



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** P07-0002 Euer Parcel Map

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

**Contact Person:** Jonathan Fong

**Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** John Euer P.O. Box 400, Folsom CA, 95763

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** John Euer P.O. Box 400, Folsom CA, 95763

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

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

**Project Location:** The project is located on the south side of South Shingle Road, approximately 1.5 miles west of the intersection with Latrobe Road in the Latrobe area.

**Assessor's Parcel No:** 087-030-48

**Zoning:** Residential Agricultural-40 District

**Section:** 17      **T:** 8N    **R:** 9E

**General Plan Designation:** Rural Residential (RR)

**Description of Project:** Request for a Parcel Map to create two residential parcels, Parcel A would be 43-acres and Parcel B would be 41-acres.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
North:	RR	RA-20	Single Family Residences on Agriculture Lands
East:	RR	RA-40	Single Family Residences on Agriculture Lands
South:	RR	RA-40	Undeveloped Agriculture Lands
West:	RR	RA-40	Undeveloped Agriculture Lands

**Briefly Describe the environmental setting:** The project site is characterized by relatively flat topography with minimal vegetation. An intermittent stream and a natural drainage flow north to south along the project site. Portions of the site contain soil types classified as Farmland of Local of Importance.

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

1. El Dorado County Building Department: Building Permits
2. El Dorado County Surveyors Department
3. El Dorado County Department of Transportation
4. El Dorado County Assessor's Office

**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 Fact		

**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: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: Jonathan Fong For: El Dorado County

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

<b>I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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:**

**Thresholds of Significance:** 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) No designated scenic highway would be substantially affected by this project.
- (b) The proposed Parcel Map would not substantially damage existing scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources within a corridor defined as a State scenic highway adjacent to the project site. The project site is not located within a scenic highway.
- (c) The proposed Parcel Map is in an area developed with existing single-family development. Future residential development would be consistent with the surrounding area.
- (d) Additional light and glare would not result from the creation of these two parcels. Light and glare issues would be addressed during the building permit process.

**FINDING:** It has been determined that there would be no potential impacts to aesthetic or visual resources.

The identified thresholds of significance for the “Aesthetics” category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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		X	

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

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
Contract?			
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:**

**Thresholds of Significance:** 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) Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that the project site is located within areas designated as ‘Grazing Land’ and ‘Farmland of Local Importance. The project was review by the Agricultural Commission on March 14, 2007 which evaluated the potential agricultural impacts of the project. The Commission recommended approval of the project with a recommendation a 200-foot agricultural setback be recorded on the Parcel Map. The El Dorado County General Plan requires a 200 foot setback for all agriculturally incompatible land uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands. Setbacks for future development would be reviewed during the building permit stage of the project. Administrative Relief from the 200 foot setback could be considered during that process consistent with the Administrative Relief process established by the County. Therefore, impacts to farmland would be less than significant.

The project would create two, 40-acre parcels which would not result in a conversion of agricultural lands. The proposed parcel sizes would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use and the Development Standards of the RA-40 Zone District. Impacts would be less than significant.

- (b) The proposed project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning in the project vicinity, and would not adversely impact any properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract. The proposed parcels would be consistent with the surrounding parcel sizes. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project. The proposed parcels would allow for future agricultural operations as permitted by right within the RA-40 Zone District. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** It has been determined that the project would not result in any impacts to agricultural lands, or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is developed existing RA-20 and RA-40 zoned lands. The proposed Parcel Map would create two, 40-acre parcels consistent with the land use pattern in the surrounding area.. For this ‘‘Agriculture’’ category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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:**

**Thresholds of Significance:** A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, 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 PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, 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) El Dorado County has adopted the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG /VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>). This plan also contains a schedule for implementation and funding of Transportation Control Measures (TCM) to limit mobile source emissions. The TCM measures are implemented through the County involvement in the Ride-Sharing program, development of transit routes by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission, and at the project level through project specific mitigation measures.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan. Implementation measures from this plan are implemented at the project level through the permitting process managed by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District. Future development of the parcels would be required to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as required under the Federal Clean Air Act as well as the State of California Ambient Air Quality Standards, which are equal to or more stringent than the National Standards as discussed below. Impacts would be less than significant.

b & c)

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

The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District’s *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* establishes a threshold of 48 dwelling units with fireplaces or woodstoves, which would result in potentially significant ROG and Nox emissions. Vehicular emissions are based upon a trip rate of 9.53 vehicle trips per day per residence. The request for a Parcel Map would result in two parcels, which may be developed with two single-family residences, would not result in a significant increase in ROG or Nox. Additionally, the maximum total daily vehicle trips generated would be 19.06 trips per day. Using the thresholds in the *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*, impacts would be less than significant.

- (d) Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, day-care 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 creation of the proposed two parcels would not substantially impact any sensitive receptors in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (e) The RA-40 zone district does not permit activities, which could generate objectionable odors. Those activities, which might result in objectionable odors, dust, or smoke, require the review and approval of a Special Use Permit. This subsequent discretionary permit would require environmental review addressing the potential impacts resulting from the proposed activity.

**FINDING:** It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project in that no sensitive receptors would be adversely impacted, no objectionable odors would be created, and the project will not obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan. The thresholds of significance for the “Air Quality” category would not be exceeded no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the parcel creations.

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

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

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

**Discussion:**

**Thresholds of Significance:** 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) Review of the General Plan exhibits and maps indicate that no rare, threatened, or endangered fish, animal, or insect species exist on or adjacent to the project site. The site has been significantly disturbed in the past through grading and the placement of fill material.
- (b & c) The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Map for the area does not show any mapped wetlands on the site.
- (d) Review of the Department of Fish and Games Migratory Deer Herd Maps and General Plan DEIR Exhibit V-8-4 indicate no mapped deer migration corridors exist on the project site. The project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites in any manner that does not currently exist.
- (e) The creation of the two parcels would not involve the removal of any native trees or shrubs. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (f) The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a proposed or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts to biological resources would result from the development of the proposed project, as mitigation measures have been included within the project design to lessen any potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. For this “Biological Resources” category the proposed project would not exceed the thresholds of significance.

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

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

**Discussion:**

**Thresholds of Significance:** 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.

If a project impacts an identified archaeological site, a lead agency is required to determine if the site is a “historic resource” as defined below:

A historic resource for the purposes of this document is defined as:

- (i) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1 (k) of the Public Resources Code.
- (ii) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that is:
  - a) Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
  - b) Associated with the lives of persons important in California's past;
  - c) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
  - d) As yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(a & b) Cultural Resource Assessments for the previous applications for the subject parcel were prepared on February 7, 2006. No significant archeological resources were found to be located within the proposed parcel boundaries of Parcels 1 and 2.

Because of the common possibility that any parcel in the County may turn up archeological finds during grading, the project would be required to comply with standard conditions of approval requiring protective measures to be

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

implemented during project construction. With the application of the standard conditions of approval, impacts would be less than significant.

(c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil locales.

(d) In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the steps outlined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines shall be implemented immediately. This is a standard grading requirement, which applies to all discretionary projects

**FINDING:** For this “Cultural Resources” category the established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded and no significant adverse environmental impacts would result from the project.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			<b>X</b>	
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.			<b>X</b>	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			<b>X</b>	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			<b>X</b>	
iv) Landslides?			<b>X</b>	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			<b>X</b>	

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

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) (i, ii, & iii)

a) As shown in the Division of Mines and Geology’s publication Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, there are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones mapped in El Dorado County. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating buildings in the project area would be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides would be less than significant.

(iv) *The Generalized Map Showing Relative Amounts of Landslides* in California places El Dorado County entirely within the low severity zone for landslide activity (CDMG 1973 - General Plan EIR). Generally, landslide activity is restricted to areas of very steep slopes (in excess of 40 percent) and where planes of weakness in the soil or bedrock are evident and have been disturbed by development activities such as grading and construction. The project site is not located in an area with significant topographic variations in slope. The potential for mudslides or landslides would be less than significant

(b) All grading activities exceeding 50 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. The proposed parcels 1 and 2 would be required to apply for a Grading Permit prior to any grading occurring, which is then reviewed and processed by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation for compliance with the provisions contained in the *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. Compliance with this ordinance would ensure that any potential environmental impact would be less than significant.

(c) The Auburn Series soil type is not considered an unstable soil. Topography on the site is level with less than two percent of the onsite slopes falling in the 30 percent range. Compliance with the *County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Liquefaction is the sudden loss of soil shear strength and a sudden increase in pore water pressure resulting from sudden shear strains as would be generated during an earthquake. Research has shown that saturated, loose to medium-dense sands with silt content less than about 25-percent located within the top forty feet are the most susceptible to liquefaction. The project site does not contain areas of relatively high groundwater. Most of the site contains shallow bedrock. In addition, large unconsolidated fill and soils, dense materials with low porosity, and the low seismicity of the area limit the potential for liquefaction to a less than significant level.

(d) Expansive soils are those soil types that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and then shrink upon drying out. Soils with high clay content are subject to soil expansion. When buildings are placed on expansive soil,

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

foundations may rise during the wet season, and fall during the dry season. This shrink-swell (expansion) activity results in cracked foundations, distortion of structural members, and warping of doors and windows. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes numerical expansion indices for soil types ranging from very low to very high. Any soil identified in the foundation investigation to have an expansion index greater than 90 (medium) would require specific engineering analysis as required within the Uniform Building Code.

The *Soil Survey of El Dorado County* contains Table 6 (Pages 56-63), which tabulates the estimated properties of all the different soil series found in the County, including the shrink-swell potential. Shrink-swell potential is dependent upon the amount of clay within the soil series. Soils series with low to moderate shrink-swell potential provide sites adequate for placing structures. Review of the *Soil Survey of El Dorado County* indicates that the Auburn series has a low shrink-swell potential.

- (e) The project would construct private onsite septic systems for the two parcels. Septic system approval would be subject to review and approval by the Environmental Health Department. The Department has reviewed an initial soil test for the proposed septic systems. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts would result from geological or seismological anomalies on the project site. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that would result in significant impacts. For the “Geology and Soils” category the established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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 interferes with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X

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

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
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?		<b>X</b>	

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
  - Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
  - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a) Any hazardous materials utilized at the project site shall comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*.
  - b) No significant amounts of hazardous materials would be utilized for the project. The project would not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
  - c) As proposed, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
  - d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there would be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.
  - e) The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart, last updated September 1, 2005, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There would be less than significant impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations and the over-flight of aircraft in the vicinity of the project.
  - f) The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart, last updated September 1, 2005, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two (2) miles of a privately operated airstrip. As such, there would be no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft over flights in the vicinity of the project site.
  - g) The proposed project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. This is based upon the location of the nearest fire station, availability of multiple access points to the project site, availability of water for fire suppression, and provisions within the County emergency

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

response plan. The County emergency response plan is located with the County Office of Emergency Services located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.

- h) The project would be subject to review and approval by the Latrobe Fire Protection District. The project site is located in an area identified as having a moderate fire hazard. The project would create two parcels and would not significantly increase the fire hazards in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** The proposed Parcel Map would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed project.

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
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

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

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

**Discussion:**

Thresholds of Significance: 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) Any grading to improve access would require an improvement plan as required by the Department of Transportation. 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”, and the “Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance”. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The proposed project would create two parcels requiring the construction of private wells. The wells would be subject to review and approval by Environmental Health. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system. The standards apply to this project. Impacts would be less than significant.

d & e)

Compliance with the standards and requirements contained within the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* would limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site, and limit erosion and siltation to a less than significant level.

f) The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

g & h)

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

The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 06795D, October 18, 1983) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. Impacts would be less than significant.

- i) The subject property in the Latrobe area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters. There would be no impact
- j) The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. Potential for a mudflow is also considered to be less than significant.

**FINDING:** As discussed above, no significant hydrological impacts would result from this Parcel Map process. For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and with the conditions of approval proposed, no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

<b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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:**

**Thresholds of Significance:** 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) The project would not result in the physical division of an established community. There would be no impact.
- (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 for both Residential Agricultural 40-District (RA-40). The proposed Parcel Map would create two parcels consistent with the development pattern in the area. There would be no impact.

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

(c) The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. There would be no impact.

**FINDING:**

For the “Land Use Planning” category the project would not exceed the established thresholds of significance.

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> <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:**

Thresholds of Significance: 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 project site is not mapped as a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology, or by El Dorado County as depicted on General Plan Exhibit V-7-4.

(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 indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value.

**FINDING:** No impacts to any known mineral resource would occur as a result of the project. For the “Mineral Resources” section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

<b>XI. NOISE.</b> <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

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

<b>XI. NOISE.</b> <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
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:**

Thresholds of Significance: 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 & c)

The project would not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. As proposed, the project is not located in an area exposed to existing noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1.

b) Persons adjacent to the project vicinity would not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration because of project construction or upon completion of the project.

d) Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the project 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 required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. All storage, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas are required to be located as far as possible from any residential areas.

e) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards contained within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport.

f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport.

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

**FINDING:** As discussed above, the creation of the three parcels would not create increased noise levels. For this “Noise” section the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> <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:**

**Thresholds of Significance:** 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 has been determined to have no growth-inducing impact as the project does not include any proposal to extend, or expand infrastructure or roads, and does not include any school or large scale employment opportunities that lead to indirect growth.

b) No substantial numbers of existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project.

c) No substantial numbers of people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**FINDING:** The project would not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project would not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or upsizing infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and not significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

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

<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> <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:**

**Thresholds of Significance:** 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 Latorbe 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 as the parcels do have the potential to be developed, but would not prevent the Fire District to not be able to meet its response times either for the project, which is located north and west of the project site, or for the designated service area. The established minimum level of service for the fire district in a Community Region is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population. Additionally, the responsible Fire District would review any future building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards including, but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking lots, fire sprinklers within buildings, building identification and construction phasing. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured.

(b) **Police Protection:** The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. No specific standard minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The potential future addition of residential and commercial

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

structures and the related development would not significantly impact the achievement of this goal, or significantly impact current response times to the project area.

- (c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Latrobe School District. 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.
- (d) **Parks:** The proposed project would not substantially increase the local population necessitating the 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. Provisions to provide parkland or the payment of an in-lieu fee are not included as the project site is a commercially zoned area exclusive of the proposed remainder, and no development is part of this application process.
- (e) No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project.

**FINDING:** Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there would be no potential for a significant impact due to the development of the subject parcel either directly or indirectly. No significant public service impacts are expected. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance would be exceeded.

<b>XIV. RECREATION.</b>			
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:**

**Thresholds of Significance:** 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) The proposed project would not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
  - (b) The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing recreation facilities.

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

**FINDING:** No impacts to recreation or open space would result from the project. For this “Recreation” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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?			
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:**

Thresholds of Significance: 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).
- 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)The creation of the two parcels would not directly increase traffic. El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the proposed Parcel Map and concluded that since no improvements are proposed with this application, the proposal does not “worsen” traffic as defined in the 2004 General Plan. Should the creation of the parcels be approved by the Planning Commission, any future development would require review for traffic impacts by Planning Services and DOT.

(c) The project would not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity.

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

- (e) The project would not result in inadequate emergency access to any of the proposed commercial structures.
- (f) Future submitted site plans would be reviewed to verify compliance with Zoning Ordinance on-site parking requirements. Section 17.18.060 of the Zoning Ordinance lists the parking requirements by use.
- (g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**FINDING:** The impacts of the proposed parcels would not impact traffic until they are developed. Any future development proposals would be reviewed for traffic impacts. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
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:**

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

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

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

- Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
  - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a) No significant wastewater discharge or surface run-off would result from the proposed Parcel Map or the development of a single-family residence on the proposed new parcel. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required because of the project. The project would be served by onsite wells and private septic systems. There would no impact.
- c) The project would require road improvements to the onsite roads. The road improvements would be subject to review and approval by the Department of Transportation. Adherence to County policies relating to drainage would reduce potential impacts. The road improvements would be limited and scope and would not significantly alter the drainage in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (d) The project would construct private wells for the parcels. All wells would be subject to review and approval by Environmental Health to demonstrate that the wells meet the minimum requirements for water quality and flow. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (e) Septic disposal systems have been proposed for both parcels. There would be no impact to the existing wastewater systems.
- (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.) may 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. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. For residential development a local provider contracting to the property owner for the service, provides curbside trash and pick-up of recyclable materials. For multi-family, commercial, and industrial development some on-site separation of materials is required and areas are required to be set aside for the storage of solid waste in accordance with Ordinance No. 4319.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts would result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects would result from the project

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

<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:</b>			
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) There is no evidence contained in the whole record that the project would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.
- 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.” Generally the discussion of cumulative impacts need not focus on the impacts created by the adjacent project, but should specify how the proposed project and adjacent project’s impacts create or combine to create a greater impact. In this case, it has been determined that the proposed creation of three parcels in and of itself would not create cumulative considerable impacts to traffic and circulation pattern.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document it has been determined that the project would not have any environmental effects which would 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 the El Dorado County Planning Department office located in Placerville. Pursuant to Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines this document incorporates the applicable portions of the following documents by reference.

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 by 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.)

### **Project Specific Reports and Supporting Information**

The following documents are available at the El Dorado County Planning Department office located in Placerville. Pursuant to Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines this document incorporates the applicable portions of the following documents by reference.

Facility Improvement Letter, October 6, 2005, El Dorado Irrigation District

Cultural Resource Assessments, Peak and Associates, Inc. on May 20, 1991, and September 2003.