



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Parcel Map P07-0021/Carr Parcel Map

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

Contact Person: Tom Dougherty, Project Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Charles and Nancy Carr, 1000 A Old Neumann Road, Rescue, CA 95672

Project Agent Name and Address: Nicole Young, Labeck Young Engineering, Inc., 3430 Robin Lane, Building #2, Cameron Park, CA 95672

Project Location: West side of Old Neumann Road approximately 3,200 feet north of the intersection with Deer Valley Road in the Rescue area, Supervisorial District IV.

Assessor's Parcel No: 102-010-25

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

Section: 8 T: 10N R: 19E

General Plan Designation: Rural Residential (RR)

Description of Project: A tentative parcel map creating two parcels of 20 and 50 acres in size on a 70-acre site. Design waivers have been requested for the following:

- A. Allow for a 5,000-foot dead-end road, exceding 2,640 feet.
- B. Allow a driveway to access Parcel B.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RE-10	RR	Residential, single-family residence
North:	RE-10	RR	Residential, single-family residence
East:	RE-10	RR	Residential, single-family residence
South:	RE-10	RR	Residential, single-family residence
West:	RE-10	RR	Residential, single-family residence

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is accessed via Old Neumann Road off of Deer Valley Road, both of which are paved with asphalt. The property slopes gently downward from both the northwest and southeast corners to the low point points in a strip of land dissecting it from the northeast corner to the low point near the southwest corner. The parcel contains 0 – 30 percent slopes, but the majority being ten percent. Proposed Lot A is developed with a single-family residential unit, associated landscaping, accessory buildings and supporting utility and access driveway. The 70-acre site is located between the 1,280 to 1,460-foot elevations above sea level. There is an existing small pond near the northeast corner. The parcel is covered intermittently with native oak trees with a few native shrubs and exotic annual grasses.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described in attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, pursuant to applicable standards; and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista.

- (a) Scenic Vista. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- (b) Scenic Resources. The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>)). Impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) The creation of these two parcels would not directly change any views from what is currently available. Impacts would be less than significant
- (d) The creation of these two parcels would not introduce new lighting and thus would have a less than significant impact on nighttime views in the area. Impacts would be less than significant

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

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 6 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
 - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
 - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- (a) Parcel A contains a small portion of Rescue sandy loam soil (ReC) which is classified as Unique and Soils of Local Importance using the USDA-NRCS Soil Surveys. The project would not directly result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses because there currently is no new development proposed in that area. The applicant is currently growing lavender plants in that area and there is a small pond. According to the Soil Survey of El Dorado County, this soil type is generally used for dryland pasture, irrigated pasture, forage crops, and for some pear and apple orchards and vineyards. The subject parcel is not located within the General Plan Agricultural (A) land use overlay and is located in a rural region on the General Plan land use map. No development within this area is proposed by this project request as this is the area where the existing dwellings are located. The effect on prime farmland would be less than significant.
- (b & c) The creation of the two parcels would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

Finding: This project would have less than significant impacts on agricultural lands and would not impact properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. For the 'Agriculture' category, impacts would be less than significant.

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or			X	

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 7 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- (a) The El Dorado County/California Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan. There would be no impact.
- (b & c) Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (O₃). Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM₁₀) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to meet the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

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

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

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 8 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Mobile emission sources such as automobiles, trucks, buses, and other internal combustion vehicles are responsible for more than 70 percent of the air pollution within the County, and more than one-half of California’s air pollution. In addition to pollution generated by mobile emissions sources, additional vehicle emission pollutants are carried into the western slope portion of El Dorado County from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area by prevailing winds. The project parcels are accessed off of Old Neumann Road. Future grading would potentially emit minor, temporary and intermittent criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and would be subject to El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District standards at that time. The proposed parcels are not located in an asbestos review area. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 9 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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 - c) The creation of these two parcels, one of which that would have an existing single-family dwelling, would not change the existing habitat much more than currently exists, as the interior roads are already rough graded in, nor the support for any of the special-status species of plants and wildlife known in the region. Further, the parcels do not fall within designated critical habitat or core areas for the Red-legged and Yellow-legged frog species. (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7). Impacts would be less than significant.

(d) Review of the Department of Fish and Game’s *Migratory Deer Herd Maps* indicate the project site does not lie within the range of a deer herd. Based on that fact, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on deer migration patterns.

(e & f) The subject parcel is located in the Blue Oak Woodland habitat type which is typical of areas mostly found below 3,000 feet elevation and is characterized by shallow, rocky, unfertile soils. The majority of Parcel B contains the Chamise chaparral habitat type characterized by shrub dominance and thin soils. (El Dorado County General Plan EIR, 5.12-7, May 2003).

Existing vegetation on the site consists predominantly of even-aged scattered native oak trees on Parcel A and predominately chaparral shrubs on Parcel B. The creation of the two parcels in and of itself, would impact the woodland in an insignificant level because a dwelling, the driveways, water, and septic services and other supporting utilities exist on Parcel A and the proposed development area of Parcel B has dirt roads and the development area shown was within an area previously disturbed. Significant disturbance not typical of single-family residential uses would not be expected. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Finding: No impacts from biological resources are expected with the creation of the two parcels either directly or indirectly because of the existing conditions, no trees are currently proposed to be removed and that the review of

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 10 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

future building permits would bring the impacts to insignificant levels. For this “Biological” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

(a-d) The applicant submitted a “Cultural Resources Study” prepared by Historic Resource Associates, dated February 2008 that reported there were no significant prehistoric and historic-period cultural resources sites, artifacts, historic buildings, structures or objects found on the subject parcel. Because of the possibility in the future that ground disturbances could turn up significant cultural resources anywhere in the County, the following would be added as a condition to address any potential future discovery:

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

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

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 11 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

- (a) There are no known faults which transect the project area or are located on the project site, however, there are faults located regionally. The project site could be expected to undergo moderate to severe ground shaking during large magnitude earthquakes, however, the occurrence of one of these events in this area has been historically rare. The impact from a major seismic event could be considered less than significant.
- (b) All grading activities exceeding 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* Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use, in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During any site grading and any new construction, there is potential for minor erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions. To reduce the potential for erosion and loss of topsoil for any future construction activity, the applicant would be required to comply with the *El Dorado County Grading Ordinance*. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (c - d) Based on the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, CA, issued April 1974*, the project site contains the following four types of soils:
1. Rescue sandy loam (ReC) which tends to be moderately sloping, with moderately slow permeability and medium surface runoff. This type is within the east-central portion, approximately 20 percent of the subject parcel.
 2. Rescue very stoney sandy loam (RfC) 3 to 15 percent slopes, slow to medium surface runoff and slight to moderate erosion hazard. This type is in the southern approximately 40 percent of the subject parcel
 3. Rescue very stony sandy loam (RfE) with 30 to 50 percent slopes, rapid surface runoff and high erosion hazard. This type is in the northwestern approximately 20 percent of the subject parcel.
 4. Rescue very stony sandy loam (RfD) with 15 to 30 percent slopes, medium surface runoff and high erosion hazard. This type is in the central approximately 20 percent of the subject parcel
- Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. As identified in the Soil Survey of El Dorado County, the subject property has low shrink-swell potential for all four types, hence low expansively. (Pp. 60-61, *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area*). The impact from expansive soils for any future construction is less than significant.
- (e) The subject site is located on soils of moderate permeability that are considered “moderate” in limiting a septic system on slopes less than 10 percent, as determined by the Soil Survey of El Dorado County. The applicants submitted a *Report of Well Production* dated June 24, 2007 that reported adequate production. The applicants submitted a *Percolation Test* dated October 26, 2007 for the subject parcel that has been reviewed by the Environmental Health Division who determined it proved the potential for adequate septic facilities for proposed Parcel B. Parcel A already has an approved septic system. The Environmental Health Division would review specific septic designs that accompany future development plans, including potential second-residential units on all parcels, to ensure that the final septic disposal design meets County standard. Impacts would be less than significant.

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 13 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

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

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

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 14 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase			X	

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 15 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

(a & f) Human activities such as agriculture, animal husbandry, municipal, industrial, recreational, and mining uses can result in runoff that could contribute to water quality problems in surface water bodies. Water quality standards for development of the project site are governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) through the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Any construction project affecting one acre or more of disturbed soil is required to comply with the SWRCB General Permit conditions for storm-water runoff from construction activities and is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program (NPDES) permit. A NPDES permit would not be required for this project because no grading would occur immediately because of the creation of the parcels. Grading would be analyzed with any future required permits. There is no evidence indicating that the parcel creations or activities associated with that would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the RWQCB. Impacts would be less than significant.

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 16 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- (b) El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. The geology of the Western Slope portion of El Dorado County is principally hard crystalline, igneous or metamorphic rock overlain with a thin mantle of sediment or soil. Groundwater in this region is found in fractures, joints, cracks, and fault zones within the bedrock mass. These discrete fracture areas are typically vertical in orientation rather than horizontal as in sedimentary or alluvial aquifers. Recharge is predominantly through rainfall infiltrating into the fractures. Movement of this groundwater is very limited due to the lack of porosity in the bedrock. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are identified in El Dorado County. The two parcels would have a less than significant impact.
- (c – e) Compliance with the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance’s* Best Management Practices for any future grading would reduce any potential construction erosion and operational runoff to less than significant.
- (g – i) The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel Nos. 060040-0700D, dated October 18, 1995, establish that the project site is within Flood Zone “C”, area of minimal flooding. Impacts from flooding would be less than significant.
- (j) A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. As the parent parcel is sited outside of the 100-year event, the potential for a mudflow is considered to be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 17 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- (a) The proposed project would not physically divide an established community as the project site is located within an established group of parcels of similar sized lots. 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. The General Plan designates the subject site as Rural Residential and the proposed parcels meet the intent for single-family residential development at densities of one dwelling unit per ten to one-hundred sixty-acres, and the utilities needed to support the residential use of the two parcels are currently available. The two proposed parcels conform to existing zoning, meeting the minimum ten-acre minimum size requirement and allowing permissible uses. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is not located in an ecological preserve mitigation area established for the Pine Hill rare plants or red-legged frog core area. The project would not conflict with any known habitat conservation plan. There would be no impact.

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

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

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- (a) The parcel site is not mapped as a known Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology as shown on the Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn 15-minute Mineral Resource Zone quadrangles or by El Dorado County as depicted on the 2004 General Plan Exhibit 5.9-6. There would be no impact.
 - (b) The western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four 15-minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County do not indicate that the subject property would contain mineral

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 18 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

resources of known local or statewide economic value, but as stated above, it can be determined that this specific site does not contain them. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60 dBA CNEL;
 - Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
 - Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- (a) The project is not listed under Table 6-1 of the General Plan as being a use subject to maximum allowable noise exposures from transportation source. As such, an acoustical analysis was not provided as part of the project application submittal. The creation of the two parcels to accommodate single-family usage would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan. There would be no impact.

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 19 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- (b – d) Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the parcel vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. There would be no impact.
- (e) General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including single-family residential, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a County owned/operated airport facility. There would be no impact.
- (f) The proposed project is located adjacent to a private airstrip on the parcel to the north. It is used by that parcel owner alone on a very intermittent basis. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
 - Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
 - Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.
- (a) The proposed project would not induce growth directly or indirectly by providing infrastructure that would create development beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. The development area on the project site is designated on the 2004 General Plan Land Use Map for rural residential development. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - (b - c) The proposed parcel split would not displace people or existing housing, which would prevent the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There would be no impact.

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 20 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

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

- Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department’s/District’s goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;
 - Substantially increase or expand the demand for public law enforcement protection without increasing staffing and equipment to maintain the Sheriff’s Department goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents;
 - Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services;
 - Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources;
 - Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
 - Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.
- a) Fire Protection: The Rescue Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. The District was solicited for comments to determine compliance with fire standards, El Dorado County General Plan, State Fire Safe Regulations as adopted by El Dorado County and the 2007 California Uniform Fire Code. The District did not respond with any concerns, as conditioned, that the level of service would fall below the minimum requirements as a result of the proposed parcel map. The impacts would be less than significant.
- b) Police Protection: The project site will 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 percent of the population within Community Regions. No specific 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 creation of two

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 21 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

parcels where one currently exists would not significantly impact current Sheriff’s response times to the project area. The impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Schools: The State allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project proposal would not directly generate the need for additional school facilities and will not impact school enrollment, as the project would not result in a dominant residential component. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d) Parks: Section 16.12.090 of the County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for parkland dedication, and the in-lieu fee. Provisions to provide parkland were not included as part of the proposal in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of County Code. The project proposal would not increase the demand for parkland. The impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Other Facilities: No other public facilities or services would be directly impacted by the project. The impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant impacts would occur with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

(a – b) The project would have the potential for a minor impact on the use of recreational facilities in the area, but would not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities in its proposal. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 22 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
 - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
 - Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.
- (a - b) Access to the site is directly off of Old Neumann Road which is not County maintained. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) maintains that the level of service (LOS) would not be significantly impacted by the proposed parcels which have an ultimate estimated traffic generation of ten Average Daily Trips (ADT) per parcel for a total of 20 ADT and three peak hour trips which does not worsen traffic pursuant to the General Plan definition of worsen. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) The project would not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns as there are no publicly or privately operated airports or landing fields in the project vicinity. There is a private airstrip on the parcel to the north but is used by that parcel owner alone. The project would not result in a change in air traffic.
- (d) The project would not substantially increase hazards because all roads and accesses exist and the widening of Old Neumann Road would improve safety conditions. There would be no impact.

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 23 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- (e) Access to the project parcels is via existing encroachments onto Old Neumann, as both driveways exist and are in use. A grading permit would be required in order for the El Dorado County Transportation Department to review all required road improvements prior to issuance of the final approved parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (f) The parking requirement for residential uses is two spaces per dwelling and all future residences shall be required to have two spaces of the Zoning Ordinance required size. Any residence would be required to have two parking spaces available and any future primary or second residential units would be required to provide the same. There would be no impact.
- (g) The proposed parcel split does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

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

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

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
- Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
- Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.

(a & e) Parcel A would utilize the existing septic systems that has been reviewed by the Environmental Health Division to insure adequacy in meeting the standards of the El Dorado County Sewage Disposal Ordinance and was given approval. The submitted percolation test has been reviewed by the Environmental Health Division who determined it proved the potential for adequate septic facilities for proposed Parcel B. The Environmental Health Division would review specific septic designs that accompany future development plans, including potential second-residential units on all parcels, to ensure that the final septic disposal design meets County standard. There is no evidence indicating the activities associated with the creation of the two parcels would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the RWQCB. Impacts would be less than significant.

(b) Any new water or sewer connections would be reviewed by El Dorado County Environmental Management Department of any future building permit. There would be no impact.

(c) All new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities proposed would be reviewed by El Dorado County Department of Transportation with any future grading permit. There would be no impact.

(d) The parcel is not located within the El Dorado Irrigation District and therefore would not require infrastructure improvements. The existing well on Parcel A has sufficient production to support residential uses and the Environmental Health Division would require that prior to filing the parcel map, each lot shall have a safe and reliable well provided for each parcel that meets the criteria of Environmental Management Policy 800-02. There would be no impact.

(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 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.

After July of 2006, El Dorado Disposal began distributing municipal solid waste to Forward Landfill in Stockton and Kiefer Landfill in Sacramento. Pursuant to El Dorado County Environmental Management Solid Waste Division staff, both facilities have sufficient capacity to serve the County. Recyclable materials are distributed to a facility in Benicia and green wastes are sent to a processing facility in Sacramento. Impacts would be less than significant.

(g) Garbage can pickup service for both existing dwellings exists. Impacts would be less than significant.

P07-0021 Carr Parcel Map Draft Negative Declaration ZA Hearing July 2, 2008 Page 25 of 25	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- (h) Power and telecommunication facilities on the road in front of both proposed parcels. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

- (a) This project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, including effects on animals or plants. Both short-term and long-term environmental effects associated with this project would be less than significant. Any potentially significant impacts would be reduced through compliance with existing standards and requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines as two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study it has been determined that the project would not result in cumulative impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (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). Impacts would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719)

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Cultural Resources Study prepared by Historic Resource Associates, dated February 2008.

Report of Well Production, Triangle Well Drilling, dated June 24, 2007

Percolation Test, Ron Duncan, dated October 26, 2007