



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** P08-0034/Nue Tentative Parcel Map

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

**Contact Person:** Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner

**Phone Number:** (530) 621-5875

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Dennis J. and Carolyn L. Neu 2240 Frosty Fir Drive, Placerville, CA 95667

**Project Applicant/Agent's Name and Address:** Wendy J. Cirimele, 3611 Chelsea Road, 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:** South Side of Fruitridge Road approximately 500 feet west of the intersection with Hassler Road in the Camino Area, Supervisorial District III.

**Assessor's Parcel Number(s):** 048-050-19, and -27 (41.76 acres)

**Zoning:** Select Agricultural Ten-Acre (SA-10)

**Section:** 3      **T:** 10N **R:** 11E

**General Plan Designation:** Agricultural Lands/Agricultural District Overlay (AL/A)

**Description of Project:** A tentative Parcel Map creating two parcels, 20.77 and 20.78 acres in size, from a 41.76 acre site. The project includes on-site road improvements.

**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:	SA-10	AL-A	Single-Family Residence, Christmas Tree Farm
North:	RE-5/AE	AL-A	Single-Family Residences, Lava Cap Winery
East:	R2A	AL-A	Single-Family Residences
South:	SA-10	AL-A	Single-Family Residences/Agriculture
West:	SA-10	AL-A	Single-Family Residences

**Briefly Describe the environmental setting:** The project site consists of 41.76 acres and is located in the Camino area at an approximate elevation of 2,440 to 2,640 feet above mean sea level. The parcel contains an existing single family residence with associated hardscape and landscape features and a Christmas tree farm with accessory structure. The existing residence currently takes access off of Fruitridge Road via Frosty Fir Drive, a paved driveway. The primary on-site biological communities include annual grasses, ponderosa pine, and montaine hardwood conifer. White Rock Creek bisects the property in the southeastern corner. Oak woodland canopy currently covers approximately 7.52 acres (18 percent) of the project site. The project site soils consist of Argonaut loam (AoB) 0 to 5 percent slopes, Cohasset cobbly loam (CoC) 3 to 15 percent slopes, Cohasset cobbly loam (CoE) 15 to 50 percent slopes, and Iron Mountain very rocky sandy loam (ImE) 3 to 50 percent slopes. Lava cap formations exist at the northeast corner of the project site. The site contains slopes in excess of 40 percent.

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

El Dorado County Department of Transportation, El Dorado County Fire Protection District, Environmental Management, Air Quality Management District, El Dorado County Surveyor, El Dorado County Resource Conservation District, El Dorado Irrigation District, California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention (CAL Fire).

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

**DETERMINATION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **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 fifteen residential parcels.

### **Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses**

The project site is located within the El Dorado - Diamond Springs. The project site is surrounded by existing developed and undeveloped residential parcels and a school.

### **Project Characteristics**

The project would create two parcels, 20.88 acres and 20.89 acres in size, from a 41.76 acre site (see Exhibit F). A request has been made to allow administrative relief to reduce the required 200-foot agricultural setback to 145 feet for the existing single family dwelling on proposed Parcel 1. Four Design Waivers have been requested for the following: 1) Allow a 30-foot right-of-way width for the proposed access road; 2) Allow less than a 100-foot tangent between the reversed curves of the proposed access road; 3) Allow the proposed access road centerline to be non-coincident with the proposed right-of-way centerline; and 4) Allow an overall road width of 20 feet for the proposed access road (18-foot travel surface with 1-foot shoulders per Standard Plan 101C). The applicant proposes to abandon the southerly portion of an existing road and public utility easement located on proposed Parcel 1. No residential development would be a result of this parcel map.

#### **1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking**

Access to the project parcel would be provided from a proposed encroachment along Fruitridge Road to the parcels. Parking exists for proposed Parcel 1 and would be required to be provided for Parcel 2 at the building permit stage. Adequate area exists to provide adequate. No impacts to parking would occur as part of the project.

#### **2. Utilities and Infrastructure**

Proposed parcel 1 has existing EID domestic water service. The project would be required to provide EID metered service prior to filing the Parcel Map. Proposed Parcel 1 has existing septic facilities and the applicant has provided a soils study reviewed by Environmental Management that Parcel 2 has the capability to support a septic facility as well

#### **3. Population**

Using the 2000 U.S. Census figures which established that, in the unincorporated areas of the County, the average household size was 2.70 persons/occupied unit. The approval of the applications as proposed would potentially add 2 single-family units which at 2.70 persons/occupied unit currently propose to potentially add approximately 5.4 persons to the neighborhood. The project proposes to add less than the potential density allowed.

#### **4. Construction Considerations**

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

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from Development Services and obtain an approved Fugitive Dust Plan from the Air Quality Management District.

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

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**Discussion:**

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. No impact would occur.
- c) The Parcel Map would result in two parcels which are suitable for existing and future agricultural and residential uses. The proposed project would not 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 exist by keeping the scenic areas of the property intact. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) This two parcel division of land does not propose development that would create substantial light or glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area. All future building plans issued for the parcel(s) shall comply with Section 17.14.170 of the County Zoning Ordinance which prohibits unnecessary and unwarranted illumination of an adjacent property. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** For the “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. No significant environmental impacts would result from the project and no mitigation is required.

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

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
  - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
  - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a) Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that the project site contains Cohasset cobbly loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes, and Cohasset cobbly loam, 15 to 50 percent slopes, which are identified as Unique Soils and/or a Soils of Local Importance. The site is designated by the General Plan as Agricultural Lands (AL), is currently zoned Select Agricultural Ten Acre (SA-10), and currently supports a single-family residential land use and agricultural pursuits to include a Christmas tree farm. El Dorado County has established the Agricultural Districts (-A) General Plan Land Use Overlay 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 the project site is located within the Agricultural Districts (-A) General Plan Land Use Overlay. The project, as proposed, would conform to the Agricultural Lands (AL) General Plan designation and Agricultural District (-A) overlay, and would conform to the development standards of the Select Agricultural Ten-Acre (SA-10) zone district. The Parcel Map would create two parcels which would support both residential and agricultural pursuits and would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. As such, the project related impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The project would not create an inconsistency with the Select Agricultural Ten Acre zone district. The project would conform to the uses permitted by right outlined in Section 17.36.230 and the development criteria outlined in Section 17.36.260. The project is not located within a Williamson Act Contract. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) The project would not result in conversion of existing agricultural farmlands to nonagricultural uses or result in other changes in the existing environment which would result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The project site is designated for agricultural and residential land uses by the County General Plan and is zoned for agricultural and residential development. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** This project would have no significant impact on agricultural lands, would not convert agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses, and would not affect properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. For the “Agriculture” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
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
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
  - Emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
  - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) El Dorado County has adopted the *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>). Activities related to the implementation of this Parcel Map would create a less than significant impact for air quality. Items are included in the conditions for project approval that require grading and construction activities to implement specific measures such as a Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan and reduction of air pollutants from vehicles and equipment in order to reduce the likelihood of defined particulate in this category. Therefore, the potential impacts of the project would be less than significant.
- b, c) The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of standard County measures, the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality.
- d) The El Dorado County AQMD reviewed the project and identified that no sensitive receptors exist in the area and would not be affected by this project. As such, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide. The proposed parcel project would not result in significant impacts resulting from odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**FINDING:** It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project in that no sensitive receptors would be adversely impacted, no objectionable odors would be created, and the project would not obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan. Based on the inclusion of standard conditions of approval, no significant adverse environmental effect would result from the project.

<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

**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 would 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. The project site is located within a 1-mile radius of a Nissenan Manzanita (*Arctostaphylos nissenana*) occurrence. Nissenan Manzanita is

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

listed on the California Native Plant Society list 1B.2. Nissenan Manzanita is not listed on any State of California or Federal listing of rare or endangered species. The applicant has submitted an approved Timber Harvest Plan, which states in reference to Nissenan Manzanita “These communities and environmental factors do not exist within the plan area.” (*Neu Timber Harvest Plan, Progressive Forestry, June, 18, 2003*) Impacts would be less than significant.

- b, c) No impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community have been identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or proposed impacts to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The southeast corner of the project site is bisected by White Rock Creek; however, no impacts are proposed to the creek and the closest proposed development would occur approximately greater than 1,100 feet from the location of the creek. Any future development would be required to conform to General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 and the Interim Interpretive Guidelines for that policy, which provide buffers and special setbacks for the protection of riparian areas and wetlands. Impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 is not located within the Important Biological Corridor (-IBC) General Plan Land Use Overlay. The project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e, f) The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, nor the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The County’s Habitat Conservation Plan is currently being developed; however, this project meets the goals of the interim guidelines that have been established for various sensitive elements anticipated for the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). These include elements of the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay, oak woodland preservation, rare plants and special-status species, and wetland preservation with the goal to preserve and protect sensitive natural resources within the County. No tree removal would result from the proposed project. The proposed project would retain the necessary tree canopy as required by General Plan policy 7.4.4.4 and the El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** For the “Biological Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>				
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>

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

**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 Assessment for APNs 048-050-19 and 27, for Site 4 Within the Neu Property, El Dorado County, California*, prepared by Peek and Associates in January 2009. One historic home site was found but it was determined not to be associated with any important events or people in history pursuant to California Register of Historic Resources criteria. According to the study, no other significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts were found. No further cultural resource study was recommended. In the event sub-surface historical, cultural, or archeological sites or materials are disturbed during earth disturbances and grading activities on the site, standard conditions of approval are included within Attachment 1 of the staff report to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. According to the submitted study, the project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil strata/locales. No impacts would occur.

d) Due to the scope of the project, there is not a high potential to discover human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the standard conditions within Attachment 1 shall be implemented immediately. Upon implementation of those conditions of approval, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**FINDING:** Established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category. Standard conditions of approval would insure that impacts would be less than significant.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			<b>X</b>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			<b>X</b>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			<b>X</b>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			<b>X</b>
iv) Landslides?			<b>X</b>

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

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
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.
- 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 for El Dorado County. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced groundshaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating buildings in the project area would be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides would be less than significant.
- b) According to the submitted preliminary grading and drainage plan, overall existing drainage patterns would not be modified and pre- and post-development drainage conditions would not change. Project grading would be required for improvements associated to road construction and general access improvements. No mass pad grading is proposed. All grading must be in compliance with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors on March 13, 2007 (Ordinance No. 4719), including the implementation of pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to eliminate run-off and erosion and sediment controls, which would reduce any potential significant impacts of soil erosion or the loss of topsoil to a less than significant level.

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

- c, d) As stated in the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974, the soils on the project site are primarily comprised of Argonaut loam (AoB) 0 to 5 percent slopes with very slow permeability, very slow to slow surface runoff, slight erosion hazard, and low shrink-swell potential; Cohasset cobbly loam (CoC) 3 to 15 percent slopes with moderately slow permeability, medium surface runoff, slight to moderate erosion hazard, and low shrink-swell potential; Cohasset cobbly loam (CoE) 15 to 50 percent slopes with moderate permeability, medium to rapid surface runoff, moderate to high erosion hazard, and low shrink-swell potential; and Iron Mountain very rocky sandy loam (ImE) 3 to 50 percent slopes with moderately rapid permeability, medium to rapid surface runoff, light to high erosion hazard, and low shrink-swell potential. The project site can adequately support the required road improvements and potential residential uses. The project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, is not anticipated to result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse, nor would the project be located on expansive soils. 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. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Waste discharge area analysis was completed and was reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, Environmental Health Division. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of 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 soil permeability for the proposed 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.

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

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>			
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) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be transported, used, or disposed of for the project. Any hazardous materials used at the project site shall comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*. Impacts would be less than significant.
  - b) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be utilized for the project. The project would not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
  - 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 a quarter mile radius of this property. Impacts within this category would be less than significant.
  - 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 would not be 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. No impacts would occur within these categories.

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

- g) The proposed project would 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. Impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 El Dorado County Fire Protection District and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention have reviewed and approved the Wildfire Fire Safe Plan and have conditioned the project to comply with Fire Safe requirements. To ensure impacts are less than significant, the project would be required to comply with the approved *Neu/Cirimele Wildland Fire Safe Plan* dated September 10, 2009.

**FINDING:** The proposed project is would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires. For the "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed project with the implementation of standard conditions of approval from the AQMD, the El Dorado County Fire Protection District, The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and implementation of a fire safe plan.

<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>	
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?			<b>X</b>	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			<b>X</b>	

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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) Any grading and improvement plans required by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) and/or Development Services shall be prepared and designed to meet the *County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. These standards require that erosion and sediment control be implemented into the design of the project. The project “Individual Sewage Disposal Suitability Study for Tentative Parcel Map”, Norton Professional Geologist, dated August 4, 2007”, for waste discharge area analysis has been reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department- Environmental Health Division. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The proposed project would be required to connect to public water via the El Dorado Irrigation District. El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 8, 2007 stating that public water services and required fire flow are available to the serve the proposed project from an existing 10-inch water line in Fruitridge Road (*Facility Improvement Letter, Nue Parcel Split, March 8, 2007*). Impacts from connection to existing water facilities would be minimal. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) Proposed grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would not 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 to this project. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- d, e) There would 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 would limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site. As such, there would be limited erosion and siltation resulting from this project and impacts would be less than significant.

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

- f) The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site. The project would be required to connect to public water. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- g, h) The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0500B and 060040 0775B, 10/18/83) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- i) The subject property is located within the Camino area and 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. Impacts would be less than significant.
- j) The proposed project is not located near a coastal area or adjacent to a large body of water such as a lake, bay, or estuary, volcanoes, or other volcanic features, and the site is located on relatively stable soils. There is no potential for impacts from seiche or tsunamis, or from mudflow at this site. There would be 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.

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

**Discussion:**

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. As proposed, the project would be compatible with the surrounding residential and agricultural land uses and would not create land use conflicts with surrounding properties. The project proposes densities and parcel sizes consistent with the project sites General Plan

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

Agricultural Lands (AL) land use designation, Agricultural Districts overlay (-A), and the Select Agricultural Ten-Acre (SA-10) zoning district. Impacts would be less than significant.

- 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 project proposes densities and parcel sizes consistent with the project sites General Plan Agricultural Lands (AL) land use designation, Agricultural Districts overlay (-A), and the Select Agricultural Ten-Acre (SA-10) zoning district. Impact would be less than significant.
- c) The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other conservation plan. As such, there is no possibility of the proposed project conflicting with an adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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. No impacts would occur.
- b) The Western portion of El Dorado county is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that this site does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** No impacts to any known mineral resources would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. For the 'Mineral Resources' category, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a, c) The project would not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project would not generate noise levels that exceed the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan as it involves the creation of one additional parcel and related residential and agricultural noise. Other than temporary noise generated from construction equipment, no significant noise would be expected from the development of the project. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

b, d) Persons adjacent to the project vicinity would not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of minor grading and improvement activities during development or upon completion of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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). As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. No impacts would occur.

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

- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
- Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
- Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.

- a) The proposed project has been determined to have a minimal growth-inducing impact as the project includes the creation of two parcels where one currently exists. No residential development is proposed with the parcel map and all future development would be required to meet established County development standards. Any future development must meet comprehensive County policies and regulations before building permits can be issued. The project does not include any school or large scale employment centers that would lead to indirect growth beyond what is currently anticipated by the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) No existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project. No impacts would occur.
- c) No persons would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** The project would not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project would 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.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department’s/District’s goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;
- Substantially increase or expand the demand for public law enforcement protection without increasing staffing and equipment to maintain the Sheriff’s Department goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents;
- Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services;
- Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources;
- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.

- a) **Fire Protection:** The El Dorado County Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Fire District from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District would review the project improvement plans and conformance with Fire District conditions of approval must be proven prior to filing the parcel map. 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 addition of one residential lot would not significantly impact current response times to the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Camino Union School District. The affected school district was contacted as part of the initial consultation process 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 would be

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

assessed and collected during the building permit review phase for any future single-family residential development. Impact 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 16.52.125 of County Code establishes that the dedication of land, the payment of fees in lieu thereof or a combination of both for park and recreational purposes applies to parcel maps which create parcels less than twenty acres in size. The project proposes creation of two parcels which are both larger in size than 20 acres, therefore, providing parkland or payment of the in-lieu fees would not apply to the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the creation of one additional 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.

<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?			<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>

**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) Because the project would only include the creation of one additional parcel, it would not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.
  - b) The project proposal does not propose any on-site recreation facilities and would not be required to construct any new facilities or expand any existing recreation facilities with the scope of this project. No impacts would occur.

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

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

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> <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

**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, b) The Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the proposed project and determined it would not trip the traffic impact threshold of the General Plan. Proposed project access would consist of construction/widening of the on-site portion of Frosty Fir Drive (existing driveway) to 20 feet roadway width with 1-foot shoulders utilizing a modified Design Improvement Standards Manual (DISM) standard plan 101C. Also, the project would include the construction/widening of the existing encroachment from the proposed road onto Fruitridge Road to DISM standard plan 103C. Potential environmental impacts for the on-site road improvement would be less than significant as they involve minimal grading/road widening.

The 2004 General Plan Policies TC-Xe and TX-Xf (which incorporate Measure Y) require that projects that “worsen” traffic by two percent, or 10 peak hour trips, or 100 average daily trips must construct (or ensure funding and programming) of any improvements required to meet Level of Service standards in the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. DOT has reviewed the proposed project and determined that it would not trigger the threshold

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

described above because of its limited size. DOT has conditioned the project to address this General Plan consistency issue by requiring payment of traffic impact mitigation fees with each building permit.

- c) The project would not result in a change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity. No impacts would occur.
- d) The project would be required to make on-site road improvements consistent with the provisions of the DISM. As such, the proposed project would not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersection or incompatible uses that would increase hazards. The applicant is requesting a Design Waiver to allow a 30-foot right of way width for the proposed access road; allow less than a 100-foot tangent between the reverse curves of the proposed access road; to allow the proposed access road centerline to be non-coincident with the proposed right of way centerline; and to allow overall width to be 20-feet for the proposed access road. DOT has reviewed and approved the proposed Design Waivers. No traffic hazards would result from the project design. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The El Dorado County Fire Protection District and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention have reviewed and approved the *Wildland Fire Safe Plan* dated September 10, 2007 and have conditioned the project to comply with “Fire Safe” requirements. To ensure impacts are less than significant, the project would be required to comply with the “Fire Safe Requirements” and fully implement the approved Wildfire Fire Safe Plan. As such, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) The proposed parcels would provide adequate space to comply with all parking requirements. Future development would be required to meet on-site parking requirements identified by use within Section 17.18.060 of the County Zoning Ordinance. Future requests for building permits would be reviewed for conformance with parking standards during the review process. A single-family residence requires two on-site parking spaces in tandem. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan Policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The El Dorado Transit Authority was contacted as part of the initial consultation process for review and comment. No specific comments or mitigation measures were received or included for this project. No impacts would occur.

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

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing			X	

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

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			
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?		<b>X</b>	
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		<b>X</b>	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		<b>X</b>	

**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) Environmental Management has reviewed and approved the existing and proposed on-site wastewater treatment systems. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed water quality standards. There is adequate septic capability for the existing and proposed systems. No significant wastewater discharge would result from the proposed parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.
  - b) No new water or wastewater treatment facilities are proposed or are required because of the project. The existing septic and proposed systems have been reviewed and approved by the Environmental Management Department. The El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 8, 2007 stating that public water services and required fire flow are available to the serve the proposed project with a water line extension from the 10-inch water line in Fruitridge Road. (*Facility Improvement Letter, Neu Parcel Split, March 8, 2007*). Impacts would be less than significant.
  - c) According to the submitted preliminary grading and drainage plan, overall existing drainage patterns would not be modified and pre- and post-development drainage conditions would not change. All project grading must be in compliance with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors on March 13, 2007 (Ordinance No. 4719) and all drainage facilities must be in compliance with standards contained in the *County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
  - d) The El Dorado Irrigation District provided a letter dated March 8, 2007 stating that public water services and required fire flow are available to the serve the proposed project with a water line extension from the 10-inch water line in Fruitridge

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

Road. (*Facility Improvement Letter, FIL0307-151, Neu Parcel Split, March 8, 2007*). Impacts from connection to existing water facilities would be minimal. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

- e) In this case, wastewater disposal for the proposed parcels would be provided by existing and proposed septic disposal systems. Environmental Management has reviewed and approved the existing and proposed disposal systems for the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

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

- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collection and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste and recyclables collection for the proposed lots would be provided by a local waste management provider contracting to the property owner for the service. Adequate space would be available at the site for solid waste collection. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

<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?			<b>X</b>
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)?			<b>X</b>
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			<b>X</b>

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

**Discussion:**

- a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the record that the project would 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, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The project would not eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Subsurface earthwork may expose previously undiscovered buried recourses; however, standard conditions of approval are incorporated into the project within Attachment 1 of the staff report ensuring that impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant impact. Any impacts from the project would be less than significant due to existing standards and requirement 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 would not result in significant cumulative impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) All impacts identified in this Negative Declaration are less than significant after and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

**SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Development Services, Planning Services in Placerville:

2004 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.

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report  
 Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report  
 Volume II - Comments on Supplement to DEIR to Comments on DEIR  
 Volume III - Technical Appendices B through H  
 Volume IV – Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR  
 Volume V – Appendices

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 Manual

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.)

El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan

**PROJECT SPECIFIC REPORTS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

*Cultural Resources Assessment of APN 048-050-19 and 27, for Site 4 Within the Neu Property, El Dorado County, California*, prepared by Peek and Associates in January 2009

*Facilities Improvement Letter*, FIL0307-151, prepared by El Dorado County Irrigation District, dated March 8, 2007

*Individual Sewage Disposal Suitability Study for Tentative Parcel Map*, prepared by Norton Professional Geologist, dated August 4, 2007

Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, prepared by Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., dated September 10, 2008

*Oak Canopy Site Assessment Form*, prepared by Phillip Mosbacher, Certified Arborist WE-7351A, dated September 11, 2008

*Neu Timber Harvest Plan, Biological and Cultural Resources Section*, prepared by Progressive Forestry, dated June, 18, 2003.