

**EL DORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: December 20, 2006

Item No.: 5.a.

Staff: Jonathan Fong

PARCEL MAP

FILE NUMBER: P06-0007

APPLICANT: Jeff Ramona, Ramona Enterprises LLC

REQUEST: A tentative parcel map creating two parcels ranging in size from 1.03 to 1.00 acres on a 2.03-acre site. (Exhibit C).

Design waivers have been requested for the following:

1. To eliminate the road improvements to Standard Plan 101 B along the property frontage on Alta Vista Court.
2. To eliminate the road improvements to Standard Plan 101 B along the property frontage on Malcolm Dixon Road.

LOCATION: On the south side of Malcolm Dixon Road, at the intersection with Alta Vista Court in the El Dorado Hills Area area. (Exhibit A)

APN: 126-070-38

ACREAGE: 2.03 acres

GENERAL PLAN: Medium Density Residential (MDR) (Exhibit B)

ZONING: One-acre Residential (R1A) (Exhibit C)

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Negative Declaration

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Conditionally Approve Parcel Map P06-0007 and Design Waiver 1. Deny Design Waiver 2.

BACKGROUND: Application AZ88-0106 was approved by the Board of Supervisors on December 5 1989 to allow a 20-acre parcel to be rezoned from Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5) to One-acre

Residential (R1A). Parcel Map 41-38 subsequently created two (2) parcels approximately ten (10) acres in size.

The project parcel was created by Parcel Map PM42-137 which subdivided Parcel 1 of the previous map. This map is a further subdivision of Parcel 2 which was originally 1.861 acres in size. Boundary Line Adjustment BLA 01-0055 was approved on June 6, 2001 to increase the lot size of the project Parcel to 2.03 acres.

Building permits 151881 and 151882 were applied for on October 28, 2003 to demolish the existing residence and the replacement of a new residence. Both permits were never issued or finalized and subsequently expired on January 28, 2005. The residence has since been demolished and the project site is currently undeveloped. Prior to recordation of the parcel map the applicant will be required to obtain permits for the demolition of the residence and removal of the septic system.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Staff has reviewed the project for compliance with County regulations and requirements. An analysis of the permit requests and issues for Zoning Administrator consideration are provided in the following sections.

Project Description: The parcel map would create two (2) residential parcels ranging from 1.00 acres to 1.03 acres in size. Public water is proposed to serve the parcels with septic wastewater facilities to be constructed on-site.

Site Description: The project site is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Region at approximately 740 feet mean sea level. The project site is relatively flat with wild grasses covering the majority of the site. One Blue Oak (*Quercus Douglasii*) exists on site located near the midpoint of the western boundary. The existing oak tree is not proposed to be removed as a portion of this project.

An approximately 80 foot driveway currently exists which provides access from Alta Vista Court to the middle portion of the parcel. The driveway provided access to the previously demolished residence.

Adjacent Land Uses:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	R1A	MDR	Vacant Land
North	AE	LDR	Undeveloped Agriculture Grazing Land
South	R1A	MDR	Single-family residence
East	R1A	MDR	Single-family residence
West	R1A	MDR	Single-family residence

The surrounding parcels in the vicinity are developed or have the potential to be developed with single-family residences. The proposed parcel map would create two residential lots which would be consistent with the surrounding land uses.

December 20, 2006 Zoning Administrator Hearing

General Plan: The project has been reviewed in accordance with the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan and it has been determined that the project is consistent with applicable policies. Findings of consistency with the General Plan are provided in Attachment 2.

The General Plan designates the subject site as Medium Density Residential (MDR), which permits a minimum parcel size of one (1) acre. The proposed 1-acre and 1.03-acre parcels are consistent within the MDR land use designation.

Because the project parcel abuts agriculturally zoned parcels to the north, additional General Plan policies are applicable. However, the parcels to the north have rolled out of their Williamson Act Contracts and development applications have been filed.

General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1 requires the Agricultural Commission review discretionary development applications for lands adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands. On June 14, 2006 the Agricultural Commission reviewed the proposed parcel map for compatibility with the agriculturally zoned parcel to the north. The Agricultural Commission recommended approval of the proposed parcel map.

General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 requires that lands adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands be a minimum of 10 acres. The proposed parcel map will create two parcels one-acre in size. The proposed parcels do not meet the minimum parcel size required by this policy. However, because the agriculturally zoned have rolled out of their Williamson Act Contracts and residential development is proposed, staff finds the smaller parcel sizes to be consistent with the General Plan.

The proposed parcel map will create two one-acre parcels. The parcel sizes are consistent with the Medium Density Residential (MDR) general plan land use designation. Based on consistency with the MDR land use designation and favorable recommendation from the Agricultural Commission, staff finds the proposed parcel map is consistent with the general plan.

Zoning: The subject site is zoned One-Acre Residential (R1A) which permits a minimum parcel size of 1 acre. Therefore, the proposed 1-acre and 1.03-acre parcels conform to existing zoning.

Because the project parcel is located within Mitigation Area 2, *Section 17.71.220* of the Zoning Ordinance is applicable. This Section establishes that a payment of a fee in lieu of Ecological Preserve Mitigation is required for parcels located within Mitigation Areas 1 and 2. A \$386.00 mitigation fee for single family development is required prior to building permit issuance.

Design Waivers Discussion: The applicant is requesting two design waivers:

1. To eliminate the required road improvements to Alta Vista Court along the property frontage.
2. To eliminate the required road improvements to Malcolm Dixon Road along the property frontage.

Upon a favorable recommendation by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department, the requested design waivers may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. The El Dorado Hills Fire Department has reviewed the requested design waivers and has recommended approval of the waiver for the

December 20, 2006 Zoning Administrator Hearing

improvements to Alta Vista Court. However, the Fire Department has recommended that the improvements to Malcolm Dixon remain as conditions of approval.

Chapter 16.40.010 of the *Subdivisions Ordinance* requires findings in order to grant design waivers. In order to grant a design waiver, the Zoning Administrator must find that each of the following conditions exists:

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

As discussed in the Findings of Approval listed in Attachment 1 of this staff report, findings have been made to support Design Waiver 1. However, without approval from the El Dorado Hills Fire Department to support Design Waiver 2, staff recommends denial of Design Waiver 2.

Public Agency Comments: The following agencies have provided comments for this project:

El Dorado County Department of Transportation
El Dorado County Environmental Management
El Dorado County Surveyor
El Dorado Hills Fire Department
El Dorado Hills Community Services District

Copies of their written comments are available at Planning Services office. From these comments, issues were raised and are included in Attachment 2, Conditions of Approval.

The following agencies and public organizations were solicited for comments and either did not respond with concerns that were applicable, or responded they had no recommended conditions of approval:

El Dorado County Resource Conservation District
El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee

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, conditions have been added to the project to avoid or mitigate to a point of insignificance the potentially significant effects of the project. Staff has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the

proposed project as conditioned will have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration has been prepared.

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

RECOMMENDATION

1. Adopt the negative declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff; and
2. Approve the Parcel Map P06-0007 and Design Waiver 1 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;and

Deny Design Waiver 2 as the required findings cannot be made.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

Attachments To Staff Report:

- Attachment 1 Conditions of Approval
- Attachment 2.....Findings of Approval
- Attachment 3.....Findings of Denial

- Exhibit A Vicinity Map
- Exhibit B General Plan Land Use Map
- Exhibit C Zoning Map
- Exhibit D Tentative Parcel Map
- Exhibit E..... Applicant Justification for Design Waivers
- Exhibit F..... El Dorado Hills Fire Design Waiver Response
- Exhibit G Environmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts

ATTACHMENT 1

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

File Number P06-0007 - Ramona
December 20, 2006 Zoning Administrator Hearing

Planning Services

1. In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to *Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code*. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission.
2. The subdivision is subject to parkland dedication in-lieu fees, based on values supplied by the County Assessor's Office and calculated in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of the County Code. The fees shall be paid at the time of filing the parcel map. The subdivider shall be subject to a \$150.⁰⁰ appraisal fee payable to El Dorado County Assessor for the determination of parkland dedication in-lieu fees.
3. Domestic water shall be supplied by a public entity 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.
4. Prior to recordation of the parcel map, the applicant shall obtain and pay appropriate fees for demolition permits for the removed residence.
5. Prior to recordation of the parcel map, the applicant shall obtain and pay appropriate fees for the removal of the abandoned septic system.

Department of Transportation

6. Developer shall enter into an Improvement Agreement with the County and provide security to guarantee performance of the Improvement Agreement to construct the half width of Malcolm Dixon Road, along the project frontage, to Standard Plan 101B standards, prior to filing the Parcel Map.
7. The applicant shall improve the half width of Malcolm Dixon Road along the project frontage, to Standard Plan 101B prior to filing the Parcel Map.

Environmental Management

8. The applicant shall make applications and pay appropriate fees to Environmental Health. Environmental Health shall review and approve the septic wastewater design prior to construction of the system.

El Dorado Hills Fire Department

9. The potable water system for the purpose of the fire protection for this residential development shall provide a minimum fire flow of 1,500 gpm with a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi for a two-hour duration. This requirement is based on a single family dwelling 4,800 square feet or less in size. This fire flow rate shall be in excess of the maximum daily consumption rate for this development. A set of engineering calculations reflecting the fire flow capabilities of this system shall be supplied to the Fire Department for review and approval.
10. A notice of restriction shall be filed for both parcels requiring that any home larger than 4,800 square feet to provide the fire flow for the square footage or shall be fire sprinklered in accordance with NFPA 13D and Fire Department requirements.
11. Prior to recordation of the map, the applicant shall prepare and implement a Wildland Fire Safe Plan for the parcels. The Fire Department shall review and approve the plan prior to implementation.
12. No raised bump traffic calming devices shall be installed on Alta Vista Court or Malcolm Dixon Road.
13. No access control barriers shall be installed along Alta Vista Court.

County Surveyor

14. Prior to filing the parcel map, a letter to the County Surveyor will be required from all agencies stating that all conditions have been met.
15. 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).

ATTACHMENT 2 FINDINGS OF APPROVAL

File Number P06-0007 - Ramona
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:

CEQA Findings

- 1.1.1 Staff has prepared an initial study to determine if the project will have a significant environmental impact and a Negative Declaration has been filed. The proposed parcel map will involve the creation of two residential parcels. The initial study has determined the parcel map will have a less than significant environmental impact.
- 1.2 The proposed project, as conditioned, will not have a significant effect on the environment and a Negative Declaration has been filed. Further, the project will not affect wetlands, watercourses, riparian lands, unique plant or animal life and habitats, or other terrestrial matters under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Fish and Game. Therefore, the project has a de minimis impact on the environment and a Certificate of Fee Exemption (DFG 753.5-5/91 is applicable.
- 1.3 The documents which constitute a record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville CA, 95667.

Tentative Map Findings

- 2.1 The proposed tentative map, including design and improvements, is consistent with the General Plan policies and land use map because the proposed parcel sizes are consistent with the Medium Density Residential land use designation.
- 2.2 The proposed tentative map does conform with the applicable standards and requirements of the County's zoning regulations and the Minor Land Division Ordinance because the proposed parcel sizes are consistent with the One-Acre Residential zone district.
- 2.3 The site is physically suitable for the proposed type and density of development. The project site does not contain special status species or critical woodland oak habitat. No trees will be removed as a part of this project. The existing topography will not require substantial grading for development.
- 2.4 The proposed tentative map is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage because the residential development associated with the parcel map will not substantially alter the

existing character of the site. The site has been previously disturbed with residential development that has been removed in preparation for this parcel map.

Design Waivers Findings

Approval of Design Waiver Request 1

To eliminate the required road improvements on Alta Vista Court along the property frontage.

- a. There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver because Alta Vista Court is a 24-foot wide paved road without curb and gutter. The requirement to include curb and gutter only on the project frontage will create drainage concerns. The remaining parcels on Alta Vista Court are developed and have not installed curb and gutter.
- b. Strict application of the design or improvement requirements of this article would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property because additional grading and drainage improvements would be necessary to construct the curb and gutter.
- c. The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public because Alta Vista Court currently provides the minimum roadway width for emergency access. Alta Vista Court along the property frontage is already constructed with drainage culverts.
- d. The adjustment or waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of this article or any other law or ordinance applicable to the division because Alta Vista Court has already been improved as a condition of approval of the previous parcel map.

ATTACHMENT 3 FINDINGS OF DENIAL

File Number P06-0007 - Ramona
December 20, 2006 Zoning Administrator Hearing

Design Waivers Findings

Denial of Design Waiver Request 2

To eliminate the required road improvements on Malcolm Dixon Road along the property frontage.

The El Dorado Hills Fire Department has responded with comments requesting that the required road improvements to Malcolm Dixon Road remain as a condition of approval. The Fire Department has determined that the road improvements along the property frontage will improve emergency access along Malcolm Dixon Road.



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: P06-0007 Parcel Map

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

Contact Person: Jonathan Fong

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Jeff Ramona 20360 Via Santa Teresa San Jose, CA 95120

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Jeff Ramona 20360 Via Santa Teresa San Jose, CA 95120

Project Agent's Name and Address: Gene Thorne and Associates, Inc. 3025 Alhambra Drive, Suite A
Cameron Park CA, 95682

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Gene Thorne and Associates, Inc. 3025 Alhambra Drive,
Suite A Cameron Park CA, 95682

Project Location: The project is located on the South side of Malcolm Dixon Road West of the intersection with Alta Vista Court in the El Dorado Hills Area.

Assessor's Parcel No: 126-070-38

Zoning: One-Acre Residential (R1A)

Section: 13 **T:** 10N **R:** 8E

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Description of Project: Request for a parcel map to create two residential parcels, Parcel 1 to be 1.0 acres and Parcel 2 to be 1.03 acres. The current parcel is 2.03 acres. The applicant has requested two design waivers: to eliminate the road improvements to Alta Vista Court and to eliminate the road improvements to Malcolm Dixon Road.

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:	R1A	MDR	Demolished single family residence
North:	AE	LDR	Single Family Residence on Agriculture Lands
East:	R1A	MDR	Single Family Residence
South:	R1A	MDR	Single Family Residence
West:	R1A	MDR	Single Family Residence

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is characterized by relatively flat topography with minimal vegetation. On-site vegetation consists of various grasses and one oak tree. Access to the two proposed parcels is proposed to be from Alta Vista Road. According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area* prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture, the predominant soil type on the project site is Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD) which has a low shrink-swell potential.

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

1. El Dorado County Department of Transportation:
2. Environmental Management 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 8, 2006

Printed Name: Jonathan Fong For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: November 8, 2006

Printed Name: Peter Maurer For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from a proposed parcel split creating two one acre parcels from a 2.03-acre parcel located at 1260 Malcolm Dixon Road in the El Dorado Hills area.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The 2.03-acre project site is located at 1260 Malcolm Dixon Road in the El Dorado Hills area. The project area lies at an elevation of approximately 740 feet about mean sea level. The surrounding properties contain single-family residential units and accessory structures. Access to the site is from Alta Vista Court in the El Dorado Hills area of El Dorado County.

Project Characteristics

This proposal is to create two separate parcels each approximately one-acre in size.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the site is provided by an existing paved road encroaching directly onto Alta Vista Court. The driveway was previously constructed for access to a single family residence which has been demolished. Any future driveways will be required to be a minimum of 10-feet wide approved pursuant to fire safe regulations requiring a fire turn-around, to maintain a minimum 15-feet vertical clearance above the driveway and to support a 40,000 pound load. Please see Item XV in the Initial Study checklist for a discussion of traffic impacts.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site is serviced by public water and an on-site septic system. Power utilities and telephone service have been extended to the site by local utility companies.

3. Population

The two parcel split and existing residential units and the potential of two more residential units, (main single family residential unit and one secondary residential unit) will not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of off site and on site road improvements including grading for a driveway. Construction access to the site would be from Alta Vista Court via Malcolm Dixon Road.

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

Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista. The project is for a two parcel land division to create two one-acre parcels from a 2.03-acre parcel. . The surrounding land uses are predominantly residential.

- a. **Scenic Vista.** The project site is located on Alta Vista Court which contains single family residences. The project parcel is the only parcel on Alta Vista Court which is undeveloped.. In addition, the project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.¹ There would be no impact.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is not adjacent or visible from a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site.² There would be no impact.
- c. **Visual Character.** The proposed parcel split and the future residential development would not affect the visual character of Alta Vista Court or Malcolm Dixon Road. There would be no impact.
- d. **Light and Glare.** The proposed parcel map will create two residential parcels. Potential sources of light and glare would result from the residential development. Alta Vista Court contains parcels which have residential development. Therefore, the impacts of existing light and glare as seen from Alta Vista Court and Malcolm Dixon Road would be less than significant.

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

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

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

Finding

No impacts to aesthetics are expected with the parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Aesthetics” category, the impacts 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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not within an Agricultural zone or Agricultural overlay. The project site is located within lands designated as “Grazing Land.”

The parcel to the north of the project is designated as Exclusive Agriculture (AE). The AE-zoned parcel contains “Grazing Lands.” The El Dorado County Agriculture Commission has reviewed the project and determined that the proposed parcel map will not conflict with the AE-zoned parcel. There would be no impact.

b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The property is not located within a Williamson Act Contract and the project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. There would be no impact.

c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The project site had been previously developed with a single family residence. The parcel map will create two one-acre residential parcels. There would be no impact.

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

Finding

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Agriculture” category, the impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

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

a-c.

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

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

smoke, ash or odors. The parcel split will not create additional vehicle traffic and emissions other than what currently exists for the residential units. Therefore, short-term and long-term air quality impacts would be less than significant.

- d-e. **Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors.** Due to the low density residential development in the area, and dense tree coverage, sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, care facilities and high density dwelling units are not located within the immediate vicinity. Common types of facilities known to produce odors include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfill, transfer station, asphalt batch plant and manufacturing plants. The requested parcel split and existing residential units on the property will not generate or produce objectionable odors. Short-term heavy equipment emissions generated by the on site and off site road improvements would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash or odors based upon an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan conforming to District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2 and Rule 300 as applicable. In addition, the nearest residential unit is located approximately 43 feet north of the north property line. Asphalt surface treatment is not being required since El Dorado County of Transportation is not requiring asphalt as a condition of approval. The proposed road improvement work will not include any features that would be a source of substantial pollutant emissions that could affect sensitive receptors or generate objectionable odors. Therefore, long-term impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

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,			X

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X

Discussion:

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

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

a-f. **Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities.** The site is not located within an area containing sensitive habitats or special-status species.³

Review of the General Plan exhibits and maps indicate that no rare, threatened, or endangered fish, animal, or insect Species exist on or adjacent to the project site. The site had been previously developed with a single-family residence.

The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Map for the area does not show any mapped wetlands on the site.

Review of the Department of Fish and Games Migratory Deer Herd Maps and General Plan DEIR Exhibit V-8-4 indicate no mapped deer migration corridors exist on the project site. The project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites in any manner that does not currently exist.

The creation of the two parcels will not involve the removal of any native trees or shrubs.

The proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of a proposed or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

³ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7

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

There are no special status species and sensitive natural communities that would be adversely affected by the proposed parcel map. There is no impact.

Finding

No Special-status plant species were found on site. For this “Biological” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-d. The project parcel has been previously developed with single family residential development. The project site has been disturbed and portions graded. The proposed parcel map will create two parcels for future residential development. There is no impact.

Finding

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

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

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:

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

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

- a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.⁴ No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.⁵ There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are two known faults within the project vicinity; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated between the Melones Fault Zones and located outside of the fault zone buffer areas. The subject parcel is approximately 0.7 miles away from the two fault zones. The Melones fault zone is associated with the Foothills fault system, previously considered inactive but re-classified to potentially active after a Richter magnitude earthquake measuring 5.7 occurred near Oroville in 1975. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.⁶

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 50 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 50 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey.⁷ While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located.⁸ The project site where the existing dwelling units are located is relatively flat, while the rest of the property is comprised of rolling terrain; and based upon the soil survey and metamorphic rock comprising the site, there would be no risk of landslide.⁹

The proposed parcel split will result in two separate parcels for residential development situated in an area subject to low to moderate groundshaking effects. The proposed project would not include uses that would pose any unusual risk of environmental damage either through the use of hazardous materials or processes or through structural design that could be subject to groundshaking hazard. There would be no significant impacts that could not be mitigated through proper building design, as enforced through the County building permit process, which requires compliance with the Uniform Building Code, as modified for California seismic conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

⁴ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)* May 2003, p.5.9-29.

⁵ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

⁶ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)*, May 2003, p.5.9-5.

⁷ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002.* (<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha>)

⁸ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)*, May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.

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

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

b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During site grading and construction of any onsite and off site road improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

The project includes onsite and off site road widening to meet fire safe standards and a requested design waiver from the standard 101 C road standards width as addressed in the "Design and Improvement Standards Manual. Access to the site is provided from Malcolm Dixon Road which is paved. The onsite access road to the residential units will be required to meet fire safe regulations, have a 15' vertical clearance, and be capable of supporting a 40,000 lb. load.

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

The El Dorado County Resource Conservation District reviewed the application in 2006 and did not have any issues with the proposed parcel split.

d. **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The project site has been classified per the USDA Soil Survey as Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD). The Auburn Series soil types are characterized by a low shrink-swell potential. There is no impact.

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

Finding

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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-b. **Hazardous Substances.** No hazardous substances are involved with the parcel split. Temporary use of heavy equipment for road improvements will be required. A diesel fuel storage tank may be located on site for the heavy equipment. The potential storage and transport of diesel fuel in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment will require an approved hazardous material business plan issued from the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. Said hazardous material business plan will identify potential impacts to the environment and require mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Based on the amount of road improvements required and the duration of heavy equipment on site and off site to complete the road improvements, and that fuel storage will most likely not occur, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant with an approved hazardous materials business plan.

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

- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site did have an underground storage tank pulled out more than five years ago. According to El Dorado County Hazardous Materials Department, have indicated the project site has no contaminants. Furthermore, the project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.¹⁰ There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There is no private airstrip(s) in the immediate vicinity that is identified on a U.S. Geological Survey Topography Map. There would be no impact.
- g. **Emergency Response Plan.** The parcel is accessed via Malcolm Dixon Road and Alta Vista Court. Fire response and fire safety issues have been reviewed by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department. The Fire District will require a Fire Safe Plan prepared by a registered professional forester. Based upon the conditions of approval for on-site and off-site road improvements, there would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.
- h. **Fire Hazards.** The project site located in an area classified as having a high fire hazard.¹¹ The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan Policy 6.2.2.2 requires development in areas of high wildland fire hazard areas to provide and demonstrate that the area can be adequately protected from wildland fire hazard as demonstrated in a Fire Safe Plan prepared by a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) and approved by the local Fire Protection District and/or California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. General Plan Policy 6.2.3.2 requires the applicant to demonstrate that adequate access exists or can be provided to ensure that emergency vehicles can access the site and private vehicles can evacuate the area. General Plan Policy 6.2.4.1 requires discretionary development within high fire hazard areas to be conditioned to designate fuel break zones and comply with fire safe requirements to benefit the new and, where possible, existing development. As part of the conditions of approval for the parcel split, the applicants will be required to provide an approved Fire Safe Plan, be required to improve both on site and off site roads for emergency access and the applicants have installed a fire safe turnaround on the property. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

Finding

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

¹⁰ California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List, accessed September 23, 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004.

¹¹ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.8-4.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;

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

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

a & f. **Water Quality Standards.** The project is of limited scope and would not involve disturbance to water bodies or require water service, and would therefore have no effect on surface or groundwater quantity or quality. The parcel split and existing residential dwelling units will utilize septic systems. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Groundwater.** The proposed parcels will be served by public water. There would be no impact.

c. **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit storm water runoff and discharge from a site. The Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed project and finds that an erosion control plan is not warranted for the proposed parcel split. However, the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District may require an erosion control plan prior to road grading. Mitigation measures addressed in the erosion control plan would reduce erosion to less than significant.

d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** The parcel split is to create two one-acre parcels from a 2.03-acre parcel. Based on current topography and slopes for the property, it appeared that no drainage corridors exist on the project site. The existing drainage most likely percolates into the ground onsite. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed parcel map project and has determined that a drainage, erosion control and grading plans are not warranted. There would be no impact.

e. **Storm Water Run-off.** Based on the soil types, surface runoff has been characterized as being slow to moderate. Erosion control plans have not been warranted at this time by the appropriate reviewing agencies. The proposed project would not involve any operations that would be a source of polluted water. Therefore, there would be no impact

g, h, & i. **Flooding.** The level project site is situated in an area of undulating terrain at an elevation of approximately 740 feet above sea level. There are no 100-year flood hazard areas at or adjacent to the site. The site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is not in an area subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. There would be no impact.

FIRM. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0679 D, last updated December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a. **Established Community.** The project site is surrounded by residential uses and is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Region. The proposed parcel split and future residential development would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact.
- b. **Land Use Plan.** The parcel is zoned for Residential One-acre (R1A) and allows single-family residential development. There would be no impact.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project will not affect any biological resources. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present.¹² Approximately 6.9 miles to the east from the proposed parcel split are MRZ-2-classified areas¹³, and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.¹⁴ There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect existing uses. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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

¹² California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.*

¹³ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.*

¹⁴ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.*

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

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X

Discussion:

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

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

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

e & f. **Airport Noise.** The project site is not within the airport land use plan. There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to noise are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth.** The project site is in an area zoned for residential use and is designated as Medium Density Residential land use under the 2004 General Plan. The minimum allowable density is one dwelling unit per acre and the population growth for the County has been analyzed within the 2004 General Plan EIR. The proposed parcel split will create two one-acre parcels which is consistent with both the General Plan and General Plan EIR. No further land division would occur without both a General Plan and Zoning amendment. Utility services are available at the project site. No housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a. **Fire Protection.** The El Dorado Hills Fire Department currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. However, it has been determined by the Fire Department that the level of service would not fall below the minimum requirements as a result of the project. The responsible Fire Department will review building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection.** The proposed parcel map will create two residential lots. Impacts to police protection services would be less than significant.

c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** The proposed parcel split is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Service Districts. Future residential development will be subject to school impact fees at time of building permit issuance. The parcel map is subject to payment of parkland dedication in-lieu fees. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-b. **Parks and Recreation.** The proposed parcel split will increase population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. Park facilities are maintained by the El Dorado Hills Community Services District. The El Dorado Hills Community Services District charges park impact fees in conjunction with building permits. There would be a less than significant impact.

Finding

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

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed parcel map and has determined that the project does not exceed the thresholds established in the 2004 General Plan. The number of vehicles associated with the parcel split would not change current vehicle trip rates and would not measurably affect traffic volumes or levels of service on a permanent basis such that County standards would be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

d. **Hazards.** The project site is readily accessible from Malcolm Dixon Road and Alta Vista Court. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access.** The project site receives access off Malcolm Dixon Road and Alta Vista Court which will terminate on site in a fire safe approved turn around. Road improvements are required to increase the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to fire safe regulations and are being placed upon the conditions of approvals for the parcel map prior to final map recording. Based upon the required road improvements there would be no disruption of emergency access to and from the existing residence or those in surrounding parcels. There would be no impact.

f. **Parking.** No additional parking required for the existing residential units on the subject parcel. There would be no impact.

g. **Alternative Transportation.** No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected because such features are not present at or adjacent to the project site. There would be no impact.

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

Finding

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
- 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. **Wastewater.** The creation of two parcels with their own septic systems, would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. Storm water runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). There would be no impact.
- b., d., e. **New Facilities** No new or expanded water or wastewater facilities would be required for the proposed parcel since the proposed water will be from ground water and will contain an approved septic system. However, if the project requires public water connections, an exiting water line is available and is located within Alta Vista Court. The distance to connect to the existing water main to the future residential site would be less than 100-feet. There would be no impact.
- c. **Storm Water Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the project proposal and has concluded that the provisions of the drainage manual will not be required. There would be no impact.
- f & g. **Solid Waste.** No anticipated increases of solid waste generated from the existing residential units and proposed residential unit once the parcel is divided into two or affect recycling goals. There would be no impact.
- h. **Power.** Power and telephone facilities are currently in place and utilized at the project site. No further expansion of power anticipated from parcel split. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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				X

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. <i>Does the project:</i>			
human beings, either directly or indirectly?			

Discussion

- a. As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have no significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources as mitigated. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be no significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV). There would be no impact.
- b. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant.
- 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. There would be no impact.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Cultural Resources Study for Parcel Number 067-270-38 prepared February 2006, Historic Resources Associates. On file in Planning Services Department.

Tentative Parcel Map prepared by Gene Thorne & Associates, May 2006.