



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** Tentative Parcel Map P08-0007/Marshall

**Lead Agency Name and Address:** Development Services- Planning Division El Dorado County, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

**Contact Person:** Aaron Mount

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

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Wayne J. and Jan L. Marshall, P.O. Box 999, Diamond Springs, CA 95619

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** Wayne J. and Jan L. Marshall, P.O. Box 999, Diamond Springs, CA 95619

**Project Agent's Name and Address:** Stanley L. Wells, 3161 Cameron Park Drive, Cameron Park, CA 95682

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:** Bob Olson, 2899 Crystal Springs, Camino, CA 95619

**Project Location:** The proposed project site is located on the west side of Peace Trail, approximately 500 feet south of the intersection with Pleasant Valley Road in the Pleasant Valley area of El Dorado County, CA.

**Assessor's Parcel Number(s):** 098-170-09 (20.32 acres)

**Zoning:** Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5)

**Section:** 33     **T:** 10N   **R:** 11E

**General Plan Designation:** Low Density Residential (LDR)

**Description of Project:**

Corresponding to applications referenced above, the project includes the following requests:

- 1) A tentative parcel map to create two lots of approximately ten acres each from an existing 20.23 acre parcel.
- 2) A Design Waiver requesting to allow the creation of a parcel without road frontage utilizing an exclusive easement and 12-foot driveway for access as required by Volume II Section 2.B.5 of the Design and Improvements Standards Manual.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

The project is located within the Diamond Springs Community Region. The project is located in a rural area and is surrounded by existing single family development as described below:

|        | <u>Zoning</u> | <u>General Plan</u> | <u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School) |
|--------|---------------|---------------------|---|
| Site:  | RE-5          | LDR                 | Single Family Residence   |
| North: | RE-5          | LDR                 | Single Family Residence   |
| East:  | RE-5          | LDR/OS              | Single Family Residence/Public Utility Water Storage Facility           |
| South: | RE-10         | RR                  | Single Family Residence   |
| West:  | RE-5/TPZ      | LDR/MDR             | Single Family Residences  |

**Briefly Describe the environmental setting:** The approximately 20.32-acre site is located within the Pleasant Valley area just east of the Oak Hill Rural Center. The elevation is approximately 2,200 feet above mean sea level. There is an existing residence on the north east portion of the parcel and an unpermitted residence on the western portion of the parcel. The subject parcel is bound by Peace Trail on the east and is surrounded by residential development. Vegetation on-site is comprised of landscaping surrounding the existing residences and

the undeveloped portions contain manzanita, foothill pine, interior live oak, and associated understory vegetation. Slopes on-site are generally mild with the northern end being the buildable area and transitioning to a gentle southern aspect slope. The proposed parcel would be accessed from a shared driveway onto Peace Trail, a privately maintained road, which connects to Pleasant Valley Road, a County maintained road.

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

- El Dorado County Building Services, permitting of illegal residence
- El Dorado County Department of Transportation, grading permits
- El Dorado County Department of the Surveyor, filing of the Parcel Map
- El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, permitting of septic for unpermitted residence
- El Dorado Irrigation District, fire hydrant connection
- El Dorado County Fire Protection District, fire safe plan and hydrant location

**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: Aaron Mount For: El Dorado County

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

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas 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 a Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) to subdivide the existing parcel of approximately 20.23 acres to two parcels of approximately 10 acres each. The newly created lot is proposed to be situated towards the western part of the existing parcel, behind the existing residence from Peace Trail. A separate driveway is proposed to provide ingress/egress to the parcel with a 12 foot wide driveway leading from the driveway access on Peace Trail westward to the western part of the existing parcel.

### Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project is located in the Pleasant Valley area adjacent to the Oak Hill Rural Center. The project is located in a rural area and is surrounded by existing single family development and a public utility water storage facility.

### Project Characteristics

#### 1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The project would be accessed from Peace Trail, a private road, via existing and proposed access driveways. The proposed access driveway would provide for a 12-foot wide drive aisle as required by County code. The driveway and future parking would be evaluated at the time of building permit submittal.

#### 2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The applicant proposes to serve the project site as follows:

Water – Public and Private, El Dorado Irrigation District and private well

Sewer – Private, County Approved Septic System

Power – Public

Telephone – Public

Cable/Internet - Public

#### 3. Population

The applicant's proposed project, if approved, would allow the construction of an additional residential unit. Additionally, pursuant to County Ordinance and State Planning and Zoning Law, an additional "granny flat" can be

developed on site in accordance with County standards. Extending the County's average population per household of 2.8<sup>1</sup>, the proposed project is estimated to add approximately 6 persons to the Pleasant Valley area.

#### 4. Construction Considerations

Minor road improvements would be required prior to filing of the parcel map. A grading permit would be required through the El Dorado County Department of Transportation. An unpermitted residence exists on the site and would be conditioned to either be vacated or permitted through El Dorado County Building Services.

#### 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 will be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency will 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 will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

- c. **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. **Supporting Information Sources:** A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

|  |  |          |          |
|--|--|----------|----------|
| <b>I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |          |          |
| 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 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. **Scenic Vista.** The project site is located adjacent to Pleasant Valley Road in the Pleasant Valley area. The project site and immediate vicinity has not been identified by the County as a scenic view or resource. There would be no anticipated impact.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is not adjacent or visible from a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site. There would be no anticipated impact.
- c. **Visual Character.** The project would not affect the visual character of Peace Trail/Pleasant Valley Road or the project vicinity. The proposed residential development would be consistent with existing uses in the area. There would be no anticipated impact.
- d. **Light and Glare.** The project would create the potential for an additional residential unit. Potential sources of light and glare would result from the residential development. Future sources of lighting as a result of the project would be typical of residential development and would be consistent with existing residential lighting in the area. The project would not result in new sources of light that would significantly impact the neighborhood. Therefore, the impacts of existing light and glare created by the project would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** Given the project location and characteristics, impacts to aesthetics are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. Common residential lighting would be anticipated to be less than significant and consistent with the existing lighting in the area.

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

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

- a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site would not be within an Agricultural zone or Agricultural overlay. The site has a General Plan Land Use designation of Low Density Residential and correspondingly zoned as Estate Residential Five-Acre. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses because there are no adjacent agriculturally zoned properties. There would be no impact.
- b. **Timberland Preserve Zone:** The subject parcel is adjacent to a parcel within the Timberland Preserve Zone district (TPZ) and contract with the State. The subject TPZ zoned parcel has been conceptually approved by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors for an immediate zone change to a residential zone district. The El Dorado County Agricultural Commission determined that the parcel is not suitable for an agricultural operation and a registered professional forester determined that the parcel does not contain an active timber operation and could not sustain an economically viable yield. Until the immediate zone change is approved by the California State Board of Forestry the County Board of Supervisors can not adopt a resolution formally changing the zoning of the TPZ parcel. Until such time, the TPZ zoned parcel has to be evaluated as an adjacent agricultural zoning and therefore the Agricultural Commission determined that a one hundred foot non-building setback on the project parcel would reduce any land use conflicts to a less than significant level.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** No conversion of agriculture land would occur as a result of the project. No impact would be anticipated.

**FINDING** For this “Agriculture” category, there would be less than significant impacts.

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

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<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. **Air Quality Plan.** 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 that the project implement a Fugitive Dust Mitigation (FDM) plan 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. **Air Quality Standards.** The project would create air quality impacts which may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction. Potential air quality impacts would result from construction related impacts during project construction and operation air quality impacts as a result of future residential development of the site. An Air Quality Analysis was prepared for the project which analyzed the potential impacts of construction and operational impacts to air quality (Rimpo and Associates, July 2007).

Construction activities associated with the project include grading and site improvements, for roadway expansion, utilities, driveway, home, and building pad construction, and associated on-site activities. Construction related

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

activities would generate PM10 dust emissions that would exceed either the state or federal ambient air quality standards for PM10. This is a temporary but potentially significant effect. The Air Quality Analysis recommended mitigation measures that would be implemented in standard conditions of approval by the El Dorado Air Quality Management District. These conditions include the approval of a Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan and adherence to all District rules during project construction. Compliance with the FDM Plan and adherence to District rules would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Operational air quality impacts would be minor and temporary, and would cause an insignificant contribution to existing or projected air quality violations. Source emissions would be from vehicle trip emissions, natural gas and wood combustion for space and water heating, landscape equipment, and consumer products. The Air Quality Analysis determined that the operational impacts would not exceed the established County thresholds and would be a less-than-significant impact.

- c. **Cumulative Impacts.** The project site is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin which is designated as non-attainment for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>. The Air Quality Analysis prepared for the project has recommended conditions of approval listed in (b) above that would reduce impacts related to PM<sub>10</sub> to a less than significant level. The Air Quality Analysis determined that the project would not generate a potentially significant level of ozone emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Sensitive Receptors.** The project would create two residential parcels. The proposed residential use would not be considered a use which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Objectionable Odors.** Table 3-1 of the *El Dorado County APCD CEQA Guide* (February, 2002) does not list the proposed residential use as a use known to create objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** The proposed project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The project would result in increased emissions due to construction and operation, however existing regulations would reduce these potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Additional impacts to air quality would be less than significant. The proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts.

| <b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>   |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |

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

| <b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>   |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| 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) **Listed Species:** 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. Staff’s review of the California Natural Diversity Database did not reveal the presence of any species of concern within the project vicinity or a one mile buffer. Impacts would be less than significant.

b/c) **Wetlands:** The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map for the project area (Placerville, CA Quadrangle, 1995) was reviewed and a subsequent site visit was done to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project site. This review indicates that there are no wetlands or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project. The project parcel contains a man made seasonal pond which may contain wetland habitat but is not shown on the NWI map. No development is proposed to impact the seasonal pond and a 100 foot non-disturbance setback is shown on the map consistent with General Plan policy to ensure protection of wetland features. The project is not located within or adjacent to the county’s Important Biological Corridor overlay district and, as such, no biological study was required as part of the project submittal. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) **Deer Migration:** Review of the California Department of Fish and Game *Deer Ranges Map* (1990) indicates that there are no mapped critical deer migration corridors on the project site. The project will not substantially interfere with the

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

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) **Oak Tree Preservation:** No tree removal will result from the proposed project. The subject project will retain the necessary tree canopy as required by General Plan policy 7.4.4.4 and the El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan. There would be no impact.
- f) **Conservation Plans:** The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to the draft Recovery/Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

| <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? |  |   | X |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? |  |   | X |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?           |  |   | X |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                              |  | X |   |

**Discussion:**

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

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

**a-b. Historic or Archeological Resources.** A Cultural Resource Study was performed on the project site (Cultural Resources Unlimited, June, 2007). Five historic resources were identified and recorded. All resources are mining related and the report concluded that they do not appear to be significant in their location or design. Additionally the historic resources are located on a portion of the property that will likely not be developed due to topography and previously discussed wetland setback. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- c. **Paleontological Resource.** The site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil strata. No such resources were identified in the Cultural Resource Study. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Human Remains.** There is a potential of human remain discovery on the project site. Standard protocol requires that, in the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains would be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. Subsequent construction plans including grading plans shall include this standard as a note on the plans. Planning Services would review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit to ensure project notation and condition. The project would anticipate less than significant impact to disturbance of human remains.

**FINDING:** No significant cultural resources were identified on the project site. Standard conditions of approval would be required with requirements for accidental discovery during project construction. This project would have a less than significant impact within the Cultural Resources category.

| <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:   |  |   |   |
| 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:**

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

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. Seismic Hazards.**

- i) According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, there are no Alquist-Priolo fault zones within El Dorado County. The nearest such faults are located in Alpine and Butte Counties. There would be no impact.
- ii) The potential for seismic ground shaking in the project area would be considered less than significant. Any potential impacts due to seismic impacts would be addressed through compliance with the Uniform Building Code. All structures would be built to meet the construction standards of the UBC for the appropriate seismic zone.
- iii) El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity. The potential areas for liquefaction on the project site would be the wetlands which are not proposed to be developed. Impacts would be less than significant.
- iv) All grading activities onsite would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Compliance with the Ordinance would reduce potential landslide impacts to less than significant.

**b. Soil Erosion.** According to the Soil Survey for El Dorado County, the soil types onsite are classified as Boomer-Sites (BpD) and Josephine Series (JrC) which have a moderate erosion hazard. The project parcel also contains a soil type identified as mixed alluvial land (MpB) which the soil survey states has properties that are too variable to be estimated and would require further onsite soils evaluations prior to any grading activities. All grading activities onsite would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

**c. Geologic Hazards.** The onsite soil types have a medium runoff potential with moderate erosion potentials. The project parcel also contains a soil type identified as mixed alluvial land which the soil survey states has properties that are too variable to be estimated and would require further onsite soils evaluations prior to any grading activities. All grading activities would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance, impacts would be less than significant.

**d. Expansive Soils.** The Boomer-Sites and Josephine Series soils have a moderate shrink-swell potential. The project parcel also contains a soil type identified as mixed alluvial land which the soil survey states has properties that are

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

too variable to be estimated and would require further onsite soils evaluations prior to any grading activities. All grading activities would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. **Septic Capability.** Proposed parcel one contains an existing residence with an approved septic system and proposed parcel two has had a septic evaluation approved the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. There would be no impacts related to septic systems.

**FINDING:** A review of the soils and geologic conditions on the project site determined that the soil types are suitable for the proposed development. All grading activities would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would address potential impacts related to soil erosion, landslides and other geologic impacts. Future development would be required to comply with the Uniform Building Code which would address potential seismic related impacts. For this ‘Geology and Soils’ category impacts 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?  |  |  | X |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  |  |  | X |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  |  |  | X |
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                   |  |  | X |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |  | X |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  |  |  | X |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |  |  | X |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   |  |  | X |

**Discussion:**

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

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

- 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-b. Hazardous Materials.** 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. 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. Prior to any use of a reportable quantity of hazardous materials, the project would be required to obtain a Hazardous Materials Business Plan through the Environmental Health- Hazardous Waste Division of El Dorado County. The impact would be a less than significant level.

**c. Hazardous Materials Near Schools.** There are no schools in the project vicinity. The project does not involve any construction that would involve a reportable quantity of hazardous substances. Future residential construction that may involve reportable quantities of hazardous materials would require a Hazardous Materials Business Plan. Adherence to the required Hazardous Materials Business Plan would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**d. Hazardous Sites.** No parcels within El Dorado County are included on the Cortese List. There would be no impact.

**e-f. Aircraft Hazards.** As shown on the El Dorado County Zoning Map, the project is not located within an Airport Safety (AA) District overlay. The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan and there would be no immediate hazard for people residing or working in the project area or safety hazard resulting from airport operations and aircraft over-flights in the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would occur within these categories.

**g. Emergency Plan.** As discussed in the Traffic category, the project would have an insignificant impact to the existing road systems. Other than an additional encroachment to Forni Road, no additional road improvements are required for the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

**h. Wildfire Hazards.** The subject parcel is located in a moderate fire severity area. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and determined that the installation of a fire hydrant and implementation of a fire safe plan would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**FINDING:** The proposed project would not expose the area to hazards relating to the use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. Any proposed use of a reportable quantity of hazardous materials would be subject to review and approval of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan issued by the Environmental Management. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District would require conditions of approval to reduce potential hazards relating to wild fires. For this 'Hazards and Hazardous Materials' category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;

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

- 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. Water quality standards.** There are no wetlands and drainage features onsite which would be impacted as part of the project. All project related construction activities would be required to adhere to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would require Best Management Practices (BMP's) to minimize degradation of water quality during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Groundwater Supplies.** 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 has one water meter and a private well approved by the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c-f. Drainage Patterns.** The project would be required to prepare a drainage study subject to review by the Department of Transportation. The drainage study would be required to conform to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g-j. Flood-related Hazards.** The project site is not located within any mapped 100-year flood areas and would not result in the construction of any structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. No dams are located in the project area which would result in potential hazards related to dam failures. The risk of exposure to seiche, tsunami, or mudflows would be remote. There would be no impact.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts to water quality or drainage features would result as part of the project. Adherence to the Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance would reduce impacts to less than significant. For this 'Hydrology and Water Quality' category, the project would not exceed the thresholds of significance and related impacts would be less than significant.

| <b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a. Physically divide an established community?   |  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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? |  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?  |  |  |  | <b>X</b> |

**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;

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

- 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. **Established Community.** The project would not result in the physical division of an established community. As proposed, the project is compatible with the surrounding residential land uses and would not create land use conflicts with surrounding properties. There would be no impact.
- b. **Land Use Consistency.** The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the 2004 General Plan, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed parcel sizes are consistent with the Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) zone district and the Low-Density Residential (LDR) land use designation. The proposal would not physically divide an established community as they would fit into the dominant pattern of parcel development for the area and that expected within a Community Region. There would be no impact.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** There are currently no adopted HCP's or NCCP's in El Dorado County. There would be no impact.

**FINDING:** For the 'Land Use Planning' category, the project would have a less than significant impact.

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <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-b. **Mineral Resources.** There are no significant mineral resources on the project site according to the General Plan mineral resource map. The site does contain historic features which are a result of past mining activities; however the CGS Open-File Report 2000-03 by the State of California Department of Conservation has not identified the site as an area of significant resources and is designated an MRZ-4H zone. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** No significant mineral resources are located on or within the vicinity of the project. There would be less than significant impacts to this 'Mineral Resources' category.

|                                |   |                              |           |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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. Noise Standards:** The project would not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project will 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 1 additional lot and related residential 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. Short Term Noise Increases:** Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of minor grading and improvement activities during development or upon completion of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

**c. Long-term Noise Increases:** The project would not increase the ambient noise levels in the area in excess of the established noise thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant

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

**e-f. Aircraft Noise:** 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.

**FINDING:** For the ‘Noise’ category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will 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. Population Growth.** The proposed project has been determined to have minimal growth-inducing impact as the project does not include any proposal to extend, or expand infrastructure or roads, and does not include any school or large scale employment opportunities that lead to indirect growth beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. The projects density is consistent with the LDR land use designation which allows a maximum density of one dwelling unit per five acres. Impacts would be less than significant.

**b. Displace Housing.** The project would result in the creation of two residential parcels. No existing or proposed housing would be displaced as part of the project. There would be no impact.

**c. Displace People.** The project would result in the creation of two residential parcels. No people would be displaced as part of the project. There would be no impact.

**FINDING:** The project would not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project would not directly or indirectly induce growth. For this ‘Population and Housing’ Section, impacts would be less than significant.

|                                |   |                              |           |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 provides structural fire protection to the project site. The District would require fire protection measures that would be included as conditions of approval of the project. These measures include the installation of a fire hydrant, preparation of a fire safe plan, and other standard requirements of the Fire Safe Regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Police Protection.** Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department. Due to the size and scope of the project, the demand for additional police protection would not be required. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Schools.** School services would be provided by the Gold Oak Union School District. Any future residences would be required to pay the impact fees adopted by the District. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Parks.** As discussed in the ‘Recreation’ category below, the project would be required to pay park in-lieu fees. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Government Services.** There are no services that would be significantly impacted as a result of the project Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**FINDING:** The project would not result in a significant increase of public services to the project. Increased demands to services would be addressed through the payment of established impact fees. For this ‘Public Services’ category, impacts would be less than significant.

| <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. Parks.** The project would result in an insignificant increase usage of parks and recreational facilities. Payment of park-in-lieu fees to the El Dorado County General Services Department would be sufficient to ensure the impacts from the new development would be offset. Impacts would be less than significant.

**b. Recreational Services.** The project would not include additional recreation services or sites as part of the project. The increased demand for services would be offset by the payment of the in-lieu fees as discussed above. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts to open space or park facilities would result as part of the project. For this ‘Recreation’ category, impacts would be less than significant.

|                                |   |                              |           |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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. Traffic Increases.** The Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the proposed project and determined it would not trip the traffic impact threshold of the General Plan. On-site and off-site improvements to Peace Trail are required in order to bring the private road to current standards. The required improvements have been analyzed and have been accounted for in the environmental review of this project. A shared driveway easement would connect proposed Parcel 2 to Peace Trail.

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 described above because of the project only creating two parcels. DOT has conditioned the project to address this General Plan consistency issue by requiring payment of traffic impact mitigation fees with each building permit. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- b. Levels of Service Standards.** The project would not exceed the thresholds of service established by the General Plan in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Air traffic.** The project will 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. Design Hazards.** The project would not create any significant traffic hazards. The proposed on-site and off-site improvements to Peace Trail would be designed and constructed to County standards. Review by the Fire District and the Department of Transportation did not identify any hazards associated with the design of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. Emergency Access.** The El Dorado County Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and concluded that the project would not result in inadequate emergency access to any potential residential structure with the implementation of the conditions of approval included in Attachment 1 of the staff report. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. Parking.** 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. There would be no impact.
- g. Alternative Transportation.** The project would not conflict with adopted plans, policies or programs relating to alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

**FINDING:** The impacts of the project related to Transportation would be less than significant. For the Transportation/Traffic category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| <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?  |  |  | <b>X</b> |  |
| 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? |  |  | <b>X</b> |  |
| 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?           |  |  | <b>X</b> |  |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |  |
| 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   |  |  | <b>X</b> |  |

|                                |   |                              |           |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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>   |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?   |  |   |  |
| 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. **Wastewater Requirements.** Environmental Management has reviewed and approved the existing and proposed septic designs. There is adequate septic capability for the existing and proposed systems. No significant wastewater discharge will result from the proposed parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Construction of New Facilities.** No new water or wastewater treatment facilities are proposed or are required because of the project. The existing and proposed septic systems have been reviewed and approved by the Environmental Management Department. A well has been drilled and approved by the County for proposed parcel 2. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **New Stormwater Facilities.** Minimal grading and improvements are proposed. Therefore, substantial drainage pattern alteration or runoff would not occur. Any future request for a grading, improvement, or building permit will be required to show how site discharge and/or run-off will not exceed the levels that existed prior to the proposed development based on BMP's and stormwater management plans. An existing man made seasonal pond exists on-site, and a 100-foot buffer on all sides is proposed and no impacts to the drainage are proposed. All required drainage facilities necessary for this project will be constructed in conformance with the standards contained in the County of El Dorado Grading and Drainage Manual. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Sufficient Water Supply.** The project would be served by EID public water and a private well. The existing residence is supplied by a public water meter and the proposed parcel has a well approved by the County. No new public water improvements would be required. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Adequate Capacity.** In this case, wastewater disposal for the proposed parcels will be provided by an existing and proposed septic disposal system. Environmental Management has reviewed and approved the existing and proposed disposal systems for the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**f. Solid Waste Disposal.** 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. Solid Waste Requirements.** County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development proved 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:** Adequate water and sewer systems are available to serve the project. For this ‘Utilities and Service Systems’ category, impacts would be less than significant.

| <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 will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?   |  |  | X |

**Discussion:**

a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the whole record that the project will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal

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

community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project will be less than significant due to existing standards and requirements imposed in the conditioning of the project.

- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as “two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not result in cumulative impacts.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report  
Volume 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6  
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9  
Appendix A  
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards 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.)

### **PROJECT SPECIFIC RESOURCE MATERIAL**

*Marshall Parcel Split, Placerville, El Dorado County, Cultural Resources Unlimited, June, 2007.*

---