



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

**Project Title:** P07-0037 Robert and Dolly Stondell Tentative Parcel Map

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

**Contact Person:** Pat Kelly, Associate Planner

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

**Project Owner's Name and Address:** Robert & Dolly Stondell, 5255 Looking Glass Lane, Placerville, CA 95667

**Project Location:** On the north side of Looking Glass Lane 500 feet east of the intersection with Shingle Springs Drive in the Shingle Springs area, Supervisorial District IV.

**Assessors Parcel No.:** 319-020-37

**Parcel Size:** 30.4 acres

**Zoning:** Estate Residential Ten Acre (RE-10)    **Section:** 18 & 19    **T:** 10N    **R:** 10E

**General Plan Designation:** Low-Density Residential (LDR ), Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay

**Description of Project:** A Tentative Parcel Map to create two parcels to be 10.00 and 10.40 acres in size. The two proposed residential parcels would have individual septic systems and well water serving each home. An existing residence including three small sheds, well and septic system are located on the proposed Parcel No. 1. An existing approximate 600 square foot accessory building and well are located on the proposed Parcel No. 2. The two proposed parcels would utilize Shingle Springs Drive, and Looking Glass Lane which are not County maintained, as the primary access roads. The applicant would be required to provide off-site road improvements on Shingle Springs Drive and Looking Glass Lane and on-site road improvements on Looking Glass Lane to be constructed to the required County Design and Improvements Standards Manual and fire safe standards.

**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	LDR/IBC	Single-family dwelling
North:	R2A	MDR	Residential, single-family dwellings
East:	RE-5	LDR	Residential, single-family dwellings
South:	RE-5	LDR	Residential, single-family dwellings
West:	RE-5	LDR	Residential, single-family dwellings

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site consists of 20.40 acres. The site and surrounding properties are primarily rural residential housing and undeveloped land. An existing rural residence is located near the southwesterly portion of the property. Access to the proposed project site would be from Looking Glass Lane. The project site has an open tree canopy dominated by foothill pine. Interior live oaks are also present in lesser abundance. Common shrubs present include chemise, manzanita, leather oak, yerba santa, and toyon. The project site is situated at an elevation range of approximately 1,120 to 1,240 feet and generally slopes from the west to the east. The site contains two soil types; Placer diggings (PrD) stony, cobbly, and gravelly material found in areas that have been placer mined and Serpentine rock land (SaF) rock outcrops and stones make up from 50 to 90 percent of the surface, and there is a thin mantel of soil. This land type is undulating to very steep.

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

1. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading permit for on-site and off-site road

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

- improvements.
2. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District requires an approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan for air.
  3. County Surveyor Office
  4. El Dorado Hills Fire Department
  5. County Environmental Management – septic and wells

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

**DETERMINATION**

**On the basis of this initial evaluation:**

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

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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: August 5, 2008

Printed Name: Patricia Kelly For: El Dorado County

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: August 5, 2008

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

**PROJECT DISCRIPTION**

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed residential project. The project would allow the creation of two (2) approximately five (5) acre parcels.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

Project Characteristics

The project site would be accessed by Estates Drive, an existing road. On-site and off-site road improvements would be required including widening of Estates Drive.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The access to the project site would be from Shingle Springs Drive, a public road. The project would provide one point of access into the development. The Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District would require a turnaround to be provided to all building sites with driveways over 150 feet in length. Turnarounds would be within 50 feet of the building with a minimum turning radius of 40 feet from the centerline of the road.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The proposed residential lots would have individual septic systems and well water serving each home. The septic systems and well water would require permits by the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management, and would comply with the regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Septic systems designated and installed on-site would be required to comply with State and County Standards. Electric power would be available on the project site.

3. Population

The project would not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of off-site and on-site road improvements including grading for on-site roadways and driveways.

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

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from the County Department of Transportation (DOT) and obtain an approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan from the Air Quality Management District.

#### Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, 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.

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

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**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 affected by this project. There would be no impact.
- b) The project would not be located along a defined State Scenic Highway corridor and would not impact scenic resources in such corridors including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources based on the location of the project. There would be no impact.
- c) The proposed project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The property would continue to provide the natural visual character and quality that currently exists by directing development to the least sensitive parts of the property and would keep the scenic areas of the property intact. There would be no impact.
- d) The project would consist of single-family residential development on two parcels, ten (10) acres in size. The large parcel size would be consistent with the surrounding properties and would allow for buffers between homes and adjacent uses. Additionally, the project would have to comply with Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, which contains outdoor lighting requirements, intended to control artificial light and glare to the extent that unnecessary illumination of adjacent property would be prohibited. These requirements include the shielding and

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

downward direction of all outdoor lighting. These requirements would also reduce project impacts on night skies. This impact would be considered less than significant.

**Finding:** As proposed, the project would have a less than significant impact to aesthetic and visual resources.

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

**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) There would be no conversion of choice agricultural lands to nonagricultural lands and there would be no impairment of agricultural productivity of agricultural lands with this project. The project would be located within an established single-family residential neighborhood and all adjacent parcels are designated for single-family residential development. There would be no impact.
- b) This project would not reduce available agricultural lands. There would be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract. There would be no impact.
- c) There would be no conversion of existing agricultural farmlands to non-agricultural uses and there are no other changes that could affect an agricultural designation for non-agricultural use. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** This project would have no impact on agricultural lands and would not impact properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. For the 'Agriculture' category, the tentative parcel map would have no impact.

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

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

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

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

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, would result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
  - Emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, as a result of construction or operation emissions, would result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
  - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) El Dorado County has adopted the 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<sub>x</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>). Any activities associated to the grading and construction of this project would pose a less than significant impact on air quality because the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) would require the project implement a Fugitive Dust Plan (FDP) during grading and construction activities. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions below a level of significance.
- b, c) Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to comply with the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

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

Short-term, superficial, minor grading and excavation activities that could be associated with the finish grading to the existing roadway, but that type of construction typically would only last a few days and intermittently at that.

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

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

d, e)

No schools, hospitals, parks, or other sensitive land uses are located within the immediate vicinity. The residential land uses associated with the project would not have the potential to create odors or expose sensitive receptors to negative impacts. Short-term heavy equipment emissions generated by the on-site and off- site road improvements would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash, or odors based upon an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan conforming to District Rules 223 and 223.1. District Rule 224 prevents additional release of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), by prohibiting the use of cutback or emulsified paving asphalt for paving, road construction or road maintenance. Adherence to rules 215 and 224 would be sufficient to ensure that emissions impacts due to the release of VOC from architectural coatings are less than significant.

**Finding:** Standard County conditions of approval have been included as part of the project permit to maintain a less than significant level of impact in the ‘Air Quality’ category. Impacts would be less than significant.

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



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

**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) The Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for Stondell Tentative Map, dated July, 2007 (Biological Resources Evaluation) stated that the project site area contains potential habitat for special-status animals and plants with potential need to mitigate. The project site area contains potential nesting for birds of prey and birds listed under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, however, no nests were observed in the project site area. Raptor nests are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code which makes it illegal to destroy any active raptor nest. The oak and riparian woodlands on-site provide potential foraging and nesting habitat for various raptor species. Consequently, raptors and other migratory birds are likely to forage and nest on the project site, and have a potential to occur within the site.

If these species occur on the project site, they would be impacted by construction activities including grading, road building and alterations in drainage patterns. These activities could result in lose of active bird nests. This would be a significant impact unless mitigated.

**MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-1**

*If construction activities are scheduled to occur within the typical breeding season for raptors (March 1 through August 31), on-site pre-construction surveys for raptors and their nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of the proposed development activities. The survey results shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and Planning Services prior to issuance of a grading permit. If active raptor nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the site, consultation must be initiated with CDFG to determine appropriate avoidance measures. The applicant shall follow the appropriate avoidance measures issued by CDFG, and no construction activities shall occur on the project site until the avoidance measures are issued and implemented. If no active nests are found, then no further action is required, and construction activities may proceed upon approval by Planning Services (MM BIO-1).*

**MONITORING:** Planning Services shall verify that the above mitigation measure has been incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a grading permit. Development Services shall coordinate with the applicant and/or biologist, assess the pertinent surveys/studies, and conduct on-site verification for conformance with this measure.

The Biological Resources Evaluation identified a population of Jepson’s onion, a special-status plant was found in the project site area. Jepson’s onion is on list 1B of the California Native Plant Society’s (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California. CNPS list 1B consists of plants determined to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere. The project site area is located outside of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) recovery boundary for the Pine Hill plants (USFWS 2002b). Further studies may be required by the California Department of Fish and Game The project site is located within the El Dorado County Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay area (El Dorado County General Plan 2004). The project is located within rare

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

plant Mitigation Area 1 of the County’s Gabbro soils rare plant preserve program which identify areas of the County that potentially contain rare plants. Mitigation Area 1 is defined as areas outside of Mitigation Area 0, but within the area as described as the rare soils study area. Section 17.71.220A of the County Zoning Ordinance requires that projects within Mitigation Area 1 pay the required fee in lieu of Ecological Preserve Mitigation. The project is designed to avoid impacts to these areas. The applicant would be required to pay the Mitigation Fee at the time of issuance of the building permit. Impacts would be less than significant.

(b, c)

The project proposes a less than significant impact to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game. The site contains one perennial stream, which is potential waters of the U.S. Approximately 2.33 acres of Fremont Cottonwood Riparian Forest and Central Valley drainage hardhead/squawfish stream, sensitive natural communities, occur in the project site area. The project does not propose impacts to 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. General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 requires development projects to be set back at a minimum of 100 feet from all perennial streams, rivers, lakes and 50 feet from intermittent streams and wetlands. The Tentative Parcel Map has been designed to observe the 100-foot required setback from the perennial stream. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be designed during the grading and improvement phase to limit the potential of surface run-off pre- and post-construction to comply with County and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards. All grading, drainage and construction activities associated with this project, including those necessary to prepare and develop the off-site and on-site road access and turn-around, would be required to implement proper BMPs. There would be no impacts to oak woodland tree canopy with the approval of this project as none are to be removed. As a result, the project would reduce any potential impacts within this category to a level that would be less than significant.

- d) The Biological Resources Evaluation identified the project site as containing approximately 16 acres of Serpentine Foothill Pine Chaparral Woodland, 3.33 acres of Fremont Cottonwood Riparian Forest and 1.07 acres of structures and landscaping. The project site has an open tree canopy dominated by foothill pine. Interior live oak is also present in lesser abundance. Common shrubs present include chamise, leather oak, manzanita, yerba santa and toyon. The herbaceous under story contains a relatively large component of native forbs and grasses due to the serpentine derived soil. Outcrops of serpentine rock occur throughout the community and support a separate assemblage of serpentine adopted herbs including milkwort jewelflower, sandwort, and wild buckwheat. Serpentine foothill pine chaparral woodland is given no special designation by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). The project site area contains potential nesting habitat for birds of prey and migratory birds. The project site consists of approximately 54 percent of predominately foothill pine with some oak tree canopy. All trees would be retained. The Tentative Parcel Map identifies the location of the existing residence on the proposed Parcel No. 1. The project proposed would not create excessive uses that would significantly interfere 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 as there are existing residences on both proposed parcels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the County’s oak woodland canopy preservation policy. All oak trees would be retained. There would be no impacts to oak woodland tree canopy. There would be adequate site area to make improvements to the existing driveways to comply with road standards and to make the necessary adjustments to the existing encroachments along the property. The impact would be less than significant.
- f) The project does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Finding:** Potentially significant impacts relating to Biological resources include impacts to protected animal species. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** would require the project pre-construction surveys to reduce impacts to protected animal species. There would be no impact to recognized or defined jurisdictional waters of the US, wetlands, or watercourses. Appropriate buffers and project conditions to address surface run-off by incorporating proper BMPs would ensure the drainage channel would not significantly be affected by this project. There would be no significant impacts to biological resources, oak trees and/or oak woodland tree canopy. In-lieu fees were assessed for the existing dwellings on the parcels which addressed project impacts within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1. As such, the impacts in the ‘Biological Resources’ category would be less than significant for this project.

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

**Discussion:** 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 & d)

The applicant submitted a “Cultural Resource Study” prepared by Historic Resource Associates, dated August 2006 that reported there were no significant prehistoric and historic-period cultural resources sites, artifacts, historic buildings, structures or objects found. Because of the possibility in the future that ground disturbances could discover significant cultural resources, the project would require standard conditions that would reduce the impacts to less than significant.

- c) No paleontological resources or unique geological features were identified on the project site. The County 2004 General Plan states that paleontological resources are unlikely to be encountered in El Dorado County. Paleontological remains are found in sedimentary rock formations, which are virtually nonexistent in the County. The impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding:** The project site would be located outside of a designated cemetery and the potential to find historic, archaeological, prehistoric, and/or human remains would not be likely. By implementing typical discovery procedures as

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

conditions in the project permit, any chance of an accidental discovery would be accounted for during grading and/or improvement activities and impacts to the ‘Cultural Resources’ category would be less than significant.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			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:

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

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

- a) There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive. (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001). Impacts would be less than significant.
- b, c)  
 All grading activities exceeding 50-cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must comply with 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.
- d) Expansive soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the site is located on Serpentine Rock Land (SaF) and Placer diggings (PrD), which have a variable shrink swell capacity and variable Serpentine Rock land is generally characterized as having a undulating to very steep slope. Placer Diggings is generally characterized as having a variable slope. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The Environmental Management Department would review specific septic designs that accompany future development plans, including a potential guess house on both parcels, to ensure that the final septic disposal design complies with County standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding:** Based on the review of information about the on-site soil conditions, a less than significant level of impact would result from any geological or seismic conditions that could have the potential to affect this property. Review of grading, building, and/or construction plans would include grading design and shall address BMPs and UBC Seismic IV construction standards in order to address any potential impacts in the ‘Geology and Soils’ category. As such, impacts within this category would be less than significant.

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials,			<b>X</b>

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

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			
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?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		<b>X</b>	
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		<b>X</b>	

**Discussion:** 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) The project may involve transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as construction materials, paints, fuels, landscaping materials, and household cleaning supplies. The use of these hazardous materials would only occur during construction, and household use of hazardous materials would be sporadic, temporary, and their potential for impact would be limited and unlikely. Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials. With existing regulations, the impact would be less than significant. Any hazardous materials used at the project site would need to comply with the El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan. 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.

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

- 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 nearest airport would be the Cameron Airpark Airport, located approximately 4.5 miles to the southwest of the project site. The project would be not located within the airport’s land use plan, nor would it be within two miles of the airport. There would be no impact.
- f) The project would not be within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There would be no impact.
- g) The project would not be expected to interfere or negatively affect any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Plans for the proposed project indicate that it would not block access or significantly decrease access to any roadways or evacuation routes. Instead, the project could improve emergency response as the project would upgrade some existing roadways to the property, thus improving circulation. Improved circulation can improve emergency response times and facilitate evacuations. The impact would be less than significant.
- h) The Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District reviewed the project and found that the project, with the recommended conditions implemented, 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.

**Finding:** 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. For the ‘Hazards and Hazardous Materials’ category, as conditioned, any potential impacts experienced by this project would be less than significant.

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			<b>X</b>	
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)?			<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>	

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

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

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
  - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
  - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
  - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
  - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) The proposed project would create two, ten (10) acre parcels which would be served by individual septic systems. The El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management would be responsible for protecting public health and the environment from the potential adverse impacts associated with on-site, individual sewage disposal systems. The proposed project's septic system design would be reviewed by the Department to ensure compliance with County Ordinance Chapter 15.32, Private Sewage Disposal System, as well as County Resolution No. 259-99, Design Standards for the Site Evaluation and Design of Sewage Disposal Systems. Review by the Department of Environmental Management and compliance with these existing regulations would ensure that all septic systems constructed as part of the project would function properly and would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. This impact would be less than significant.
- b) El Dorado County lies within the Central Sierra Nevada geomorphic province. There are 357 defined groundwater basins in California, but no designated basins are identified in El Dorado County. Water service for the proposed project would be provided by individual water wells. There are two existing water wells on the project site. There would be no evidence that the project would substantially reduce the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere



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

with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The applicant has provided a well production report for the proposed project. The Water Tech Well Drilling, Inc. well production report shows that one well produced 4-gpm at a depth of 25-feet. Based on the results of the on-site well report and the general geo-hydrologic conditions in the area, the domestic water supplies would be adequate for the project site. This impact would be less than significant.

- c) There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbance associated with the project would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on and off the site. There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance contain specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system. The standards would apply to this project when a building permit request is submitted to the County. This impact would be less than significant.
- d) The proposed project site would encompass 20.40-acres. The rate of surface runoff from development would be minimized through the application review process; there would be a less than significant impact from the current proposal's road improvements and future impervious surfaces created with development on the new parcels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) There would be insignificant impacts from stormwater runoff directly caused by the approval of this application request and minor road improvements. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All storm-water 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. The impact would be less than significant.
- g) The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel No. 060040-0725C, revised December 4, 1986, for the project area establishes that the northeast portion of the project site, located adjacent to Dry Creek, would be located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. A 100-foot setback from the mean high water mark of Dry Creek would be shown on the Tentative Parcel Map to limit development within the floodplain. There would be no impact.
- h) The closest dam and levees to the project site is Folsom Lake. This project site would be approximately nine miles from Folsom Lake Dam. Additionally, failure of Folsom Lake Dam is considered remote. There would be no impact.
- (i, j) The project area would not be near a body of water large enough to generate a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The nearest large bodies of water are Lake Tahoe and Folsom Lake. Neither is close enough or large enough to predict seiche risk. Mudflow on this type of soil would be unlikely, see geology and soils section. There would be 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.

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

<b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING.</b> <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 request for tentative Parcel Map 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 would be consistent with specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted 2004 General Plan. The creation of the two new parcels takes into consideration the required development standards of the RE-10 zone. The Design Waiver request would allow a parcel with a length in excess of three times the width required in the County Design and Improvement Manual. Any future residential development on either of the two new parcels would be required to be designed to comply with the requirements of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and local subdivision policies. The project would comply with 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 to the tentative parcel map application would be less than significant.

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource			X

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

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> <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 2004 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 has been 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 and the ‘Mineral Resources’ category would not be affected, therefore there would be no impact.

<b>XI. NOISE.</b> <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X
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 – d)

The on-site and off-site road improvements would generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment, trucks, bulldozer) at a potentially significant level (greater than 60 dB L<sub>eq</sub> and 70 dB L<sub>max</sub> between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 GP table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in rural regions-construction noise). Construction operations for road improvements would require adherence to construction hours as required by General Plan Policy 6.5.11. Construction activities would be limited to 7a.m. to 7p.m. during weekdays and 8a.m. to 5p.m. on weekends and federally recognized holidays. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant. The long-term noise impacts would be related to current vehicle traffic along the Salmon Falls Road which would be under the maximum noise level thresholds in the 2004 General Plan Table 6-1 of 60 dB L<sub>dn</sub>/CNEL or less. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

- e) General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including single-family residential development, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site would not be located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a County owned/operated airport facility. There would be no impact.
- f) The proposed project would not be 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:** For the ‘Noise’ category impacts would be less than significant.

<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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)?			<b>X</b>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			<b>X</b>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			<b>X</b>

**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;

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

- Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
  - Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.
- a) The proposed project would have a minimal growth-inducing impact. All future residential development such as second-residential units would be required to comply with County development standards and would pay project related impact fees. These include traffic related impacts fees, park and public facilities impacts fees, school impact fees, and other fees, as required by the County’s Building Services and affected County agencies. Any future development must comply with comprehensive County policies and regulations before grading and/or building permits could be issued. The project does not include school or large scale employment centers. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) No existing housing stock would be displaced by this project and no replacement housing would be necessary with the approval of the tentative parcel map. There would be no impact.
- c) No persons would be displaced by approving the tentative parcel map and construction of replacement housing would not be required for this project. There would be no impact.

**Finding:** The project would not displace any individuals and would not remove existing housing. The project would not directly or indirectly induce a substantial growth in population by process of a two-parcel subdivision of land. For this ‘Population and Housing’ category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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 comply with 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 Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. The Department 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 Department 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. 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 creation of two parcels where one currently exists would not significantly impact current Sheriff’s response times to the project area. The impacts would be less than significant.
- c) Schools: The State allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project proposal would not directly generate the need for additional school facilities and 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 proposed project 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.

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

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

**Discussion:** 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) By creating two parcels where one currently exists, no significant increase or effects in the use of area wide neighborhood or regional parks would be experienced by approving this project. There would be 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 would not require 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 the final Parcel Map. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

**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) The DOT has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that the project would not exceed the thresholds established in the 2004 General Plan. The number of vehicles associated with the project would not change current vehicle trip rates and would not measurably affect traffic volumes or levels of service on a permanent basis such that County standards would be exceeded. A traffic study was not required as the project would generate less than 100 ADT or less than 10 peak hour trips. The impacts would be less than significant.
  - b) Approval of the Tentative Parcel Map would accommodate the allowed density. The proposed density would not have a significant traffic and/or circulation impact to Shingle Springs Drive and Green Valley Road, or the surrounding road circulation system. 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) There would be no design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections added or changed on Green Valley Road and Shingle Springs Drive. Impacts would be less than significant.
  - e) The proposed project site would receive access off of Shingle Springs Drive, an existing public road, which would provide through access for the project. Road improvements would be required by the DOT and the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District to provide the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to the fire safe regulations that are being placed upon the conditions of approvals for the project prior to filing of the map. Based upon the required road improvements there would be no disruption of emergency access to and from the existing residences or those on surrounding parcels. The impact would be less than significant.
  - f) Future development would be required to comply with on-site parking identified by use and the Zoning Ordinance. Section 17.18.060, of the Zoning Ordinance, 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.



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

**Finding:** For the ‘Transportation/Traffic’ category, the project would have a less than significant impact on traffic and transportation. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Discussion:** 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 - b)

The project proposes the subdivision of the site into two, ten (10) acre parcels; the new residential parcels are proposed to have individual septic systems and well water serving each home. Septic systems designed and installed on-site must comply with State and County standards, and thus would not exceed any standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. There are no anticipated wastewater treatment or facility impacts. The impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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 as determined by the Department of Transportation. There would be no impact.
- d) As referenced above, the proposed project would provide for well water and septic systems for each proposed lot. The project would be conditioned to ensure adequate water pressure for fire control with the final review and approval by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department required prior to filing the parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The County’s Environmental Management Department previously reviewed and approved the existing septic systems. Future residential development would be reviewed by Building Services and Environmental Management Department during the building permit review phase 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 655acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.  
  
 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 proposed lots 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.

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

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

**Discussion:**

- a) The proposed project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to biological resources. Potential impacts to biological resources include the alteration of habitat and or direct impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species. This impact would be mitigated by **MM BIO-1** which would require on-site pre-construction surveys for raptors and their nests conducted by a qualified biologist.
- 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, would be considerable or which would compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Based on the analysis in this study, 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

El Dorado County 2004 General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, Adopted February 5, 2007

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.)

**Additional References:**

Biological Resources Evaluation and Botanical Inventory for the Stondell Property, prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. (July, 2007)

Cultural Resources Study of Assessor's Parcel Numbers 319:020:11 & 319:020:09, prepared for Robert G. Stondell, prepared by Historic Resource Associates (December, 2005)

Preliminary Drainage Report for Robert G. Stondell Tentative Parcel Map, prepared by Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc. (July, 2007)

El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District. CEQA Guide First Edition. (February 2002)

El Dorado County Development Services Department --- Planning Services. Parcel Data Information System.