fire Safe Plan has been prepared for the site, and recommendations of the Plan are required conditions of the project approval. Combined with existing building code requirements, the Fire Safe Plan recommendations are sufficient to ensure the risks associated with fire damage to persons and structures would be less than significant.

The site is not located within an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos. Asbestos is a carcinogen which can cause significant adverse health impacts on humans and animals if inhaled in large quantities or over long periods of time. No mitigation measures are required to address impacts to hazards and their potential impacts on human health.

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

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?		X
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		X
j.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		X

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
 - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) The project would include grading for the proposed roadway along the southern boundary of the project site, as well as grading for home sites on the southern end of the proposed lots. Septic systems are proposed for the additional homes, and existing requirements of the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Health are sufficient to ensure that no wastewater discharge requirements would be violated as a result of the installation and operation of the septic systems. The impact would be less than significant.
 - b) The project would create new impervious surfaces through the expansion of the roadway and the creation of building pads and driveways. The impact of these additional impervious surfaces would affect less than 10 percent of the total lot area, and would not create significant changes to the groundwater recharge abilities of the site. The impact would be less than significant.
 - c) The proposed improvements would not significantly alter the existing drainage patterns on the site. The drainage follows natural low points in elevation across the site, and would continue to do so following the proposed grading and improvements to portions of the site. Substantial erosion is not expected to occur from these activities. The impacts would be less than significant.
 - d) The proposed improvements would not significantly alter the existing drainage patterns on the site. The drainage follows natural low points in elevation across the site, and would continue to do so following the proposed grading and improvements to portions of the site. Flooding is not expected to occur from these activities. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

- e) Grading and improvements would alter the drainage patterns on the site, and may result in a minor increase in runoff from the site. The impacts of such changes would be minor, and no overloading of the storm drainage system is expected to occur. The impact is less than significant.
- f) See discussion above. No other components of the project are expected to further degrade water quality in the area or on the site. The impact would be less than significant.
- g) The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (FIRM Panel 060040 0450 B). Thus, no housing is proposed within the 100-year floodplain. There would be no impact.
- h) See item g) above. There would be no impact.
- i) The site is not located within a dam inundation zone or within the probable flood area from any area levee. There would be no impact.
- j) The site is not located near any body of water sufficient in size to create a seiche, tsunami, or in a geologically active area sufficient to induce a mudflow. There would be 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) - c) The project is located in a rural residential area of El Dorado County, and is substantially surrounded by rural residential development. The project would not physically divide any existing community, nor would the project result in any conflicts with existing HCP, NCCP, or existing policy adopted to mitigate an environmental impact. For a full

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

discussion of the consistency of the project with the biological protection ordinances of the County, refer to the Biological Resources section of this Initial Study. There would be less than a significant 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) - (b) The project site is not located on property known to contain mineral resources. The site is not classified MRZ-2x in the Zoning Ordinance, or identified in the General Plan as a location of known resources. There would be no impact.

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

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

- 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) Noise would be generated on the site from construction associated with the new homes and improvements to the roadways and driveways. This noise generation would be required to comply with the County’s noise ordinance, limiting the amount and duration of noises produced in residential areas. Construction times are limited to daytime hours, and the noise generation would be intermittent and temporary in nature. The impacts would be less than significant.
- b) Ground borne vibrations are associated with heavy vehicles (i.e. railroad) and with heavy equipment operations. Vehicle traffic generated by the Project would be typical of traffic generated by the adjacent residential uses; passenger cars and trucks, which are not a source of significant vibration. The impact would be less than significant.
- c) The noise generated during construction would be temporary in nature. Subdivision of the land and construction and operation of the three additional homes would result in periodic noise generation from the use of vehicles, noises generated on home sites, and landscape maintenance. The overall effect on the ambient noise level would be less than significant.
- d) As noted above, the construction aspects of the project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels. The increase associated with this construction would be relative to the type of equipment used in residential construction which does not result in significant noise generation. Given the low ambient noise level in the area of the project site, and the limited nature of the construction anticipated, the impact would be less than significant.
- e) The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport or airstrip. There would be no impact.
- f) The project site is not located within two miles of an airstrip. There would 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

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

- Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.

a) - c) The project would create three additional residential lots in an area characterized by rural residential development. The project would not displace any existing housing or persons, and would create no additional need for housing in the region. Roadways and utilities already exist in the area, and the project would not facilitate any additional growth as a result of project implementation. There would be 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>				
a. Fire protection?			X	
b. Police protection?			X	
c. Schools?			X	
d. Parks?			X	
e. Other government services?			X	

Discussion:

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

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

a) Public services are provided to the site by various County and special district departments. The project would add housing to the site, but would not result in the change of any service providers. Fire services are provided by the Rescue Fire Protection District, which currently provides service to the site and its surroundings. The creation of additional homes on the site would result in an increased demand for services, and would be subject to the payment of fees to offset the increase in service demand associated with the growth. As the District currently serves the site and driveway improvements would meet the minimum safety codes required by the County and the Fire Safe Code, no additional impacts would result.

b) The El Dorado County Sheriff's Department would provide police services to the site, as they do presently. The creation of additional homes on the site would result in an increased demand for services, and would be subject to

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

the payment of fees to offset the increase in service demand associated with the growth. As the Department currently serves the site and driveway improvements would be sufficient to allow for access by public safety vehicles, no additional impacts would result.

- c) School services would be provided by the Gold Train Union School District. The occupancy of homes may add school-age children to the District, adding demands to school facilities. The District assesses fees, as permitted by State law, to offset the potential impacts associated with population growth. Fees are assessed as part of the County's building permit process. This fee is sufficient to offset the environmental impacts to the school district.
- d) Parks services would be provided by the County and special districts which maintain facilities in the County. The addition of three new residential lots to the area would create a minor increase in the demand for parks and recreational services in the area. The impact associated with three new homes is insufficient to result in any significant additional demand or need for new facilities. The impact would be less than significant.
- e) No other government services would be adversely affected by the project. Overall impacts to public services would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

The project would result in the creation of three additional residential lots, which would add limited population to the area. Any increase in usage of existing regional or neighborhood parks would be minimal, and the impacts to facilities are not considered significant. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. Impacts to recreation would be less than significant.

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

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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.

The project proposed to divide the project site into four residential lots, east five acres in size. Vehicular access will be provided to the site by Snow Creek Drive, running adjacent to and along the southern boundary of the project site. The project applicant has requested three design waivers from standard El Dorado County Department of Transportation conditions. Snow Creek Drive will remain a privately maintained roadway, with a maintenance agreement among all parcels created by the project. The roadway is more than 2,650 feet from a publicly maintained road, thus requiring a waiver from this standard requirement. A third design waiver has been requested to reduce onsite roadway widths to 20 feet, and offsite roads to 18 feet, a variation from the standard requirement of 24 feet. Each of these waivers can be provided without resulting in the reduction in level of service, minimum safety standards, or other aspects of roadway operation. The maintenance of the roadway by private parties will be sufficient to ensure its continued operability. The distance of Snow Creek Drive from a public roadway will not result in any deficiency in operation or emergency access, and the reduction in road width will not result in any barriers to accessibility by emergency vehicles.

- a) The project would add three residential homes to the site, all of which would receive access from Snow Creek Drive, a private road connecting to Lower Lake Drive on the east of the site. Snow Creek Drive serves residential traffic only, and is a free-flowing residential street. Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, the three new homes are expected to generate an additional 31 daily traffic trips onto Snow Creek Drive, with no more than eight of these trips within any given hour. This slight increase is insufficient to result in a significant impact to volume to capacity ratios or levels of service along any roadway. The impact would be less than significant.
- b) See discussion under s) above. The generation of 31 additional trips is not sufficient to exceed any level of service standard on area roadways. The impact would be less than significant.
- c) The project includes subdivision of rural residential property, and the construction of three new homes. The project does not impact air traffic patterns. There would be no impact.

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

- d) The project would add new homes to the site, with access coming from the existing driveway on the north end of the site, and a new driveway on the south end of the site. The project would not create any design features which limit visibility or impair safety mechanisms, nor place incompatible uses adjacent to one another. The impact would be less than significant.
- e) The project would increase on-site circulation options, and would not adversely affect any roadway or route used or potentially usable for emergency access to or through the property. The impact would be less than significant.
- f) The project would add three new single-family residential homes. Parking for these uses would be provided on site, likely in the creation of garage parking for residents of the homes. The impact would be less than significant.
- g) The project proposes no design characteristics, uses, or features that conflict with any plans, policies, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The impact would be less than significant.

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

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;

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

- 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) The project proposes the subdivision of the site into four residential parcels, with the three new lots proposed to have individual septic systems serving each home. One existing home site has a septic system in operation at present. The septic systems fall under the authority of the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Health, and under the regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Septic systems designed and installed on site must meet State and county standards, and thus would not result in the exceedance of any standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The impact would be less than significant.
 - b) See discussion a) above. The project would require the installation and operation of three individual septic systems on site. Water service would be provided by private wells located on each parcel, and would require approvals for well water quantity and quality from the County. No offsite or regional improvements to water and wastewater systems would be required. The impact would be less than significant.
 - c) The project would include the addition of impervious surfaces which may limit groundwater recharge or absorption of water into the land during periods of rainfall. Outside of driveway and building pad locations, no grading is proposed on the site. The limited area of site disturbance and the addition of driveways and building pads are insufficient to significantly alter drainage patterns from or through the site. The impact would be less than significant.
 - d) Water service to the site is to be provided by wells located on each property. Supply and water quality are verified through existing permit requirements of El Dorado County, and well data must be provided for each well to be drilled, thus ensuring that each residence has sufficient water supply. The impact would be less than significant.
 - e) Wastewater service is to be provided by on-site septic systems. There would be no impact.
 - f) The project would create a minimum additional amount of solid waste for disposal, and the site is already served by solid waste pickup and disposal at area landfills. The impact would be less than significant.
 - g) The project would generate waste similar to other single-family residential uses. No local, state, or federal statutes related to the generation, treatment, or disposal of solid waste would be violated by the project. The impact would be less than significant.

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 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 or on special-status plant or animal species.
- 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 this Initial Study, 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.
- 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.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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