



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: P 07-0041/ Dixon Tentative Parcel Map

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

Contact Person: Robert Peters, Assistant Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-7428

Property Owner's Name and Address: Daniel R. and Pamela B. Dixon, 4241 Wood Ranch Road, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Applicant/Agent's Name and Address: Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., 4080 Plaza Goldorado Circle, Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., 4080 Plaza Goldorado Circle, Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Location: Northwest side of Wood Ranch Road approximately 0.2 miles west of the intersection with Pleasant Ranch Road in the Lotus area.

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 102-130-14 (20.01 acres)

Zoning: Estate Residential (RE-10)

Section: 2 **T:** 10N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: Rural Residential (RR)

Description of Project: A tentative parcel map request creating two (2) parcels, 10 and 10.01 acres in size, from a 20.01 acre site. Both of the resulting parcels would contain an existing single-family residence taking access from Wood Ranch Road. Proposed parcel 1 would take access through parcel 2 via an exclusive easement (driveway) which bounds the proposed eastern property line of proposed parcel 2 and proposed parcel 2 will utilize an existing paved driveway. The applicant would be required to widen the on and off-site portions of Wood Ranch Road cul-de-sac and roadway, widen the off-site portions of Pleasant Ranch Road, and widen the on-site driveway for access to proposed parcel 1.

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	Single-Family Residences
North:	RE-10	RR	Single-Family Residences
East:	RE-10	RR	Single-Family Residences
South:	RE-10	RR	Single-Family Residences
West:	RE-10	RR	Single-Family Residences

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The subject parcel is at an approximate average elevation of 1,200 feet above mean sea level on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada mountains. The parcel contains two existing single family residences (one primary and one secondary) and takes its access from and is adjacent to Wood Ranch Road. The site is dominated by montane hardwood habitat, valley oak woodland habitat, with small areas of annual grassland habitat. Soils consist of Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2-30 percent slopes (AxD).

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

El Dorado County Department of Transportation, Rescue Fire Protection District, Environmental Management, Air Quality Management District, County Surveyor, Resource Conservation District.

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: Robert Peters For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas 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,b) No scenic vistas, resources, trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or designated scenic highways would be affected by this project.
- c) The parcel map will result in two parcels which are suitable for residential use. The surrounding neighborhood is equally well suited to residential use, and has been developed accordingly. The proposed project will not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The property will continue to provide the natural visual character and quality that currently exists by keeping the scenic areas of the property intact.
- d) This two-lot division of land does not propose development that will create substantial light or glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area. All future building plans issued for the parcel(s) must comply with Section 17.14.170 of the County Zoning Ordinance which prohibits unnecessary and unwarranted illumination of an adjacent property.

FINDING: For the “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project. No impacts are proposed to aesthetic or visual resources are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

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

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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) El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land Use Overlay District and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan Land Use Map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan Land Use Overlay District area adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses because there are no adjacent agriculturally zoned properties.
- b) This project will not reduce available agricultural lands. There is no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) There will be no conversion of existing agricultural farmlands to nonagricultural uses and there are no other changes proposed that could effect an agricultural designation or to change such a designation to allow nonagricultural uses.

FINDING: This project will have no impact on agricultural lands and will not affect properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding properties are mostly developed with single-family residences on tracts that are ten acres in size or larger and allow agricultural uses. For the “Agriculture” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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,b) Future site clearing, burning, grading, utility excavation, and movement of construction equipment would create temporary air quality impacts during construction. The construction-related impacts should be insignificant since these aspects of the project would be controlled by Chapter 15.14 of the County Code which sets minimum standards for such activities and El Dorado Air Pollution Control District Rule 223 that controls fugitive dust. County records indicate that this property is located within the asbestos review area. Activities related to the processing of the proposed tentative parcel map will create a less than significant impact on air quality because project conditions will require grading and construction activities to implement an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) in order to limit dust emissions during construction activities. This project does not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the County’s air quality plan.

c) Regarding cumulative air quality impacts, the proposed project does not require a change in existing land use designation or exceed the project alone significance criteria. Based on the project information provided, the proposed project would not result in any 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. The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of standard AQMD measures, the project would have a less than significant impact on air quality. As part of the conditions for project approval, an application for an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) must be submitted to the AQMD prior to the issuance of any grading or construction permits.

d) The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and identified that no sensitive receptors exist in the area. No such receptors will be affected by this project.

e) Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide.

FINDING: It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project because it would not ; obstruct implementations 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.

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) This parcel map request will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

b/c) The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Map for the project area (Placerville, CA Quadrangle, 1995) was reviewed and a subsequent site visit was done to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project site. This review indicates that there are no wetlands or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project. The project is not located within or adjacent to the county's Important Biological Corridor overlay district and, as such, no biological study was required as part of the project submittal.

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

- d) Review of the California Department of Fish and Game *Deer Ranges Map* (1990) indicates that there are no mapped critical deer migration corridors on the project site. The project will 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.
- e) No tree removal will result from the proposed project. The subject project will retain the necessary tree canopy as required by General Plan policy 7.4.4.4.
- 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.

FINDING: It has been determined that all potential biological resource impacts as a result of the proposed project are less than significant. For the “Biological Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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 submitted a Cultural Resources Study was completed by Historic Resource Associates, dated January 2007, for this project. The study provides an overview of the property and assesses the likelihood of finding cultural as well as subsurface archaeological resources. The results of the study concluded that no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts were found. The potential to discover such resources on the site is very unlikely. Based on these findings, no additional subsurface studies will be necessary and typical project conditions have been added to the project permit to address accidental discoveries.

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

- 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 strata/locales.
- d) Due to the scope of the project, there is not a high potential to discover human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery. However, in the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the County has mitigation measures in place pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code, that in the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and deposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission.

FINDING: While the project does not have 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 the required mitigation measures would ensure that any potential impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level. Established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category.

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
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:

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

- 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 are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating buildings in the project area would be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.
- b) Minor project grading will be required for improvements associated to road, driveway and general access improvements. The newly created, previously developed parcel will be a minimum of 10-acres in size and run-off or erosion is not likely to have a significant impact on this project based on property size alone. Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD) soil exists on the entire site. This soil has a slow to medium surface runoff and a slight to moderate erosion hazard. By implementing County grading and drainage standards in the development of such plans, the project soil types have been considered and are appropriate for the types of improvements. All future grading activities shall comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance, which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- c,d) Because future grading and/or improvement activities must comply with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*, to include the implementation of pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce and eliminate run-off, there will be a less than significant impact within this category. The soil types that exist on this property can adequately support the type of development that would be required for this project for immediate road improvements. The mapped soils on the property are Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD) with 2-30 percent slopes (*Soil Survey on El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). The site does not comprise of expansive soils and is suitable for the existing estate single-family residential development. The project would require all future improvement activities to implement the requirements established by the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* and any future building designs to implement Uniform Building Code Seismic construction standards.
- e) The existing parcel currently has two single-family residences (one primary and one secondary) which would be separated by the proposed tentative parcel map. Each residence contains existing septic systems and is located on soils which adequately support those systems. El Dorado County Environmental Management has review and approved the proposed project.

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. There is adequate soils

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

permeability for the existing septic disposal areas. For the “Geology and Soils” category, established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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.

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

- a) Any hazardous materials used at the project site shall comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*.
- b) No significant amount of hazardous materials will be used for the project. The project will not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c) As proposed, the project will 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 a quarter mile radius of this property.
- d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites near this property. As such, there would be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.
- e,f) As shown on the El Dorado County Zoning Map, the project is not located within an Airport Safety (AA) District overlay. *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 public airport. As such, the project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan and there would be no immediate hazard for people residing or working in the project area or safety hazard resulting from airport operations and aircraft over-flights in the vicinity of the project site.
- g) The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. The County emergency response plan is overseen by the County Sheriff's Department and they are located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.
- h) The degree of hazard in wild-land areas depends on weather variables like temperature, wind, and moisture, the amount of dryness and arrangement of vegetation, slope steepness, and accessibility to human activities, accessibility of firefighting equipment, and fuel clearance around structures. The Rescue Fire Protection District has reviewed and approved the Wildfire Fire Safe Plan and "Proposed Cul-De-Sac" detail for the proposed project. To reduce impacts to a less than significant level, the project shall be required to comply with the "Fire Safe Requirements" and fully implement the approved Wildfire Fire Safe Plan.

FINDING: The proposed project will not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials. The project will also not expose people and property to increased risks associated with wildland fires because improvements will be consistent with an approved Fire Safe Plan and allow for the movement of emergency vehicles onto the project site to serve the existing and newly created lot. For the "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) Any grading to improve access will require an improvement plan as required by the Department of Transportation. The plan shall be in conformance with the County of El Dorado “Design and Improvement Standards Manual”, the “Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance”, the “Drainage Manual”, and the “Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance”. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site.
 - b) Potable water is to be supplied by private wells. 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 existing and newly created parcel would each utilize existing wells. The existing residence on proposed parcel 2 has a 1,500 gallon water storage for domestic and fire suppression use. The approved fire safe plan requires that water storage of at least 2,500 gallons for domestic and fire suppression use is required for the existing residence on proposed parcel 1. The El Dorado County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the current application requests and determined the parcel map cannot be finalized until it is proven to them that the newly created parcels have an adequate, analyzed water source, including water storage of at least 3000 gallons above what is required pursuant to the fire safe plan.
 - c) There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances associated with the project will substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply would apply to this project.
 - d/e) There will be no substantial change in the pattern of drainage on or off the property with this project. Compliance with the standards and requirements contained within the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* considers the requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and will limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site. As such, there will be limited erosion and siltation resulting from this project.
 - f) The project will not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site.
 - g/h) The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0725C, 12/4/86) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain.
 - i) The subject property in the Lotus area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters.
 - j) As the property is not adjacent to a large body of water such as a lake, bay, or estuary, there is no potential for a seiche or tsunami. Additionally, the topography and location of the property provides no potential for mudflow.

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

FINDING: For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and therefore no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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 will not result in the physical division of an established community.
- 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 proposed parcel sizes are consistent with the Estate Residential (RE-10) zone district and the Rural Residential Land Use Designation.
- c) As discussed in Section IV ‘Biological Resources’, this project will have a less than significant impact on biological resources. As such, the proposal will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

FINDING: For the ‘Land Use Planning’ category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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			X

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

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			

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.
 - b) The El Dorado County Mineral Resources Zone Map, General Plan Exhibit V-7-4 indicates that the project is not in a mineral resource zone. Based on the review of this map, there are no significant mineral deposits on the project site.

FINDING: No impacts to any known mineral resources will occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. For the 'Mineral Resources' category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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:

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

- 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 proposed project will not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels for the neighborhood and vicinity. The project will not generate noise levels that exceed the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 of the General Plan.
- b) Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of minor grading and improvement activities during development. There will be no such noise when the project is completed. The temporary noise during construction activities will cease once the project improvements have been made.
- d) Short-term noise impacts may be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the project vicinity. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. All storage, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas are required to be located as far as possible from any residential areas.
- e) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards established by an adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). There will be a less than significant level of impact for this project based on excessive noise generated from a public airport.
- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. There will be no impacts within this category.

FINDING: For the ‘Noise’ category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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:

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

- 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 minimal 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. Approval of the parcel map will result in the creation of two parcels. The resultant parcels already have single family residences. The only potential for future development would include secondary residential structures.
- b. No substantial numbers of existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project.
- c) No substantial numbers of people will be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

FINDING: The project will not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project will not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or expanding infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

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

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

- Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.
- a) **Fire Protection:** The Rescue Fire Protection District operates two fire stations in its service are. The district provides fire protection and suppression as well as emergency medical services for a variety of rural areas, public/private schools and businesses, and various housing types. The existing parcel currently has two single-family residences on the property which would simply be separated onto separate parcels by the proposed tentative parcel map. Development of the project would result in a negligible or no increase in the demand for fire protection services, and would not prevent the Fire District from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The Fire Protection District will review the parcel map and building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards including, but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking lots, fire sprinklers within buildings, building identification and construction phasing. Fire District fees are collected prior to building permit issuance.
 - 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. Currently, the County has 0.89 sworn officers per 1,000 daytime populations. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The proposed parcel map will result in the development previously improved parcels with two single-family residences and will not significantly impact the achievement of this goal, or significantly impact the current response times to the project area.
 - c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Rescue Union School District. The tentative parcel map was sent to the affected school district for review and comment. No specific comments or mitigation measures were received or included for this project that creates an incremental increase in student body. School impact fees will be assessed and collected during the building permit review phase for any future single-family residential development. Impact to the affected school district from the proposed development would be less than significant.
 - d) **Parks:** The proposed project would not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. Provisions to provide parkland or the payment of in-lieu fees are included as the project is residential in nature.
 - e) No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the project.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the development of the subject parcel either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

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			X

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

XIV. RECREATION.			
on the environment?			

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

FINDING: No impacts to recreation or open space will result from the project. For the “Recreation” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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

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

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) Approval of the proposed parcel map would result in the creation of two residential parcels that are currently developed with single-family residences. Approval of the project would allow for potential secondary units on each of the two lots. This density of units would not significantly contribute to or substantially increase the number of trips, volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion of intersections in the area. One newly created parcel will be accessed by a new driveway which will encroach onto Wood Ranch Road a private road. The creation of the two residential parcels does not meet the threshold as required by the General Plan to require a traffic study in order to analyze possible mitigations.
- b) The approval of the proposed parcel map will not significantly impact the existing level of service of Wood Ranch Road, Pleasant Ranch Road, or Springvale Road.
- c) The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity.
- d) The proposed project includes a design waiver to allow creation of an additional parcel on an existing dead-end road of greater than 2,640 feet in length serving more than 24 parcels. As proposed the project would create the 27th parcel on the approximately one (1) mile (5,280 feet) long dead-end roadway. The project would result in improvements of greater than the County minimum standards for Wood Ranch Road and Pleasant Ranch Road to minimum County standards, and would improve an existing sub-standard roadway, lack of an approved fire safe turnaround, and the current traffic and circulation conditions in the project vicinity. Less than significant traffic hazards are anticipated as result from the project design.
- e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access to any of the proposed residential structures. The proposed project will comply with a Wildfire Fire Safe Plan and “Proposed Cul-De-Sac” detail which has been reviewed and approved by the Rescue Fire Protection District, including roadway improvements complying with “Fire Safe Requirements.”
- f) Section 17.18.060 of the Zoning Ordinance lists the parking requirements by use. A single-family residence requires two on-site parking spaces in tandem. The proposed parcels would provide adequate space to comply with all parking requirements.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan Policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

FINDING: For the “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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

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 will result from the proposed parcel map. Both proposed parcels have existing residences on site and no new run-off is expected. There is adequate septic capability for the existing septic systems.
- b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required because of the project. The existing septic systems have been reviewed and approved by the Environmental Management Department. For water, existing wells will be utilized and will be required to be an adequate, safe and available water source. All wells must be in place before the approval of the final map.

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

- c) On-site stormwater drainage facilities are required as needed so as to reduce runoff to appropriate discharge levels. Any future request for a grading, improvement, or building permit will be required to show how site discharge and/or run-off will not exceed the levels that existed prior to the proposed development based on BMP's and stormwater management plans. All required drainage facilities necessary for this project will be constructed in conformance with the standards contained in the *County of El Dorado Grading and Drainage Manual*.
- d) Proposed parcel 2 has an existing approved well and water storage system. Proposed parcel 1 has an existing well which does not currently meet minimum supply standards. Proposed parcel 1 would be conditioned to have a safe and reliable water source prior to the recording of the final map. The applicant can use a water storage system to meet this minimum requirement. County Environmental Health Department would require review and approval of the proposed well and storage system prior to finalizing the parcel map. The impacts would be less than significant.
- e) In this case, wastewater disposal for the parcel will be provided by an existing on-site septic disposal system.
- 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, collection and loading of solid waste and recyclables. For residential development, curbside trash and pick-up of recyclable materials is provided by a local provider contracting to the property owner for the service.

FINDING: No significant impacts will result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the "Utilities and Service Systems" section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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 whole record that the project will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project does 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 will be less than significant due to existing standards and requirements imposed in the conditioning of the project.
- 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 compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not result in cumulative impacts.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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.)

Cultural Resources Study prepared by Historic Resource Associates, dated January 2007

Oak/Canopy Site Assessment Form, prepared by Phillip Mosbacher Certified Arborist WF 7315A, dated September 12, 2007

Report of Well Production, prepared by Gary C. Tanko Well Drilling, Inc., dated June 30, 1995

Report of Well Production, prepared by Rumsey Enterprises, Inc., dated April 28, 2006

Report of Percolation Test, prepared by Joe Norton Registered Geologist, dated July 11, 1995

Report of Percolation Test, prepared by Wheeldon Geology, dated November 1, 2005