



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: P90-0146E / P90-0147E Casper and Mackay Parcel Maps

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

Contact Person: Jonathan Fong	Phone Number: (530) 621-5355
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Property Owner's Name and Address: Edward Mackay, P.O. Box 6314 Auburn California 95619.
John Casper, P.O. Box 6314. Auburn California 95619.

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Edward Mackay, P.O. Box 6314 Auburn California 95604.
John Casper, P.O. Box 6314. Auburn California 95604.

Project Agent's Name and Address: Larry Patterson, Patterson Development, 6610 Merchandise Way.
Diamond Springs CA, 95619.

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Larry Patterson, Patterson Development, 6610
Merchandise Way, Diamond Springs CA, 95619.

Project Location: The project is located on the north side of Mineral Way, one mile east of the intersection with Mineral Way in the Pleasant Valley area.

Assessor's Parcel No: 099-020-02/ 096-090-05

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

Section: 27 **T:** 10N **R:** 11E

General Plan Designation: Rural Residential (RR)

Description of Project: The project request includes two parcel map time extensions. The Parcel Map for APN 099-020-02 (Mackay Parcel Map) consists of 40-acres and would create four 10-acre parcels. The Parcel Map for APN 096-090-05 (Casper Parcel Map) consists of 80-acres and would create four 10-acre parcels and one 40-acre remainder parcel. The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps include a Design Waiver request to allow the creation of parcels ½ mile beyond a dead-end road.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RE-10	RR	Undeveloped
North:	RE-10	RR	Undeveloped
East:	RE-10	RR	Single Family Residence
South:	RE-10	RR	Single Family Residence
West:	RE-10	RR	Single Family Residence

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is currently undeveloped and is accessed via an existing dirt road. The project is located at elevation ranging from 2,010 to 2,450 feet above sea level. Onsite slopes are moderate to steep with 60% of the slopes falling within the 30 percent or greater range. Vegetation onsite is comprised of dense oak woodland canopy and native grasslands. One intermittent stream is located on the south side of Mineral Way and runs along the northern boundary of APN 099-020-02.

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

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

agreement.):

1. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading permit for onsite and offsite access road improvements.
2. Environmental Management Department: approved soil evaluation report for waste disposal and identified water source prior to map recording.

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.

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

Signature:  _____ Date: January 1, 2008

Printed Name: Jonathan Fong For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: July 12, 2007

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps. The two parcel maps would result in the creation of eight residential parcels.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located in the Pleasant Valley area approximately three miles south of the City of Placerville. The project site is surrounded by existing single-family residences and undeveloped residential lands.

Project Characteristics

The project would approve time extensions to two approved tentative parcel maps which are located adjacent to one another and share a common access. The Mackay Parcel Map would create four, 10-acre parcels. Parcel Map P90-0147E would create four, 10-acre parcels and one 40-acre remainder parcel. The access road has been graded and is currently a dirt road. The road would be paved as a condition of both parcel maps.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Both the Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps would be accessed via a cul-de-sac road extension from Mineral Way. Mineral Way is an approximately 1.25 mile long dead-end road which ends south of the project site. Improvement plans have been submitted to the Department of Transportation for the proposed cul-de-sac for the project.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps would be served by onsite wells and private septic systems.

3. Population

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

The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps would add a total of eight developable parcels in the area. The potential of two residential units, (main single family residential unit and one secondary residential unit) would not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of offsite and onsite road improvements including grading for a driveway.

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

Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

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

- 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.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista. The Mackay Parcel Map would create four, 10-acre parcels. The Casper Parcel Map would

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

create four, 10-acre parcels and one 40-acre remainder parcel. The parcel maps would create a total of eight residential parcels and one remainder parcel. The surrounding land uses are predominantly residential.

- a. **Scenic Vista.** The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps are located in an area which contains single family residences. The project sites and vicinity are not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.¹ There would be no impact.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps are not adjacent or visible from a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site.² There would be no impact.
- c. **Visual Character.** The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps would not affect the visual character of the project vicinity. There would be no impact.
- d. **Light and Glare.** The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps would create a total of eight residential parcels. The potential sources of light and glare that would result from the residential development of the project would be consistent with the project area. The project would not have the potential to create sources of light that would adversely affect views in the area. There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to aesthetics are expected with the Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps either directly or indirectly. For this “Aesthetics” category, there would be 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:

¹ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1.
² California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>).

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

- 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-c. **Agricultural Resources.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps are not within an Agricultural zone or Agricultural overlay. No parcels surrounding the Mackay or Casper Parcel Maps are located within a Williamson Act Contract. The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps are not currently in use for any agricultural operation. There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the parcel maps either directly or indirectly. For this “Agriculture” category, there would be no impact.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

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

a-c.

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

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

d-e.

Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors. Sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, care facilities and high density dwelling units are not located within the immediate vicinity. Common types of facilities known to produce odors include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfill, transfer station, asphalt batch plant and manufacturing plants. The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps would not generate or produce objectionable odors. Short-term heavy equipment emissions generated by the onsite and offsite road improvements would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash or odors based upon an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan conforming to District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2 and Rule 300 as applicable. The proposed road improvement work would not include any features that would be a source of substantial long term pollutant emissions that could affect sensitive receptors or generate objectionable odors. Therefore, long-term impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps 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			X	

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a.

Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities. The project sites are not located within known areas containing special status species or sensitive natural communities. There would be no impact.

b-c.

Riparian Habitat/ Wetlands Features. The Biological Resources Studies prepared for both project sites identified intermittent and ephemeral streams which cross the project sites. Pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 a 100 foot setback would be required from all perennial streams and rivers. A 50 foot setback would be required from all intermittent streams. The proposed access road runs along an intermittent stream, but has already been constructed and would not require additional widening. All future development on the proposed parcel maps would require adherence to these setbacks. Impacts would be less than significant.

d.

Wildlife Species. The project sites are not located with an important wildlife migration corridor. There would be no impact.

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

e.

Local Conservation Policy. Both project sites are heavily wooded with oak woodland habitat. Pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 both parcel maps would require retention and replacement of impacted oak woodland canopy. The submitted Arborist Reports for the parcel maps analyzed potential oak woodland canopy impacts associated with future development associated with the parcel maps. A conservation easement would be established consistent with the Interim Interpretative Guidelines established for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. The proposed retention and establishment of a conservation easement would be consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. Impacts would be less than significant.

f.

Habitat Conservation Plan. The parcel maps would not conflict with any State, regional or local habitat conservation plan. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-d.

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

Review of culturally sensitive areas as part of the original approval of both Mackay and Casper Maps indicated that the projects lie in an area not know to contain archeologically sensitive resources. Standard conditions of approval would be required for both parcel maps requiring protective measures in the event any culturally sensitive resources or interred human remains are discovered during project construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

All feasible conditions would be incorporated in the proposed parcel maps to reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance. For this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance would not be 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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X	

Discussion:

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as ground shaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property

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

resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;

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

a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.³ No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.⁴ There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are two known faults within the project vicinity; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The Melones fault zone is associated with the Foothills fault system, previously considered inactive but re-classified to potentially active after a Richter magnitude earthquake measuring 5.7 occurred near Oroville in 1975. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.⁵

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 50 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 50 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey.⁶ While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence,

³ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)* May 2003, p.5.9-29.

⁴ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

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

⁶ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002.*
 (<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha>)

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

or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located.

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

- b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During site grading and construction of any onsite and offsite road improvements, there would be a potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions. Adherence to applicable ordinance policies would reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- d. **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The project site has been classified per the USDA Soil Survey as Boomer, Mariposa, and Iron Mountain Series soil types which are characterized by a low shrink-swell potential. There would be no impact
- e. **Septic Systems.** The Mackay Parcel Map would create four lots. The Casper Parcel Map would create four parcels and one remainder parcel. Both parcel maps would require installation of private septic systems for each of the proposed lots. The Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the application. The Department would require review and approval of any septic system prior to installation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

⁷ *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.*

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-b. **Hazardous Substances.** No hazardous substances would be involved with the parcel maps. Temporary use of heavy equipment for road improvements would be required. A diesel fuel storage tank may be

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

located onsite for the heavy equipment. The potential storage and transport of diesel fuel in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment would require an approved hazardous material business plan issued from the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. Said hazardous material business plan would identify potential impacts to the environment and require mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Based on the amount of road improvements required and the duration of heavy equipment onsite and offsite to complete the road improvements, and that fuel storage would most likely not occur, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant with an approved hazardous materials business plan.

- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the Mackay or Casper project sites. The proposed projects would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** are not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.⁸ There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The Mackay and Casper project sites are not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There is no private airstrip(s) in the immediate vicinity that is identified on a U.S. Geological Survey Topography Map. There would be no impact.
- g. **Emergency Response Plan.** The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps are accessed by Mineral Way. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District provides fire protection in the project vicinity. The District was distributed the projects during the initial review and determined road improvements and structural fire protection measures for future development would provide adequate measures. There would be no impacts related to emergency response or evacuation plans.
- h. **Fire Hazards.** The project sites are located in an area classified as having a moderate fire hazard.⁹ The project would be required to construct road improvements as conditions of approval. The proposed onsite road would provide a 24 foot wide roadway with shoulders. The required improvement would provide adequate emergency access to the project site. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

Finding

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

⁸ California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List, accessed September 23, 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004.

⁹ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.8-4.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical storm water pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a & f. **Water Quality Standards.** The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps are of limited scope and would not involve disturbance to water bodies or require water service, and would therefore have no effect on surface or groundwater quantity or quality. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Groundwater.** The proposed parcels would be served by private wells. The usage of the wells to serve two additional parcels would not significantly affect the groundwater in the area. Prior to construction of any wells, permits subject to review and approval by Environmental Management would be required. Adherence to Environmental Management requirements for the construction of new wells would reduce impacts to less than significance.
- c. **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit storm water runoff and discharge from a site. The Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed project and finds that an erosion control plan is not warranted for the proposed parcel map. However, the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District may require an erosion control plan prior to road grading. The conditions of approval addressed in the erosion control plan would reduce erosion to less than significant.
- d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** The parcel map would create eight 10-acre parcels and one 40-acre remainder parcel. A natural drainage course is located near Mineral Way along the northern property boundary of the Mackay Parcel Map. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed parcel map and has determined that a drainage, erosion control and grading plans would be warranted. The Department of Transportation would review the plans to ensure conformance with applicable County regulations. The project would not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern, impacts would be less than significant..
- e. **Storm Water Run-off.** Based on the soil types, surface runoff has been characterized as being slow to moderate. Erosion control plans have not been warranted at this time by the appropriate reviewing agencies. The proposed project would not involve any operations that would be a source of polluted water. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- g, h, & i. **Flooding.** There are no 100-year flood hazard areas at or adjacent to the site. The site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is not in an area subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. There would be no impact.
- FIRM.** The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0725 C last updated December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a. **Established Community.** The project sites are surrounded by residential uses and is located within the Pleasant Valley area. The proposed parcel maps and future residential development would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact.
- b. **Land Use Plan.** The parcels are zoned for Estate Residential Ten-Acre (RE-10) and have a Rural Residential (RR) General Plan Land Use Designation. Both the RE-5 Zone District and RR land use designation allow single family residential development. The project would create eight residential parcels. The proposed density and parcel sizes would be consistent within the RE-10 zone district and RR land use designation. There would be no impact.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the projects would not affect any biological resources. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project sites are not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present¹⁰ and the project sites have not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.¹¹ There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project sites that could affect existing uses. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

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

¹⁰ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.*

¹¹ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.*

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

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X

Discussion:

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

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

a-d. **Noise Standards.** The onsite and offsite road improvements would generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment, trucks, bulldozer) at a potentially significant level (greater than 60 dB L_{eq} and 70 dB L_{max} between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 GP table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in rural regions-construction noise). Construction operations for road improvements would require adherence to construction hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. during weekdays and 8:00.m. to 5:00p.m. on weekends and federally recognized holidays. All heavy construction equipment would be required to install the latest noise reduction technologies available. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant. The long-term noise impacts would be related to current vehicle traffic along Mineral Way which would be under the maximum noise level thresholds in the 2004 General Plan table 6-1 of 60 dB L_{dn}/CNEL or less. The road improvement activities would occur weekdays during daylight hours and would not involve extensive use of heavy equipment that would be a substantial source of noise or vibration at the residence or adjacent residences. No known changes in traffic-generated noise levels would occur. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

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

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

Finding

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

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

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

b. **Police Protection.** The Mackay Parcel Map would create four residential parcels. The Casper Map would create four residential parcels. The increase in residential density in the project area would require additional police services.. Impacts to police protection services would be less than significant.

c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** The proposed project adds an incremental amount to the existing population and does not propose any substantial increase in the local population requiring development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects.

Both the Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps would be required to pay parkland dedication in-lieu fees as a condition of maps. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-b. **Parks and Recreation.** The proposed parcel maps would not increase population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. The project does not propose any onsite recreation facilities and is not required to construct any new facilities or expand any existing recreation facilities with the scope of this project. Quimby fees for the acquisition of parklands would be assessed during the process of the final parcel map for both projects.

Finding

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

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

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			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. **Capacity and Level of Service.** The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps and has determined that neither project exceeds the thresholds established in the 2004 General Plan. The number of vehicles associated with the creation of four additional parcels from the Mackay Parcel Map and four parcels from the Casper Parcel Map would not change current vehicle trip rates and would not measurably affect traffic volumes or levels of service on a permanent basis such that County standards would be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project sites are not within an airport safety zone. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the Mackay or Casper Parcel Maps. There would be no impact.

d. **Hazards.** The Mackay Casper Parcel Maps are accessible from Mineral Way. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access.** Road improvements would be required to increase the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to the Design and Improvement Standards Manual are being placed upon the conditions of approvals for both the Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps prior to final map recording. Based upon the required road improvements there would be no disruption of emergency access to and from the existing residence or those in surrounding parcels. There would be no impact.

f. **Parking.** The Mackay Parcel Map would create four residential parcels. The Casper Map would create four parcels and one remainder parcel. Both parcel maps would provide for the required parking for residential land uses on each of the resultant parcels. There would be no impact.

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

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

Finding

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
- 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 onsite water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;

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

- Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate onsite wastewater system; or
 - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a. **Wastewater.** Both projects would require private septic systems. The require septic systems would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. Storm water runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). There would be no impact.
- b., d., e. **New Facilities** No new or expanded water or wastewater facilities would be required for the proposed parcel since the proposed water service would be provided from private well systems. There would be no impact.
- c. **Storm Water Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the project proposal and has concluded that the provisions of the drainage manual would not be required. There would be no impact.
- f & g. **Solid Waste.** No anticipated substantial increases of solid waste generated from the existing residential units and proposed residential unit once the parcel is divided into two or affect recycling goals. There would be no impact.
- h. **Power.** The Mackay and Casper Parcel Maps would require extension of power services to each proposed residence. The increase in power demands would not substantially increase the power requirements in the project areas. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

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

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

Discussion

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

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Biological Resources Evaluation Report for the APN 099-020-02 Tentative Parcel Map. El Dorado County. Sycamore Consultants. February 2007.

Tree Survey, Preservation and Replacement Plan Project: Casper Mineral Way Proposed Subdivision. Sierra Ecosystem Associates. July 2007.

Tree Survey, Preservation and Replacement Plan Project: Mackay Mineral Way Proposed Subdivision. Sierra Ecosystem Associates. July 2007.