



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

DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project Title: Conditional Certificate of Compliance, COC06-0063/Hall

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

Contact Person: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner/ Applicant's Name and Address: Andrew Hall, 4501 Pleasant Valley Road, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Location: On the southwest side of Sweeney Road approximately 1.5 miles north of the intersection with Grizzly Flat Road in the Grizzly Flat area, Supervisorial District II.

Assessor's Parcel Number: 093-270-01 (26.20 acres)

Zoning: Residential Agricultural 20-Acre (RA-20)

Section: 13 **T:** 9N **R:** 12E

General Plan Designation: Natural Resource (NR)

Description of Project: Certificate of Compliance for Assessor's Parcel Number 093-270-01, which would acknowledge the County's acceptance of the parcel as legally created accordance with the Subdivision Map Act and local subdivision ordinances. The parcel would be served by a future well and onsite septic wastewater system. The parcel takes off-site access directly from Sweeney Road and improvements would be made to the interior access road as well as Sweeney Road to meet California SRA Firesafe Regulations, and the California Fire Code 2007 Edition for access and water supply.

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:	RA-20	NR	Vacant, 26.20-acre parcel.
North:	RA-20	NR	Vacant, 40-acre parcel.
East:	RA-20	NR	Vacant, 40-acre parcel.
South:	RA-20	NR	Single-family residence, 13.80-acre parcel.
West:	RE-10	RR	Single-family residences, some vacant, five one to twelve-acre parcels.

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The site is located on a 26.20-acre parcel located at the 2,740 to 2,800-foot elevations above sea level. The parcel is covered primarily with conifers with some scattered black oaks. The parcel was recently logged and there are remnants of the old Caldor Railroad on the site. The interior access roads serve three other parcels and those roads and a building pad area for the subject parcel are rough-graded in.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado County Environmental Health Division, Pioneer Fire Protection District, El Dorado County Department of Transportation, 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 will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

- a) No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway would be substantially affected by this project. The subject parcel is not located adjacent to any designated scenic highways or scenic vistas. There would be no impact.
- b) The proposed project would have no impact on 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. There would be no impact.
- c) The proposed project would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The surrounding area has been developed with single family residences with some vacant parcels. The project would not introduce residential development that is out of character with the surrounding existing development. There would be no impact.
- d) Some limited light and glare would result from the addition of residential structures on the parcel in the future. These increases are expected to be typical for the RA-20 zone district and are not expected to have a significant effect or adversely affect day or nighttime views adjacent to the project site. There would be a less than significant impact.

FINDING: Identified thresholds of significance for the “Aesthetics” category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 5	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				

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-c) According to the USDA-NRCS Soil Surveys, approximately 20 percent of the southern portion of the parcel contains Holland coarse sandy loam (HgD) soils which are classified as Unique and Soils of Local Importance. The project site is not located within an area of Prime Farmland or Statewide Important Farmland as shown on the Important Farmland Maps prepared by the California Resources Agency using the USDA-NRCS Soil Surveys. No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project. The closest lands that are designated by the General Plan with an Agricultural District overlay are approximately two miles to the west. The issuance of a Clear Certificate of Compliance on this parcel would not impede the ability of the parcel owner from any residential agricultural uses not previously allowed by right. There would be no impacts.

FINDING: It has been determined that the project would not result in any new impacts to agricultural lands, or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is developed with residential agricultural and rural residential uses. For this “Agriculture” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. There would be no impacts.

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 non-attainment 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);

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

- 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) El Dorado County adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG / VOC, NO_x, and O₃). The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - b, c) The subject parcel is not within an asbestos review area. 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 No_x emissions. Vehicular emissions are based upon a trip rate of 9.53 vehicle trips per day per residence. The request for a Certificate of Compliance would result in recognizing an existing parcel as legal which would not result in a significant increase in ROG or No_x. Additionally, the maximum total daily vehicle trips generated would be 9.53 trips per day. Using the thresholds in the *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*, this has been determined to be less than significant.
 - d) Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and 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 proposed site and use would not substantially impact any sensitive receptors in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - e) the Residential Agricultural 20-acre (RA-20) Zone District does not permit activities that could generate objectionable odors. Those activities, which might result in objectionable odors, dust, or smoke, would require the review and approval of a special use permit. This subsequent discretionary permit would require further environmental review addressing the potential impacts resulting from the proposed activity. There would be no impact.

FINDING: It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project because it would not: obstruct implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan; violate any air quality standard; result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 7	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state 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) Potential development of the 26.2-acre site with a typical dwelling associated with single-family residency would not in and of itself 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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Staff's review of the California Natural Diversity Database did not reveal the presence of any species of concern within the project vicinity. Impacts would be less than significant.

b, c) The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Map for the project area (Sly Park, CA Quadrangle, 1995) was reviewed to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat. This review, as well as a site visit, indicates that there is an intermittent stream that transverses the southeast corner of the parcel that flows northeast into Tennessee Creek. It would be the responsibility of the applicant to determine if a 1600, Fish and

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 8	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Game Streambed Alteration Permit would be required for any road improvements to Sweeney Road. Pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4, a 50-foot setback from the high water mark of that stream would be required from any future development. The existing on-site road has been rough graded in and would need minor surface and widening improvements not anticipated to have significant impacts on the stream. With an approved 1600 Permit, if required, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) The existing parcel recognized by this 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, any more then it currently does. Future development opportunities guided by those allowed in the RA-20 zone district would only permit uses currently typical in the surrounding parcels. Impacts would be less than significant.

The subject parcel is located in a conifer-dominated habitat and oak canopy has been determined to be less than ten percent. Impacts would be less than significant.

- f) 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 the draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: For the “Biological Resources” category, it has been determined that all potential biological resource impacts as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant.

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, b) The applicant supplied an archeological survey, (*Archeological Survey Report, Mark Stewart, RPF #2308 dated February 5, 2006*), that was completed as part of Timber Harvest Plan 4-06-12/E10-6, which found miscellaneous fallen trestle and timbers related to the Caldor Railroad. The California Door Company (Caldor) formerly ran a

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

narrow gauge railroad grade from Diamond Springs, through the parcel and on to the Caldor Lumber Company 13 miles to the east. When that Mill burned down in the early 1900s, logs were then shipped from that site, back down to the new mill in Diamond Springs, 12 miles to the east. The railroad was discontinued in 1955. The tracks and ties have been removed and the RPF had required steps to be able to use the old grades for skidding, avoiding the miscellaneous timbers and the requirement not to fall trees towards the fallen trestle. The location of the interior access roads to be improved as part of the subject permit, are not anticipated to significantly impact the noted Caldor artifacts. Because those roads avoid additional impacts than the Timber Harvest Plan caused, that avoidance would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

- 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. The Department of Transportations Grading Ordinance states that, in the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent would ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until an archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) During any future grading requiring a permit and in the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the Department of Transportations Grading Ordinance requires that all work would stop and the County coroner would be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: Although the project has the potential to create significant impacts to sub-surface cultural or historic resources, or disturb human remains located outside of a designated cemetery, the incorporation of policies required by the Department of Transportation would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. For this “Cultural Resources” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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:			X	
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	

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 10	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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.
- 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 would be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating structures 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 significantly abrupt topographic variation in slope and amongst any large cuts in the landscape. Any future grading permit would require erosion control measures. Therefore, 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 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 future site grading and construction of foundations and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions. The issuance of a grading permit would address potential impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - c, d) Approximately 20 percent of the soils on the project site are classified as Holland coarse sandy loam (HgD) typically having 15 to 30 percent slopes and a low shrink-swell potential, (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, April, 1974*). This type of soil is characterized as having medium to rapid surface runoff and the erosion hazard is high. Approximately 80 percent of the soils on the project site are classified as Holland very rocky coarse sandy loam (HkE) typically having 15 to 50 percent slopes and a low shrink-swell potential, (*Soil Survey of El*

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 11	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Dorado Area, California, April, 1974). This type of soil is characterized as having medium to rapid surface runoff and the erosion hazard is high. All grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. For the control of fugitive dust, any future grading would need to comply with the requirements of Rule 223, 223.1 and 223.2, whichever rule is appropriate. In addition, the appropriate Fugitive Dust Plan (FDP) Application would be submitted to and approved by the District prior to the start of project construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

- e) Septic disposal for the parcel would be provided by an on-site septic disposal system and would need to be analyzed by the Environmental Health Division for any future single family dwelling. A percolation test would be provided for the 26.2-acre parcel that shows adequate percolation and potential area for an adequate septic system and would be analyzed prior to issuance of a building permit. 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, established thresholds would not be exceeded and impacts would be less than significant.

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 <i>Government Code Section 65962.5</i> 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	

Potentially Significant
Impact

Potentially Significant
Unless Mitigation
Incorporation

Less Than Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
 - Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
 - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a) Any hazardous materials used at the project site would need to comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*. This site and related future residential project would not be expected to include hazardous materials in the future construction or development of the new parcel. There would be no impacts.
 - b) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be used 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. There would be no impacts.
 - 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. There are no schools located within the quarter mile radius. There would be no impacts.
 - d) The project site has not been identified on any list that has been compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 which identifies hazardous material sites near this project site. There would be no impact from hazardous material at this location. There would be no impacts.
 - e) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the property is not located within two miles of a public airport. The project would not be subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan and there are no impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations that includes continued over-flight of aircraft near the site. There would be no impacts.
 - f) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impacts.
 - g) With the adoption and subsequent fulfillment of the recommended conditions of approval, 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 on 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 response plan. The County emergency response plan is overseen by the County Sheriff's Department. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - h) The Pioneer Fire Protection District reviewed the project and found that the project, with the recommended conditions implemented to the requirements of the California SRA Firesafe Regulations, and the California Fire Code 2007 Edition for access and water supply, would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area. Impacts would be less than significant.

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 13	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	-----------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	-----------

Finding: With the adoption and fulfillment of the recommended conditions of approval, the proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and/or would not expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires to the level required by the California SRA Firesafe Regulations, and the California Fire Code 2007 Edition for access and water supply. For the ‘Hazards and Hazardous Materials’ category, as conditioned, any potential impacts experienced by this project would be less than significant.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

- 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) Permit applicants would be required to prepare and retain on the construction site, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan which would describe the site, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste control, implementation of local plans required by the Resource Conservation District, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control, and non-stormwater management controls. Compliance with the Erosion Control Plan would limit water runoff and discharge that would violate water quality standards or discharge requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. 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. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances that could be associated with future uses this COC would allow would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site because none is proposed as a part of this application. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that would limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards would apply to this project for any future development of the subject parcel. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d, e) In this case, the residential development that the approval of this COC would potentially allow, would require a grading permit grading. An erosion control plan would be required by any future development permit that requires the reduction of erosion and sediment discharge off the site to a less than significant level. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) The project would not directly 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* would need to 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 and i) No portion of the project would be within the limits of the floodplain, as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (Panels 060040 00800 B, October 18, 1983. Therefore, no flooding impacts are expected. There would be no impact.
- 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 would be considered less than significant because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a water body. 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. There would be no potential impact from mudflow because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a dam or other water body. There would be no impact.

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 15	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Finding: Any future development plans submitted for a building and/or grading permit would be analyzed to address erosion and sediment control. No significant hydrological impacts would occur with the project. For this “Hydrology” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
 - Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
 - Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
 - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a) The project would not result in the physical division of an established community. The granting of a Certificate of Compliance would be consistent with the policies established by the General Plan and would be consistent with the established land use pattern of the neighboring area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) As proposed, the project is consistent with specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted 2004 General Plan. The creation of the parcel takes into consideration the required development standards of the RA-20 zone. Any future residential development on the new parcel would be designed to meet the requirements of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and local subdivision policies. All related setback areas for buildings and septic disposal areas to the man-made drainage channel and/or pond shall be maintained at all times with the approval of this project. The project would meet the land use objectives that have been established by the County. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) As discussed in Section IV ‘Biological Resources’, this project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources, and the proposal would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: For the ‘Land Use Planning’ category, project related impacts associated with the Certificate of Compliance application would be less than significant.

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 16	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- a) The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan. 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 and 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. There would be no impact.

FINDING: No impacts to any known mineral resources would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. For this “Mineral Resources” section, there would be no impact.

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

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 17	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

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

a, c)The project would not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project is not located in an area exposed to existing noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. As such, an acoustical analysis was not provided as part of the project application submittal. The project would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 of the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

b, d)Persons adjacent to the project vicinity would not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of project operation. This conclusion is based upon the use of the property as residential agricultural. By nature of the use, minimal noise is expected. However, persons adjacent to the project vicinity may be subjected to short-term ground borne noise and vibration as a result of grading and excavation during potential future development of the parcel that would not exceed the thresholds of significance

e) The proposed project is not in the vicinity of a public airport. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport. There would be no impact.

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. There would be no impact.

FINDING: As mentioned above, residential use as well as potential project related short-term construction and related noise would not exceed the thresholds of significance within the vicinity of the project area. For the “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would occur from the proposed development. Impacts would be less than significant.

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 18	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
 - Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
 - Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.
- a) 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. No residential development is proposed as part of the project. There would be no impact.
- b) No substantial numbers of existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project. There would be no impact.
- c) No substantial numbers of people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There would be no impact.

Finding: The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the recognition of the legality of this parcel either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, there would be no impact.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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 Pioneer 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 California Uniform Fire Code. The District did not respond with any concerns that the level of service would fall below the minimum requirements as a result of the proposed parcel map, as long as the onsite and offsite roads were improved the requirements of the California SRA Firesafe Regulations, and the California Fire Code 2007 Edition for access and water supply. Upon adoption and subsequent fulfillment of those conditions, the impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 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 recognition of the legality of the subject residential parcel with a Certificate of Compliance would not significantly impact current Sheriff's response times to the project area, and the response time would be improved with the fulfillment of the recommended conditions of approval. 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 would 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.

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 20	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
 - Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- a) No significant increase or effects in the use of area wide neighborhood or regional parks would be experienced by approving this project. There is no potential for a substantial physical deterioration of neighboring or regional recreational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The project does not propose any on-site recreation facilities and is not required to construct any new facilities or expand any existing recreation facilities with the scope of this project. In lieu fees for the acquisition of parklands would be assessed during the process of meeting the conditions of the Conditional Certificate of Compliance. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: No impacts to recreation or open space would result from the project. For the 'Recreation' category, there would be a less than significant impacts.

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	

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 21	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
 - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
 - Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.
- a) Access to the subject parcel is from an encroachment onto Paloran Court. The approval of the Certificate of Compliance would allow the construction of a single family residence in an area that currently is entirely residential in use and would not cause an increase in traffic that would be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - b) The issuance of a Certificate of Compliance to the subject parcel and the subsequent potential development of a single-family residence would not significantly impact the existing level of service on Paloran Road and Paloran Court. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - 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. There would be no impact.
 - d) The proposed project does not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards. There would be no impact.
 - e) Pioneer Fire Protection District and Calfire staffs have recognized the current substandard conditions of the interior access road and the off-site portion of Sweeney Road from the subject parcel to Grizzly Flat Road. Both agencies have recommended conditions of approval for the applicant to provide a Fuel Modification and Wildland Fire Safety Plan, to be prepared by a Registered Professional Forester which shall be reviewed and approved by Pioneer Fire Protection District and Calfire prior to issuance of a clear Certificate of Compliance. This project is further required to meet the requirements of the California SRA Firesafe Regulations, and the California Fire Code 2007 Edition for access and water supply prior to issuance of a clear Certificate of Compliance. With the approval of the recommended conditions, impacts would be less than significant.
 - f) Future development would be required to meet on-site parking identified by use and the Zoning Ordinance. Section 17.18.060 regulates the parking provisions and all on-site uses would include, and identify required parking. Future requests for building permits would be reviewed for conformance with parking during the review process. There would be no impact.
 - g) The proposed project would not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 22	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	-----------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	-----------

Finding: For the ‘Transportation/Traffic’ category, processing the Certificate of Compliance would have a less than significant impact within this category. Impacts would be less than significant.

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;
 - 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) No significant wastewater discharge or surface run off would result from this project. Any future residential development on the parcel would be designed to meet the County standards to include BMPs for pre- and post construction development for wastewater discharge and surface run-off. Impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

- b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed and none are required as a result of this project. There would be no impact.
- c) On-site stormwater drainage facilities may be required on the property in order to reduce run off to appropriate discharge levels. Any future request for a residential single-family unit, grading, or improvement plans would be required to show site discharge and/or run off at pre and post levels. All required drainage facilities would be built in conformance with the standards contained in the *County of El Dorado Grading and Drainage Manual*. There would be no impact.
- d) Prior to filing issuance of a Clear Certificate of Compliance, the parcel would be required to have a safe and reliable well provided for each parcel that meets the criteria of Environmental Management Policy 800-02. The project would be conditioned to ensure adequate water pressure for fire control with the final review and approval by the Pioneer Fire Protection District required prior to recording the Clear Certificate of Compliance. Upon fulfillment of the conditions of approval, impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The County’s Environmental Management Department would review and approve any future septic system. Future residential development would be reviewed by Building Services and Environmental Management during the building permit review phase for the 26.2-acre parcel to ensure that septic areas are established to County design standards. Impacts would be less than significant.
- 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) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the parcel would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space would be available at the site for solid waste collection. There would be no impact.

Finding: Impacts within the ‘Utilities and Service Systems’ category would remain at a less than significant level based on this tentative parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.

COC06-0063/Hall ZA Hearing, July 2, 2008 Draft Negative Declaration Page 24	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

Discussion:

- a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the project record that would indicate that this project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. This project proposal would not have the potential to 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 California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project would be less than significant due to the design of the project and required standards that would be implemented with the process of the issuance of the Clear Certificate of Compliance/or any required project specific improvements on or off the property. The applicant would be responsible for acquiring the necessary California Department of Fish and Game 1600, Stream Alteration permits where applicable for road improvements. Based on the analysis in this study, as conditioned, and with strict adherence to County and State Codes, it has been determined that the project would have a less than significant impact based on the issue of cumulative impacts.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as "two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which would compound or increase other environmental impacts." Based on the analysis in this study, as conditioned, and with strict adherence to County and State Codes, it has been determined that the project would have a less than significant impact based on the issue of cumulative impacts.
- c) As outlined and discussed in this document, this project proposes a less than significant chance of having project-related environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Based on the analysis in this study, as conditioned, and with strict adherence to County and State Codes, it has been determined that the project would have a less than significant impact based on the issue of cumulative impacts.

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 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9
Appendix A
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

El Dorado County General Plan – A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief (Adopted July 19, 2004)

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Archeological Survey Report, Mark Stewart, RPF #2308 dated February 5, 2006