



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** P 08-0025/S 08-0027/Hiroshima Parcel Map and Gate

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

**Contact Person:** Thomas A. Lloyd

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

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Phil Hiroshima, 6508 Benham Way, Sacramento, CA 95831

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** : Phil Hiroshima, 6508 Benham Way, Sacramento, CA 95831

**Project Engineer / Architect:** David Chung, 2712 Cardillo Avenue, Hacienda Heights, CA 91745

**Project Location:** East side of Emmerson Road, 475 feet north of the intersection with Coloma Road in the Placerville area.

**Assessor's Parcel Number(s):** 089-202-34 (20.17 acres)

**Zoning** Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5)

**Section:** 35      **T:** 11N **R:** 10E

**General Plan Designation:** Low Density Residential-Platted Land overlay (LDR-PL)

**Description of Project:** A tentative parcel map to create four lots ranging in size from 5.00 to 5.09 acres from an existing 20.17 acre parcel and a Special Use Permit to allow the installation of an electric gate across the proposed access road serving the project.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single-family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RE-5	LDR-PL	Undeveloped
North:	RE-10	LDR-PL	Single-family residences
East:	RE-10	LDR-PL	Single-family residences/Undeveloped
South:	RE-5/R1A	MDR-PL	Single-family residences
West:	RE-10/RE-5	LDR-PL	Single-family residences

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site lies on the western slope of the central Sierra Nevada in the northwestern portion of El Dorado County, at an approximate average elevation of 1,850 feet above mean sea level. The majority of the parcel consists of annual grassland and pasture surrounded by oak woodland habitat. The woodland canopy in the northwest corner of proposed parcel one is dominated by oaks, primarily interior live oak. The remainder of the canopy is comprised mostly of ponderosa pine. On the east side of the property, across a small valley, the blue oak-foothill pine woodland is dominated by blue oaks. In this area there are two very large oaks with diameters exceeding 40 inches.

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

El Dorado County Department of Transportation	El Dorado County Surveyor
El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management	El Dorado Irrigation District
El Dorado County Fire Protection District	California Department of Transportation (CalTrans)

**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: Thomas A. Lloyd For: El Dorado County

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

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**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 four parcels which are suitable for residential use. The surrounding neighborhood is equally well suited to residential use, and has been developed accordingly. The proposed project, therefore, would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings as its residential use is consistent with adjacent parcels. No impact would occur.
- d) There is no lighting proposed as part of this project. All future building plans issued for the parcel(s) must comply with Section 17.14.170 of the County Zoning Ordinance which prohibits unnecessary and unwarranted illumination of an adjacent property. No impact would occur.

**FINDING:** For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. No impacts from light and glare are expected 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?			√
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?			√
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?			√

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
  - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
  - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a) El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land Use Overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan Land Use Map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan Land Use Overlay District area adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses because there are no adjacent agriculturally zoned properties. No impact would occur.
- b) The proposed project would not conflict with any agricultural use in the project vicinity, and would not adversely impact properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract. No impact would occur.
- c) No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project. No impact would occur.

**FINDINGS:** It has been determined that the project would not result in any impact to agricultural lands, or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area mainly consists of residential development. For this “Agricultural” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

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

- 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,b) Site clearing, burning, grading, utility excavation, and movement of construction equipment would create temporary air quality impacts during construction. The construction-related impacts should be less than significant since these aspects of the project would be controlled by Chapter 15.14 of the County Code which sets minimum standards for such activities and El Dorado Air Pollution Control District Rule 223 that controls fugitive dust.

c) Regarding cumulative air quality impacts, the proposed project does not require a change in existing land use designation or exceed the project alone significance criteria. Based on the project information provided, the proposed project would not result in any cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) The El Dorado County AQMD reviewed the project and identified that no sensitive receptors exist in the area and found that no such receptors would be affected by this project. 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 parcel map would create a less than significant impact onto the environment from odors.

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

<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?			√
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?			√

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?		√	
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?			√
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		√	
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?		√	

**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) After Reviewing County resource materials for sensitive and protected species, it has been determined that the project would not affect locally designated natural communities, disturb wetlands, or affect migration corridors. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b,c) The U.S. Department of Interior National Wetlands Inventory Maps were reviewed and subsequent site visit was done to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project site. This review indicates that there are no wetlands or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project. The project is not located within or adjacent to the county’s Important Biological Corridor overlay district and, as such, no biological study was required as part of project submittal. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) Review of the Department of Fish and Games Migratory Deer Herd Maps and General Plan DEIR Exhibit V-8-4 indicate the site is outside the range of the deer study area. The project would have no impact on any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, nor impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.
- e) As part of application submittal, the applicant was required to submit a tree canopy exhibit which has been confirmed with aerial photography. This exhibit identifies total oak canopy coverage of 17 percent over the entire 20.17 acre site. This 17 percent of existing oak canopy coverage requires 90 percent retention pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. At 95 percent, overall canopy retention exceeds the provisions of Policy 7.4.4.4, and is consistent with the El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan, adopted May 2008. The applicants have the choice to use either Option A or

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

B of Policy 7.4.4.4, as prescribed by the Oak Woodland Management Plan to mitigate the impacts of any tree canopy removed. The project has been conditioned accordingly. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

- f) The project area 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. Therefore, the established thresholds for significance in the “Biological Resources” category would not be exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a,b) The applicant supplied a Record Search completed by the North Central Information Center. This Record Search indicated a low possibility for discovery of Native American (prehistoric) and a moderate to high potential for discovery of historic-period cultural resources in the project area. Based on the Record Search results, an intensive field investigation of the study area was conducted by Peak & Associates, Inc. of El Dorado Hills, CA in September, 2007. This investigation found no historical resources in the project area. Standard conditions 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. The project site does not contain any known paleontological site or known fossil locales. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

**FINDING:** Established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the ‘cultural Resources’ category. Standard conditions of approval would ensure 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:			√	
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.			√	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			√	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			√	
iv) Landslides?			√	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			√	
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?			√	
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?			√	
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?			√	

**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;

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

- 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 is less than significant.
  - b) No grading has been proposed as part of this project. However, any grading activities shall comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance, which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
  - c) The soil type of the site is predominantly BhC or Boomer gravelly loam, 3-15 percent slopes. Included in mapping are small areas of Auburn silt loam, Argonaut gravelly loam, and Sobranite silt loam. Surface runoff is medium, and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. There is also a significant percentage of DfC or Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes. Included in this mapping are small areas of Auberry coarse sandy loam and Boomer gravelly loam. The erosion hazard is moderate, and runoff is medium. All future grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
  - d) Expansive soils are those soil types that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and then shrink upon drying out. Soils with high clay content are subject to soil expansion. When buildings are placed on expansive soil, foundations may rise during the wet season, and fall during the dry season. This shrink-swell (expansion) activity results in cracked foundations, distortion of structural members, and warping of doors and windows. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes numerical expansion indices for soil types ranging from very low to very high. Any soil identified in the foundation investigation to have an expansion index greater than 90 (medium) would require specific engineering analysis as required within the Uniform Building Code.  
  
 Table 6 of the *Soil Survey of El Dorado County* (Pages 56-63), lists properties indicative of each soil series found in the County, including the shrink-swell potential. Shrink-swell potential is dependent upon the amount of clay within the soil series. Soils series with low to moderate shrink-swell potential provide sites adequate for placing structures. Review of the *Soil Survey of El Dorado County* indicates that the Boomer series has a low to moderate shrink-swell potential and the Diamond Springs series has a low shrink-swell potential. Based upon this review, the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.
  - e) The applicant provided a Report of Percolation Test prepared by Sonde Geological. The El Dorado County Environmental Management Department has reviewed the project, had no specific concerns related to percolation rates. At the time of development, all proposed parcels would require the proper permits and approvals from El Dorado County Environmental Management for on-site septic systems. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**FINDING:** No significant impacts would result from geological or seismological anomalies on the project site. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that would result in significant impacts. For the “Geology and Soils” category, established thresholds would not be exceeded 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?		√	
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?		√	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		√	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		√	
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?			√
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?			√
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		√	
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?		√	

**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;

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

- 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 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) 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. CalFire and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and has conditioned the project to comply with "Fire Safe" requirements to ensure impacts are less than significant.

**FINDING:** The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and 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 and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District.

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?		√	
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)?		√	
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?		√	
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?		√	
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?		√	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		√	
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?		√	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?		√	
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?		√	
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			√

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) Any grading 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 septic feasibility report 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 County Irrigation District, Policy AR 9024 provides unique provisions for parcels connected to agricultural service meters. Pursuant to correspondence with the District, all parcels under common ownership would be allowed to “split” an agricultural meter into separate services. El Dorado Irrigation District has determined adequate public water services and required fire flow are available to the serve the proposed project. As a condition of project approval, the applicant would be required to provide Planning Services with proof of meter award or similar assurance of adequate service for all parcels, prior to recordation of the map. As such, 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.
  - 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 0475 B, 10/18/1983) 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 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.

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

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

**FINDING:** As discussed above, no other additional significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. 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?		√	
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?		√	
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			√

**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 is 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 site’s General Plan land use designation Low Density Residential-Platted Lands overlay (LDR-PL) and that of the Estate Residential five-acre (RE-5) zone 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 applicable 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 site’s General Plan land use designation of Low Density Residential-Platted Lands overlay (LDR-PL) and that of the Estate Residential five-acre (RE-5) zone district. Impacts 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.

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

**FINDING:** For the “Land Use Planning” section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

<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?			√
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?			√

**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 El Dorado County Mineral Resources Zone Map, General Plan Exhibit V-7-4 indicates that the project is not in a mineral resource zone. Based on the review of this map, there are no significant mineral deposits on the project site. 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. In the “Mineral Resources” section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

<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?		√	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		√	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		√	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		√	

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>			
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?			√
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?			√

**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 three ( ) additional lots 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.

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:** As discussed above, for this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. No significant noise impacts would occur as a result of this project.

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

<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)?		√	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			√
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			√

**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 four (4) parcels where one currently exists. 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.

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

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>			
d. Parks?	√		
e. Other government services?	√		

**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, yet would not prevent the Fire Department from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District would review any future building permit applications to ensure compliance with fire standards including, but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking areas, fire sprinklers within buildings, and building identification. 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. For the rural areas, there is no standard minimum level of service or response time. Currently, the County has 0.89 sworn officers per 1,000 daytime populations. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The addition of a residential parcels and the related development would not significantly impact the achievement of this goal, or significantly impact the current response times to the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Gold Trail Union School District. Impact to the affected school district from the proposed development would be less than significant.

d) **Parks:** The proposed development would not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. Provisions to provide parkland or the payment of an in-lieu fee are included as the project is residential in nature. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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 development of the subject parcel either directly or indirectly. No significant public service impacts are expected. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<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. 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?			√

**Discussion:**

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.

a) The proposed project would not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur because this project is not expected to increase population in the region. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing recreation facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts to recreation or open space would result from the project. For this “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)?		√	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		√	
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?			√
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		√	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?		√	
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?		√	
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			√

**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 come from State Highway 49 from the southern boundary of the parcel inside an existing access easement. Macbeth Road is currently a named road easement and shall be constructed to be a privately maintained roadway. The proposed access road shall be improved to the El Dorado County Design and Improvements Standards Manual (DISM) Standard Plan 101C, with a road width of 20-feet. The project would include the construction of a roadway encroachment from the access roadway onto State Highway 49, after obtaining an encroachment permit from CalTrans. Potential environmental impacts for the on and off-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 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

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

Element. DOT has reviewed the proposed project and determined that it would not trigger the threshold 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 and off-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. No traffic hazards would result from the project design. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) CalFire and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and has conditioned it to comply with “Fire Safe” requirements. 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:** No significant impacts to transportation/traffic are expected. For this “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. 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?				√
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?			√	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			√	
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or				√

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>			
may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's 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?		√	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		√	

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Utilities and Service Systems would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
- Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
- Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.

- a,b,e)The El Dorado County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the current application requests along with the submitted percolation tests and site and soil report performed by Sonde Geological Services dated January 16, 2007. With this information, Environmental Health has determined that the requirements for demonstrating adequate sewage disposal for the newly proposed parcels have been satisfied. No impact would occur as a result of the project.
- c) On-site drainage facilities are required as needed so as to reduce runoff to discharge levels, which do not exceed site discharge levels, which existed prior to development of the site. All drainage facilities should be designed in conformance with the standards contained in the “County of El Dorado Drainage Manual.” Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) A Facilities Improvement Letter (FIL) provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District and dated June 28, 2007 demonstrates adequate water supply can be found in the form of a 27-inch water line exists in and along Emmerson Road and an 18-inch water line located near the northeast corner of the subject parcel. The project would be conditioned such that meter award letters for each newly created parcel must be provided to Planning Services prior to filing the parcel map. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- f,g) 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.

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

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.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts would result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the “Utilities and Service Systems” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects 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. 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)?			√
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			√

**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 resources; 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 given the 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 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 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 Planning Services in Placerville.

El Dorado County General Plan 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 Oak Woodland Management Plan, adopted May 2008

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.)

*Cultural Resource Assessment for Assessor's Parcel Number 089-202-39, El Dorado County, California*, Peak and Associates, Inc. (September 2007)

*Final Tree Survey, Preservation, and Replacement Plan*, Sierra Ecosystem Associates (April, 2008)

*Facilities Improvement Letter*, El Dorado Irrigation District, June 28, 2007.