

**EL DORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: December 20, 2006

Item No.: 5.b.

Staff: Tom Dougherty

PARCEL MAP

FILE NUMBER: P 06-0022

OWNER/APPLICANT: Bruce and Elizabeth Elisher

AGENT: Patterson Development

REQUEST: A tentative parcel map creating two (2) parcels ranging in size from 5.07 to 5.01 acres on a 10.08-acre site. Design waivers have been requested for the following:

1. Allow a reduction in shoulder width to an average of two-foot wide.
2. Allow the existing onsite and offsite road grade to be 18 percent maximum.

LOCATION: South side of Farish Road approximately 1,400 feet east of the intersection with Greenstone Road in the Shingle Springs area. (Exhibit A)

APN: 319-190-12

ACREAGE: 10.08 Acres

GENERAL PLAN: Low-density Residential (LDR) and Important Biological Corridor (IBC) (Exhibit C)

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Negative Declaration

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Conditional Approval

BACKGROUND: The subject parcel was created by Parcel Map 4-102, a four-parcel map which was recorded October 12, 1973.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Project Description: A tentative parcel map creating two (2) parcels ranging in size from 5.07 to 5.01 acres on a 10.08-acre site. Design waivers have been requested to allow; existing offsite 18 percent road grade, allow the existing onsite 18 percent road, allow a reduced roadway width of the onsite roadway to be 24-feet wide and to allow a dead-end road to exceed 500 feet in length.

Site Description: The site is located on the south side of Farish Road and slopes downward from the north in a predominately southwest direction. The site varies from 1,480 feet to 1,560 feet in elevation above sea level. The seasonal swale exit on the west boundary is the low point. The terrain dips down from Farish Road to the swale and then elevates from approximately 11-20 percent slopes to 30-40 percent slopes up to the south parcel boundary. Existing vegetation on the site consists predominantly of even-aged scattered blue oaks (*Quercus douglasii*), multi-trunked interior live oaks (*Quercus wislizenii*), and toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), coffeeberry (*Rhamnus californica*), and annual, seasonal grasses. The majority of the oak trees are located in the perimeter areas portion of the parcel. Proposed Parcel 1 has an existing single-family dwelling and an asphalt and gravel driveway with direct access onto Farish Road. Proposed Parcel 2 is currently undeveloped and has 30-40 percent slopes trending downhill to the south from Farish Road for approximately 80 feet in the northeast corner to 11-29 percent slopes in the proposed building and septic areas within the central portion of the proposed parcel.

Adjacent Land Uses:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	RE-5	LDR/IBC	Single-family dwelling
North	RE-5	LDR/IBC	Single-family dwelling
South	RE-5	LDR/IBC	Single-family dwelling
East	RE-5	LDR/IBC	Single-family dwelling
West	RE-5	LDR/IBC	Single-family dwelling

General Plan: The General Plan designates the subject site as Low Density Residential (LDR)/ Important Biological Corridor (IBC) which permits a minimum parcel size of 5 acres. The proposed 5.07 and 5.01-acre parcels therefore conform to the General Plan land use designation. The following General Plan policies apply to this project:

Policy 2.1.1.7 directs that development be limited in some cases until such time as adequate roadways, utilities, and other public service infrastructures become available and wildfire hazards are mitigated as required by an approved Fire Safe Plan. *Policy 5.7.1.1* directs that applicants demonstrate that adequate emergency water supply, storage, conveyance facilities, and access for fire protection either are or will be provided

concurrent with development. Policy 6.2.3.2 directs that the applicant must 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.

Adequate utilities, and other public services, exist and are available for both existing dwellings. The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District has conditioned the project to include improving or maintaining Farish Road to have 14-foot horizontal clearance and to have 15-foot vertical clearance all the way from Greenstone Road to the eastern edge of proposed Parcel 2. There is a fire hydrant located opposite proposed Parcel 2 on Farish Road in a water line supplied by the El Dorado Irrigation District. Power and phone services exist on Farish Road. The project has been conditioned by the Fire District to provide proof that there is minimum fire flow at the hydrants prior to any future building permit.

The El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) recommended conditions to require Farish Road to be widened to 20-foot wide onsite and offsite to a new encroachment onto Greenstone Road. An approved design waiver will allow an 18-foot wide all weather surface on a 24-foot wide road bed. The finaling of the parcel map will require DOT and The Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District approval that the required improvements to Farish Road meet their specifications.

Policies 2.2.2.8 and 7.4.2.9 establish the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay which was applied to lands identified as having high wildlife habitat values because of extent, habitat function, connectivity, and other factors. Proposed Parcel 1 has an existing single-family dwelling, infrastructure and utilities and could potentially have accessory buildings in the future. Proposed Parcel 2 has had the brush cleared. The entire parcel is located within the IBC overlay, however the creation of two (2) approximately five-acre parcels will not impede the intentions of this policy in a significant manner. Significant disturbances not typical of single-family residential uses would not be expected.

Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes the native oak tree canopy retention and replacement standards and requires that 70 percent of the existing oak tree canopy for proposed Parcel 1 to be retained, and 60 percent of the existing oak tree canopy. The creation of Parcel 1 in and of itself, will impact the woodland in an insignificant level because a dwelling, the driveways, water, and septic services and other supporting utilities exist. Approximately 96 percent of the tree canopy will be retained and the trees proposed for removal are located within the road improvement area. The tree canopy figures for Parcel 2 indicate that 70 percent of the existing canopy will be retained and other significant disturbance not typical of single-family residential uses would not be expected, and will be further analyzed during the building permit stage. It has been determined that there is sufficient area for construction without exceeding the maximum percentage of oak tree canopy removal. The imposition of and compliance to Policy 7.4.4.4 will create a less than significant affect.

The full discussion of the impacts to both policies is contained in section IV in the attached Initial Study/ Environmental Checklist.

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

Zoning: The subject site is zoned Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5)) which permits a minimum parcel size of five-acres. The proposed 5.07 and 5.01-acre parcels conform to existing zoning.

Other Issues:

Water and Sewer: El Dorado Irrigation District has existing utilities on Farish Road. The applicant has decided to utilize wells instead. Proposed Parcel 1 has an existing approved well. Proposed Parcel 2 shall be conditioned to have a safe and reliable water source prior to the recording of the final parcel map, and the applicant will be required to drill a well and then provide a well production report to Environmental Health Division for review and approval prior to the recording of the parcel map. (Condition 20). The applicant has provided a percolation rate for proposed Parcel 2 and well report for Proposed Parcel 1 which has existing well and septic, and have been reviewed by El Dorado County Environmental Health Division. (*Septic and Well Capability Report, Patterson Development, March 9, 2006*).

Access: Access to the project parcels is via an existing encroachment from Greenstone Road to Farish Road that continues approximately 1,600 feet to the proposed location of the driveway entrance to proposed Parcel 2. The driveway to proposed Parcel 1 is existing and in use. Farish Road serves 12 parcels and has an existing asphalt surface in need of repair that is approximately 16-feet wide a to about one-third of the way back where it becomes approximately 10 feet in width. The back one-third portion exceeds 18 percent grade in some spots. A grading permit will be required in order for the El Dorado County Transportation Department to review all required road improvements prior to issuance of the final approved parcel map. The requirements of the Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District and El Dorado County Department of Transportation, discussed above in the General Plan section, address the potential access problems related to public safety. The Fire District had required the applicant include a hammerhead turnaround at the driveway encroachment onto Farish Road which is shown on the proposed Tentative Parcel Map, Exhibit F. Further, the County Surveyor has requested that the applicant provide proof of legal access and the right to make road improvements.

The El Dorado County Design Improvement Standards Manual, Volume II, Section 3, Streets requires the following access requirements:

9. “At least two connections with an existing, improved public street or with a future street expansion...”
12. “A dead-end street connecting to a County or State maintained street may exceed 500 feet in length, but not more than 2,640 feet, and only when geographic features restrict a street expansion and the street will not serve more than twenty-four (24) existing or potential parcels.”

The Department of Forestry, Title 14, regulates road width, roadway surface and the minimum length of a dead-end road. For a dead-end road, the standard is as follows:

1273.09. Dead-End Roads: (a) The maximum length of a dead-end road, including all dead-end roads accessed from the dead-end road, shall not exceed the following cumulative lengths, regardless of the numbers of parcels served:

Parcels zoned for five acres to 19.99 acres -----2,640 feet

Discussion: The entrance to proposed Parcel 2 is approximately 1,600 feet from Greenstone Road and continues on to a dead end past the parcels to approximately 2,450 feet, however, Farish Road serves twelve parcels, there are no options currently available for expansion of the road to allow two connections, and a Fire Safe Plan is required to be approved by the Diamond Springs – El Dorado Protection District and California Department of Forestry.

Discussion: Staff finds there is no conflict with the above requirements because of the conditions required by said agencies.

Design Waiver Requests: The applicant has requested design waivers to the requirements contained in the County of El Dorado Design and Improvement Standards. Section 16.40.010 of County Code establishes that *the approving authority may grant a waiver or conditional waiver of any of the design or improvement requirements of this article with respect to a particular division at the time it approves the tentative map of the division.*

A design waiver may only be approved if specific findings may be made supporting the waiver. Each request is looked at individually using the following four criteria:

1. *There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver.*
2. *Strict application of County design and improvement requirements of this article would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property.*
3. *The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public.*
4. *The adjustment or waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of this article, (Article II of Chapter 16 of the County Code), or any other law or ordinance applicable to the division.*

Project Specific Design Waiver Requests: The applicant requested the following design waivers:

- 1) Allow a reduction in shoulder width to an average of two-feet wide.
- 2) Allow the existing onsite and offsite road grade to be 18 percent maximum.

The Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District and the El Dorado County Department of Transportation reviewed the three design waiver requests and have concluded that they can recommend approval of all three should their recommended conditions of approval be incorporated into the project.

The findings for the three Project Specific Design Waiver Requests 1 and 2, as each relate to the required categories 1 thru 4 listed above in Design Waiver Requests are listed in the attached Attachment 2, Findings.

Conclusion: As discussed above, staff finds that the Design Waiver Findings can be made.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has prepared an Initial Study (Environmental Checklist with Discussion) to determine if the project has a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, staff finds that the project could not have a significant effect on biological and cultural resources. Therefore, 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

Staff recommends the Zoning Administrator take the following actions:

1. Adopt the Negative Declaration, based on the Initial Study prepared by staff.
2. Approve the Tentative Parcel Map (P 06-0022) subject to the Conditions of Approval in Attachment 1, based on the Findings in attachment 2.
3. Approve the following design waivers since appropriate findings have been made as noted in Attachment 2:
 - 1) Allow a reduction in shoulder width to an average of two-feet wide.
 - 2) Allow the existing onsite and offsite road grade to be 18 percent maximum.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

Attachments to Staff Report:

Attachment 1	Conditions of Approval
Attachment 2	Findings
Exhibit A	Vicinity Map
Exhibit B1 and B2.....	General Plan Land Use Map, Biological Corridor Overlay
Exhibit C	Zoning Map
Exhibit D	Parcelization Map, (Assessor's Map)
Exhibit E	Parcel Map 4-102, recorded October 12, 1973.
Exhibit F.....	Tentative Parcel Map
Exhibit G.....	Soils Map
Exhibit H.....	Shingle Springs and Placerville U.S.G.S. Quadrangles
Exhibits I1, I2 and I3	Site Visit Photos from August 17, 2006
Exhibits J1 and J2	Aerial Photos
Exhibit K.....	Environmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts

ATTACHMENT 1

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

File Number P 06-0022 -Elisher Parcel Map
December 20, 2006 Zoning Administrator Hearing

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Planning Services

1. During all grading and construction activities in the project area on the proposed parcels, an archaeologist or Historian approved by the Development Services Director shall be on-call. In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent and/or future parcel owner shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until the on-call archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. If the find is determined to be significant and authenticated, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item. Grading and construction activities may resume after appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance.
2. In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission.
3. The applicant shall be required to pay Park-in-Lieu fee of \$150.00 payable to El Dorado County, pursuant to El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinance Chapter 16.12.090.

Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District

4. The minimum fire flow required is 1500 gpm at 1500 psi for 2 hours for any residence larger than 3600 square feet. If the square footage for all the single-family dwellings together add up to less than 3600 square feet, the minimum fire flow will be 1000 gpm @ 200 p.s.i for 2 hours. Prior to recording of this map, the applicant shall provide documentation from the El Dorado Irrigation District and Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District that shows the required fire flow will be met to support both parcels subject of this permit.
5. In place of Condition 4, the applicant shall record a Notice of Restriction (NOR) that states that each structure on both parcels shall install a NFPA 13D residential sprinkler system with 3,000 gallons of water storage for each parcel. Said Notice of Restriction shall be reviewed and approved by the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection

District prior to recordation. The approved NOR shall then be recorded and a copy of the recorded document shall be received by Planning Services and the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District prior to recording the parcel map.

6. All access roads and driveways shall provide and permanently maintain unobstructed horizontal clearance of 14 feet and unobstructed vertical clearance of 15 feet along the entire length of the roadway and be capable of supporting a 40,000 pound load.

El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT)

7. The applicant shall improve the onsite property frontage along Farish Road, to a width of 18 feet per El Dorado County Standard Plan 101C – paved, with AC dike (including signage as necessary – stop signs, street name signs, etc.).
8. The applicant shall improve the off-site portion of Farish Road, from the eastern property line to Greenstone Road, to a width of 20 feet pursuant to El Dorado County Standard Plan 101C – paved, with AC dike (including signage as necessary – stop signs, street name signs, etc.).
9. The applicant shall improve the encroachment of Farish Road to Greenstone Road to County Standard Plan 103D and shall obtain an encroachment permit from DOT.
10. The applicant shall irrevocably offer to dedicate a 30 foot road and public utility easement for the half-width, on-site portion of Farish Road along the entire property frontage, on the parcel map. This offer will be rejected by the County.
11. The developer shall construct all required improvements or enter into an Improvement Agreement with the County and provide security to guarantee performance of the Improvement Agreement as set forth within the County of El Dorado Subdivision Ordinance, prior to filing the parcel map.
12. Applicant shall join and/or form an entity, satisfactory to the County, to maintain all roads not maintained by the County, that is required for access to County or State maintained roads. If a Zone of Benefit, Home Owner Association or informal road maintenance association does not exist or cannot be formed to maintain non-County maintained roads, the applicant should be aware that Civil Code 845 requires that the owner of any easement in the nature of a private right-of-way, or of any land to which any such easement is attached, shall maintain it in repair, and in the absence of an agreement, the cost shall be shared proportionately to the use made of the easement by each owner.
13. If site improvements are to be made, the applicant shall submit a site improvement/grading plan prepared by a professional civil engineer to the Department for review and approval. The plan shall be in conformance with the County of El Dorado “Design and Improvement Standards Manual”, the “Grading, Erosion and Sediment

Control Ordinance”, the “Drainage Manual”, the “Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance”, and the State of California Handicapped Accessibility Standards. The improvements shall be substantially completed, to the approval of the Department of Transportation, prior to occupancy.

14. The applicant shall provide a soils report at time of improvement plan or grading permit application addressing, at a minimum, grading practices, compaction, slope stability of existing and proposed cuts and fills, erosion potential, ground water, pavement section based on TI and R values, and recommended design criteria for any retaining walls.
15. Any import, or export to be deposited within El Dorado County, shall require an additional grading permit for that offsite grading.
16. The applicant shall provide a drainage report at time of improvement plans or grading permit application, consistent with the Drainage Manual and the Storm Water Management Plan, which addresses storm water runoff increase, impacts to downstream facilities and properties, and identification of appropriate storm water quality management practices to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation.
17. Upon completion of the improvements required, and prior to acceptance of the improvements by the County, the developer will provide a CD to DOT with the approved drainage and geotechnical reports in PDF format and the approved record drawings in TIF format.
18. Applicant shall pay the traffic impact fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued. Until such time as updated traffic impact fees are adopted pursuant to the General Plan, any subdivisions will be required to either (1) execute an agreement agreeing to pay the higher fees, even after building permits have been issued or (2) have a notice of restriction placed on the final map prohibiting the issuance of building permits until the updated traffic impact fees are adopted.

El Dorado County Environmental Management – Environmental Health Division

19. Parcel 2 shall have a safe and reliable water source prior to recording the parcel map. A well production report shall be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Health Division prior to recording the parcel map.

El Dorado County Office of the County Surveyor

20. All survey monuments must be set prior to filing the parcel map.
21. Prior to filing the parcel map by the applicant, a letter to the County Surveyor shall be received from all agencies that have conditions placed on the map. The letter will state that all conditions placed on the map by that agency have been met.

-
22. The applicant shall provide a parcel map Guarantee, issued by a title company, showing proof of access to a State- or County-maintained road as defined by *Section 16.44.120 (B) (2)* with the legal right to improve that access as required by the County Design Manual, prior to filing the final or parcel map.
23. 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

File Number P 06-0022 -Elisher Parcel Map
December 20, 2006 Zoning Administrator Hearing

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

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1.0 CEQA Findings

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Negative Declaration together with the comments received during the public review process. The Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and is adequate for this proposal.
- 1.2 No significant impacts to the environment as a result of this project were identified in the initial study.
- 1.3 The project will not affect wetlands, water courses, 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 and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services-Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.

2.0 Tentative Map Findings

- 2.1 The proposed tentative map, including design and improvements, is consistent with the General Plan designation of Low Density Residential (LDR) which permits a minimum parcel size of 5 acres. The proposed 5.07 and 5.01-acre parcels therefore conform to the General Plan land use designation.
- 2.2 The proposal conforms to the County's zoning regulations and Minor Land Division Ordinance because they are of adequate size for the Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) zone district and there is adequate emergency and regular vehicular access, public facilities and existing utilities to support the residential uses needed by the parcels.
- 2.3. The site is physically suitable for the proposed type and density of development because the parcels have existing facilities and utilities or have been conditioned to have them to support the residential uses.

- 2.3. The proposed tentative map is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage because the access roads, driveways, and supporting utilities exist for proposed Parcel 1 and the impacts from all other required improvements have been analyzed in the Initial Study and, as conditioned, have been found to be less than significant.

3.0 General Plan Consistency Findings

- 3.1 The proposed tentative map is consistent with the Low-Density Residential General Plan land use designation.
- 3.2 The proposal, as conditioned, is consistent with the intent of Policies 2.1.1.7, 5.7.1.1 and 6.2.3.2 because there are adequate roadways, utilities, and other public service infrastructure available and wildfire hazards.
- 3.3 The proposal, as conditioned, is consistent with the intent of Policies 2.2.2.8 and 7.4.2.9 because significant disturbance not typical of single-family residential uses would not be expected.
- 3.4 The proposal is consistent with the intent of Policy 7.4.4.4. it has been determined that there is sufficient area for construction without exceeding the maximum percentage of oak tree canopy removal and any new development proposal will be further analyzed during the building permit stage. The imposition of and compliance to Policy 7.4.4.4 will create a less than significant affect.

4.0 Design Waiver Findings

- 4.1.0 Allow a reduction in shoulder width to an average of two-feet wide.
- 4.1.1 Special conditions for circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver because the Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District has stated they have no concerns with the proposed improvements to the road surface and 18 feet wide all-weather surface is within the limits of the State Fire Safe Standards.
- 4.1.2 Strict application of County design and improvement requirements would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property because widening the road beyond a 40-foot road bed width including shoulders would require the removal of a significant number of mature oak trees and installation of retaining walls because of the steepness of the terrain.
- 4.1.3 The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public because the requested

improvements to the access road will improve health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public by improving an existing sub-standard road.

4.1.4 This waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of *Article II of Chapter 16* of the *County Code* or any other ordinance applicable to the division because it meets the intent of the SRA Fire Safe Regulations.

4.2.0 **Allow the existing onsite and offsite road grade to be 18 percent maximum.**

4.2.1 Special conditions for circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver because the access road was constructed at the current grades to serve 12 parcels pursuant to standards in affect at the time of construction. The proposal adds one new parcel to the existing conditions with minimal impact but improves the existing road surface.

4.2.2 Strict application of County design and improvement requirements would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property because strict application would cause problems in achieving the goal of having residences, support utilities and access driveways on separate parcels. The tearing out of the existing pavement and removal of large amounts of dirt and trees would cause significant economic hardship.

4.2.3 The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public because the waiver will not be injurious or detrimental because the proposed improvements will improve a dangerous and substandard access road.

4.2.4 This waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of *Article II of Chapter 16* of the *County Code* or any other ordinance applicable to the division because as conditioned, the proposed driveway, encroachment and access road improvements will all meet County requirements.



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: P 06-0022 Elisher Parcel Map

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

Contact Person: Tom Dougherty, Project Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Bruce and Elizabeth Elisher, P.O. Box 1810, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Agent Name and Address: Larry Patterson, Patterson Development, 6610 Merchandise Way, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Location: South side of Farish Road approximately 1,400 feet east of the intersection with Greenstone Road in the Shingle Springs area.

Assessor's Parcel No: 319-190-12

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

Section: 28 **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential (LDR) and Important Biological Corridor (IBC)

Description of Project: A tentative parcel map creating two parcels ranging in size from 5.07 to 5.01 acres on a 10.08-acre site. Design waivers have been requested for the following:

1. Allow a reduction in shoulder width to an average of two-feet wide.
2. Allow the existing onsite and offsite road grade to be 18 percent maximum.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

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

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 10-acre site is located on the south side of Farish Road and slopes downward from the north in a predominately southwest direction. The site varies from 1480 feet to 1560 feet in elevation above sea level. The seasonal swale exit on the west boundary is the low point. The terrain dips down from Farish Road to the swale and then elevates from approximately 11-20 percent slopes to 30-40 percent slopes up to the south parcel boundary. Existing vegetation on the site consists predominantly of even-aged scattered blue oaks (*Quercus douglasii*), multi-trunked interior live oaks (*Quercus wislizenii*), and toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), coffeeberry (*Rhamnus californica*), and annual, seasonal grasses. The majority of the oak trees are located in the perimeter areas portion of the parcel. Proposed Parcel 1 has an existing single-family dwelling and an asphalt and gravel driveway with direct access onto Farish Road. Proposed Parcel 2 is currently undeveloped and has 30 - 40 percent slopes trending downhill to the south from Farish Road for approximately 80 feet in the northeast corner to 11 - 29 percent slopes in the proposed building and septic areas within the central portion of the proposed parcel.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement: El Dorado County Office of the County Surveyor, Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District, El Dorado County Department of Transportation, El Dorado County Environmental health Division.

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 9, 2006

Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: November 9, 2006

Printed Name: Peter Maurer, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, 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.

- a. Scenic Vista. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- b. Scenic Resources. The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwyl.html>)).
- c. The creation of these two parcels will not directly change any views from what is currently available.
- d. The creation of these two parcels will allow new lighting by creating the potential for a new residence and potentially add one additional second residential unit single-family dwelling on each parcel. These impacts would not be expected to be any more than any typical residential lighting similar and typical to those existing on the surrounding parcels and thus will have a less than significant impact on nighttime views in the area.

Finding: No impacts to views and viewsheds are expected with the creation of these two parcels either directly or indirectly. The project and the potential introduction of new single-family dwellings, is compatible with the existing surrounding uses in the direct vicinity. For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
 - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
 - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a. The two proposed parcels are located on Auburn soils, Auburn silt loam (AwD) of 2-30 percent slopes, which is not classified as either prime farmland, statewide important farmland, or unique, soils of local importance on the Important Farmland Maps prepared by the California Resources Agency using the USDA-NRCS Soil Surveys. El Dorado County has established the Agricultural District(-A) General Plan land use overlay designation and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural District (-A) General Plan land use overlay designation adjacent to the project site. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The effect on prime farmland will be less than significant.
- b. & c. The creation of the two parcels will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. No existing agricultural land will be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

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	

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

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a. The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan.
- b. & c. Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (O3). Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM10) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to meet the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

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

Short-term, superficial, minor grading and excavation activities that could be associated with the finish grading associated with future development permits would be the only activity caused by the creation of these two parcels as both could potentially have second residential units and accessory buildings, but that type of construction typically would only last a few days and intermittently at that.

Mobile emission sources such as automobiles, trucks, buses, and other internal combustion vehicles are responsible for more than 70 percent of the air pollution within the County, and more than one-half of California's air pollution. In addition to pollution generated by mobile emissions sources, additional

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

vehicle emission pollutants are carried into the western slope portion of El Dorado County from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area by prevailing winds. The project parcels are accessed off of Farish Road. Future grading would potentially emit minor, temporary and intermittent criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and would be subject to El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District standards at that time. The proposed parcels are not located in an asbestos review area.

- d. Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, daycare centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. General Plan Policy 6.7.6.1 requires that the County ensure that new facilities in which sensitive receptors are located (e.g., schools, child care centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, and hospitals) are sited away from significant sources of air pollution. It has been determined that the proposed parcel sites are more than one mile from any sensitive receptors in the area, and any impacts from the project will be less than significant.
- e. The single-family residential uses allowed after the creation of these parcels do not, under normal circumstances, create any excessive objectionable odors.

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

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

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
habitat conservation plan?			

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. Parcel 1 has existing single-family dwellings and support amenities and the existing habitat will not change much more than currently exists. Parcel 2 will require tree canopy removal for the construction of the driveway and single-family dwelling which shall adhere to the requirements of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. Both have been weedeated and previously cleared of shrubs in their respective development areas. There are intermittent re-sprouts of toyan shrubs on Parcel 2 in the areas proposed for the home site and septic area. The imposition of, and compliance to, Policy 7.4.4.4 will create a less then significant affect. (See discussion under c and f below).
- b. Review of the Important Biological Resources Map and California Natural Diversity Database did not reveal the presence any of the special-status species of plants and wildlife known in the region. Further, the parcels do not fall within designated critical habitat or core areas for the Red-legged and Yellow-legged frog species. (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7).
- c. The seasonal swale does not contain any wetland indicator plants and the annual grasses grow directly up to a 12 to 24” wide area where there is evidence of previous storm water flow. The swale high water flow point is approximately 70 feet from the nearest proposed development area on the two proposed parcels.
- d. Review of the Department of Fish and Game’s *Migratory Deer Herd Maps* indicate the project site does not lie within the range of a deer herd. Based on that fact, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on deer migration patterns.
- e. & f. The subject parcel is located in the Blue Oak Woodland habitat type which is typical of areas mostly found below 3000 feet elevation and is characterized by shallow, rocky, unfertile soils. (El Dorado County General Plan EIR, 5.12-7, May 2003).

Existing vegetation on the site consists predominantly of even-aged scattered blue oaks (*Quercus douglasii*) and multi-trunked interior live oaks (*Quercus wislizenii*). Blue oaks (*Quercus douglasii*) dominate proposed Parcel 1, with very few native shrubs. Multi-trunked interior live oaks dominate proposed Parcel 2. The agent submitted a tree preservation plan dated October 4, 2006 that breaks down the tree canopy figures for each proposed parcel as follows:

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

	Proposed Parcel 1	Proposed Parcel 2	Total
Site Area	218,236 square feet	220,849 square feet	439,085 square feet
Existing Tree Canopy Area	160,034 square feet	201,307 square feet	361,341 square feet
Existing Canopy Coverage	73 percent	91 percent	82 percent
Canopy Area To Be Removed	5,695 square feet	41,364 square feet	47,059 square feet
Percent of Canopy Cover Retained	96 percent	79 percent	87 percent

General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires that 70 percent of the existing oak tree canopy for proposed Parcel 1 to be retained, and 60 percent of the existing oak tree canopy. The creation of Parcel 1 in and of itself, will impact the woodland in an insignificant level because a dwelling, the driveways, water, and septic services and other supporting utilities exist. Approximately 96 percent of the tree canopy will be retained and the trees proposed for removal are located within the road improvement area. The tree canopy figures for Parcel 2 indicate that 70 percent of the existing canopy will be retained and other significant disturbance not typical of single-family residential uses would not be expected.

The project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted or approved habitat conservation plan.

Finding: No significant impacts from biological resources are expected with the creation of the two parcels either directly or indirectly because of the existing conditions, and the adherence to Policy 7.4.4.4, which will get further review during any future development permit. That review and the associated required adherence will bring the impacts to insignificant levels. For this “Biological” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
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;

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

- 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. A Cultural Resources Study was done of Assessor’s Parcel Number 319-190-12, (Historic Resource Associates, Dana Supernowitz, April, 2006) which reported there were no significant prehistoric and historic-period cultural resources sites, artifacts, historic buildings, structures or objects found. Because of the possibility in the future that ground disturbances could turn up significant cultural resources anywhere in the County, the following will be added as a condition to address any potential future discovery:

“In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit, to ensure that this notation has been placed on the grading plans.”

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

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

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

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

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
 - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a. There are no known faults which transect the project area or are located on the project site, however, there are faults located regionally. The subject parcel is located approximately 1400 feet east and approximately 1.5 miles west of portions of the El Dorado Fault Zone. The project site could be expected to undergo moderate to severe ground shaking during large magnitude earthquakes, however, the occurrence of one of these events in this area has been historically rare. The impact from a major seismic event could be considered less than significant.
 - b. All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the County of El Dorado - *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88)*. This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use, in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During any site grading and any new construction, there is potential for minor erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions. To reduce the potential for erosion and loss of topsoil for any future construction activity, the applicant would be required to comply with the *El Dorado County Grading Ordinance*.
 - c. – d. Based on the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, CA, issued April 1974*, the two proposed parcels are located on Auburn soils, Auburn silt loam (AwD) of 2-30 percent slopes. 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 subject property has low shrink-swell potential, hence low expansively. The impact from expansive soils for any future construction is less than significant.
 - e. The subject site is located on soils of moderate permeability that are considered “moderate” in limiting a septic system on slopes less than 10 percent, as determined by the Soil Survey of El Dorado County. Proposed Parcel 1 has an existing County approved septic system and well. A percolation report/Land

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

Capability Report submitted by the applicant dated March 9, 2006 has been reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Health Division who did not respond with concerns for the system capability. They will also review the final plan at the building permit stage.

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

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

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or

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

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

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

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	

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
 - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a. & f. Human activities such as agriculture, animal husbandry, municipal, industrial, recreational, and mining uses can result in runoff that could contribute to water quality problems in surface water bodies. Water quality standards for development of the project site are governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) through the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Any construction project affecting one acre or more of disturbed soil is required to comply with the SWRCB General Permit conditions for storm-water runoff from construction activities and is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program (NPDES) permit. A NPDES permit will not be required for this project because no grading will occur immediately because of the creation of the parcels. Grading would be analyzed with any future required permits. There is no evidence indicating that the parcel creations or activities associated with that will violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the RWQCB.

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

- b. El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. The geology of the Western Slope portion of El Dorado County is principally hard crystalline, igneous or metamorphic rock overlain with a thin mantle of sediment or soil. Groundwater in this region is found in fractures, joints, cracks, and fault zones within the bedrock mass. These discrete fracture areas are typically vertical in orientation rather than horizontal as in sedimentary or alluvial aquifers. Recharge is predominantly through rainfall infiltrating into the fractures. Movement of this groundwater is very limited due to the lack of porosity in the bedrock. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are identified in El Dorado County.
- c. – e. Compliance with the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance’s* Best Management Practices for any future grading would reduce any potential construction erosion and operational runoff to less than significant.
- g. – i. The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel No. 060040-0725C, dated December 4, 1986 establish that the project site is within Flood Zone “C”, area of minimal flooding. Impacts from flooding will be less than significant.
- j. A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. As the parent parcel is sited outside of the 100-year event, the potential for a mudflow is considered to be less than significant.

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

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:

- Physically divide an established community
- Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
- Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses with specific zoning designations; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, General Plan policies and goals of the community.

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

- a. The proposed project will not physically divide an established community as the project site is located within an established group of parcels of similar sized lots.
- b. The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the 2004 General Plan, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. The General Plan designates the subject site as Low-Density Residential (LDR)/Important Biological Corridor (IBC) and the proposed parcels meet the intent for single-family residential development at densities of one dwelling unit per five to ten acres, and the utilities needed to support the residential use of the two parcels are currently available. The two proposed parcels conform to existing zoning, meeting the five-acre minimum size requirement.
- c. As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is not located in an ecological preserve mitigation area established for the Pine Hill rare plants or red-legged frog core area. The project will not conflict with any known habitat conservation plan.

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

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. The parcel site is not mapped as a known Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology as shown on the Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn 15-minute Mineral Resource Zone quadrangles or by El Dorado County as depicted on the 2004 General Plan Exhibit 5.9-6.
 - b. The western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four 15-minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County do not indicate that the subject property would contain mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value, but as stated above, it can be determined that this specific site does not contain them.

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

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

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

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60 dBA CNEL;
 - Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
 - Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- a. The project is not listed under Table 6-1 of the General Plan as being a use subject to maximum allowable noise exposures from transportation source. As such, an acoustical analysis was not provided as part of the project application submittal. The creation of the two parcels to accommodate single-family usage will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan.
- b. – d. Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the parcel vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are

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

required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. The creation of the two parcels will not create new construction and grading.

- e. General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including single-family residential, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a County owned/operated airport facility.
- f. The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport.

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

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. The proposed project will not induce growth directly or indirectly by providing infrastructure that would create development beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. The development area on the project site is designated on the 2004 General Plan Land Use Map for rural residential development.
- b. – c. The proposed parcel split will not displace people or existing housing, which will prevent the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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

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>				
a. Fire protection?			X	
b. Police protection?			X	
c. Schools?			X	
d. Parks?			X	
e. Other government services?			X	

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

Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department’s/District’s goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;

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

a. & b., d. & e.

General Plan Policy 5.1.2.2 establishes that the provision of public services to new discretionary development shall not result in a reduction of service below minimum established standards to current users, pursuant to Table 5-1. Table 5-1 establishes Minimum Levels of Service for public services such as schools, parks, fire districts, ambulance and sheriff. The Diamond Springs – El Dorado Protection District currently provides fire protection services to project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services, however, no factual information was provided by the either fire district stating that the minimum level of service would fall below the minimum response time of 15-45 minutes, as designated in Table 5-1. The current staffing within the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department is approximately 1 to 1.2 officers per 1,000 County residents compared with the statewide average of 1.8 officers per 1,000 population. The department will serve the project site with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The project site is accessed by traveling on Farish Road approximately 1,600 feet from Greenstone Road to the proposed access driveway for Parcel 2. The creation of the second parcel will not directly affect the response time in a way different than that which exists today for the twelve parcels that use the Farish Road access so impact of the project to the level of service provided by the Sheriff’s Dept. will be less than significant.

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

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

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

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. The project would have no impact on the use of recreational facilities in the area, nor does it include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities in its proposal.

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

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X
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. Access to the site is directly off of Farish Road which is not County maintained. Comments were received from the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) indicating that the level of service (LOS) will not be significantly impacted by the proposed parcels which have an ultimate estimated traffic generation of ten Average Daily Trips (ADT) per parcel for a total of 30 ADT and three peak hour trips which does not worsen traffic pursuant to the General Plan definition of worsen.
- c. The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns as there are no publicly or privately operated airports or landing fields in the project vicinity.
- d. The project will not substantially increase hazards because the access road and driveway into proposed Parcel 1 exist, and the widening and resurfacing of Farish Road will improve safety conditions.

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

- e. Access to the project parcels is proposed to be via encroachments onto Farish Road. A grading permit will be required in order for the El Dorado County Transportation Department to review all required road improvements prior to issuance of the final approved parcel map. Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District will also be reviewing the final road improvements prior to issuance of the final approved parcel map.
- f. The parking requirement for residential uses is two spaces per dwelling and all future residences shall be required to have two spaces of the Zoning Ordinance required size. The existing residence currently has two parking spaces available and any future primary or second residential units would be required to provide the same prior to issuance of a building permit.
- g. The proposed parcel split does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

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

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	

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

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

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

- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
 - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
 - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a & e. Proposed Parcel 1 has an existing County approved septic system and well. A percolation report/Land Capability Report submitted by the applicant dated March 9, 2006 dated has been reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Health Division to insure adequacy in meeting the standards of the El Dorado County Sewage Disposal Ordinance. They did not respond with concerns for the system capability. They will also review the final plan at the building permit stage. There is no evidence indicating the activities associated with the creation of the two parcels will violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the RWQCB.
- b. Any new water or sewer connections would be reviewed by El Dorado County Environmental Management Department of any future building permit.
- c. All new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities proposed will be reviewed by El Dorado County Department of Transportation or Building Services with any future grading permit.
- d. El Dorado Irrigation District has existing utilities on Farish Road. The applicant has decided to utilize wells instead. Proposed Parcel No. 1 has an existing approved well. Proposed Parcel 2 shall be conditioned to have a safe and reliable water source prior to the recording of the final parcel map, and the applicant will be required to drill a well and then provide a well production report to Environmental Health Division for review and approval.
- f. In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) are allowed to be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal site. All other waste materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.
- g. Garbage can pickup service is available for both proposed parcels.
- h. Power and telecommunication facilities on the road in front of both proposed parcels. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

Discussion:

- (a) This project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, including effects on animals or plants. Both short-term and long-term environmental effects associated with this project will be less than significant. Any potentially significant impacts will be reduced through compliance with existing standards and requirements.
- (b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines as two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study it has been determined that the project will not result in cumulative impacts.
- (c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly (no impacts identified, or mitigation has been included in the project design to reduce the impact).

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Cultural Resources Study for APN 319-190-12, Historic Resource Associates, Dana Supernowitz, April, 2006.