Exhibit I

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FILE: P18-0004

PROJECT NAME: Sawmill Creek Tentative Parcel Map

NAME OF APPLICANT: CTA Engineering and Surveying

ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NOs.: 090-190-002, 090-380-019

SECTION: 6 T: 9N R: 10E,

LOCATION: On the south side of Tulle Lane, 0.5 miles south of the intersection of Tulle Lane and Mother Lode Drive in the Shingle Springs area.

☐ GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT: FROM: TO:

☐ REZONING: FROM: TO:

☒ TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP

☐ SUBDIVISION (NAME):

☐ SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW:

☐ OTHER:

REASONS THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

☐ NO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS WERE IDENTIFIED DURING THE INITIAL STUDY.

☒ MITIGATION HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED WHICH WOULD REDUCE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.

☐ OTHER:

In accordance with the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), State Guidelines, and El Dorado County Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, the County Environmental Agent analyzed the project and determined that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment. Based on this finding, the Planning Services Division hereby prepares this MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION. A period of thirty (30) days from the date of filing this mitigated negative declaration will be provided to enable public review of the project specifications and this document prior to action on the project by COUNTY OF EL DORADO. A copy of the project specifications is on file at the County of El Dorado Planning Services, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667.

This Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted by the ________________________on__________________.

__________________________________________
Executive Secretary
**Project Title:** P18-0004: Sawmill Creek Tentative Parcel Map

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

**Contact Person:** Tom Purciel, Project Planner  
**Phone Number:** (530) 621-5903

**Property Owner/Applicant’s Name and Address:** David Zweck, 3496 Fairway Drive, Cameron Park, California 95682

**Project Location:** On the south side of Tulle Lane, 0.5 miles south of the intersection with Mother Lode Drive in the Shingle Springs area, El Dorado County, Supervisorial District 2

**Assessor’s Parcel Number(s):** 090-190-002, 090-380-019

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

**Section:** 6 T:9N R:10E

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

**Description of Project:** A request for a residential Tentative Parcel Map to divide an undeveloped 134-acre parcel into three residential parcels ranging in size from 20.6 acres, 22.99 acres and 90.53 acres. Water and wastewater service would be provided by on-site domestic wells and septic systems and power service would be provided by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). Access to the proposed lots would be provided via two existing roadways: Holiday Lake Drive, a privately maintained road, serving proposed Parcels 1 and 3, and Tulle Lane, a County maintained roadway, serving proposed Parcel 2. Subdivision improvements would be limited to minor on-site grading and oak tree removal associated with construction of a new vehicular and fire access turnaround at the terminus of Holiday Lake Drive as shown on the Tentative Parcel Map. Grading and driveways for future home sites is not proposed and would be deferred to future building and grading permits for the new lots. The project is located on the south side of Tulle Lane, 0.5 miles south of the intersection with Mother Lode Drive in the Shingle Springs area.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>General Plan</th>
<th>Land Use (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>RE-5</td>
<td>LDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>R2A/RF-L</td>
<td>MDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-family residences/private recreational pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>RE-10</td>
<td>LDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East:</td>
<td>RE-5</td>
<td>LDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undeveloped/Single-family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West:</td>
<td>R1A/RE-10</td>
<td>MDR/LDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-family residences/Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Briefly Describe the environmental setting:** The project site is located at approximately 1,300 feet above mean sea level with elevations ranging from approximately 1,250 to 1,450 feet. The site is undeveloped and characterized by rolling topography with native oak and grey pine woodlands and nonnative annual grasses. The project parcels contain a wide range of slopes varying from approximately 2 percent to over 40 percent. However, more than 80 percent of the project area contains average slopes in the range of only 10-15 percent. Sawmill Creek, a perennial stream, flows in a narrow channel from north to south through the project site and supports riparian and wetland vegetation and associated animal habitat. Access would be provided via two existing roadways along the north project boundary, Holiday Lake Drive and Tulle Lane.
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

1. El Dorado County Fire Protection District
2. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Review of Conditions of Approval
3. El Dorado County Planning and building Department: Review and approval of permit.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology / Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology / Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use / Planning</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population / Housing</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation / Traffic</td>
<td>X Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities / Service Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: [Signature] Date: 10/15/2019
Printed Name: Tom Purciel, Associate Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: [Signature] Date: 10/15/19
Printed Name: Rommel (Mel) Pabalinas, Planning Manager For: El Dorado County
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project consists of a request for a residential Tentative Parcel Map to divide an undeveloped 134-acre property into three residential parcels ranging in size from 20.6 acres, 22.99 acres and 90.53 acres. Water and wastewater service would be provided by on-site domestic wells and septic systems and power service would be provided from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). Access to the proposed lots would be provided via two existing roadways: Holiday Lake Drive, a privately maintained road, serving proposed Parcels 1 and 3, and Tulle Lane, a County maintained roadway, serving proposed Parcel 2. Subdivision improvements would be limited to minor on-site grading and oak tree removal associated with construction of a new vehicular and fire access turnaround at the terminus of Holiday Lake Drive as shown on the Tentative Parcel Map. The project is located on the south side of Tulle Lane, 0.5 miles south of the intersection with Mother Lode Drive in the Shingle Springs area.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The proposed project would subdivide two existing parcels into three lots. Due to the nature and scope of the proposed project, a streamlined Initial Study was prepared which focuses only on specific resources with potential significant impacts.

Construction and soil disturbance associated with the project would be limited to minor fire safe road improvements. Subdivision improvements would be limited to minor grading and oak tree removal associated with construction of a new vehicular and fire access turnaround at the terminus of Holiday Lake Drive as shown on the Tentative Parcel Map. Grading and driveways for future home sites is not proposed and would be deferred to future building and grading permits for the new lots. There are several oak trees near the site of the proposed improvements, however, any oak tree removal associated with the proposed work would be required to comply with the provisions of Chapter 130.39 of the Zoning Ordinance (Oak Resources Conservation). Impacts to Oak Resources would be less than significant.

Due to the location, limited size and scope of soil disturbance related to construction of the proposed driveway turnaround, impacts to aesthetic resources, water quality, air quality plans or standards, including greenhouse gases, impact or degradation of cultural or historic resources or increases in odors or pollution concentrations will be less than significant.

No sensitive receptors are located adjoining the project parcels. Further, noise from project-related construction activities will be subject to General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11 (Construction Noise Limits) and Zoning Ordinance Section 130.37 (Noise Standards), so that impacts from noise as a result of required road/driveway improvements will be less than significant.

Airborne particulate impacts from associated driveway improvements shall be subject to Policy 6.7.7.1 (Construction Related, Short-Term Emissions) requiring consistency with the Environmental Protection Agency and El Dorado County AQMD air quality standards.

The project was reviewed by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District and both fire agencies have found that
adequate fire protection infrastructure, access and water supply exists to serve the proposed parcels. These agencies recommended standard conditions of approval be incorporated into the project to ensure adequate fire protection measures are developed and maintained in perpetuity. These standard conditions include development of a wildland fire safe plan by a qualified consultant to ensure public and firefighter safety in the event of wildland fires or other emergencies within the project area. With incorporation of the above described conditions of approval, impacts of wildland fire would be less than significant.

Impacts on population density and surrounding land use will be less than significant. The creation of three new lots, two lots greater than 20.0 acres, and one lot greater than 90.0 acres, has been deemed consistent with the Low Density Residential (LDR) General Plan Land Use Designation and the corresponding Residential Estate, Five-Acre (RE-5) zone district. Although the proposed parcels exceed the maximum parcel sizes for LDR and the RE-5 zone, the proposed parcel map meets the intent of the LDR designation for single-family residential development in a rural setting as described in Policy 2.2.1.12 (Land Use Types and Densities). The project is located in the southeast portion of the Shingle Springs Community Region, where connections to public water and public sewer service are not feasible at this time. For such projects, Policy 2.2.5.19 (Development Below Densities Contemplated by the General Plan) allows for approval of projects with a zoning designation otherwise compatible with the General Plan but less than the density contemplated by the General Plan. According to this policy, the County may grant such approvals as being consistent with the General Plan. Further, approval of this parcel map would not preclude future subdivision to the ultimate potential density contemplated in the General Plan consistent with Policy 2.2.5.16 (Appropriate Level of Planning for Land Divisions).

The project parcels will gain access from two existing public roadways, Holiday Lake Drive and Tulle Lane. The Transportation Department reviewed the project and determined traffic levels as a result of the project would remain less than the level of service thresholds established under General Plan Policy TC-Xe, and therefore, project impacts on traffic would be less than significant. Impacts on transportation elements of roadway design, levels of service, and corresponding air quality impacts from residential uses will be less than significant.

The project parcels are currently vacant. There are adequate existing public utilities and services available to serve the proposed parcels. Impacts on public utilities and services from residential development will be less than significant.

The project is substantially consistent with surrounding residential uses and would not have an impact on aesthetics, agriculture and forestry, geology/soils, hydrology/water quality, mineral resources and recreation.
### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 or the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish and wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Special Status Species biological surveys were completed by Miriam Green Associates in the spring of 2007 for a previous, but withdrawn, project on the same site. At that time, no special status plant species were observed and only one special-status animal species (white-tailed kite) was observed. Due to tree removal associated with proposed road/access improvements, the study recommended a pre-construction raptor survey for the previous project to confirm species absence from the site and to implement avoidance measures in the event the white-tailed kite or other listed bird species are detected. As the current project will require roadway improvements and associated tree removal, albeit minor in scope, incorporation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 below would ensure impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be less than significant.

The 2007 survey also determined there was a potential occurrence of the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB) associated with a single elderberry shrub in the riparian area along Sawmill Creek. As no development is proposed along the Sawmill Creek riparian area, there would be no impact to the VELB. To determine the likelihood of any new or increased impacts to listed special-status species since completion of the 2007 biological survey, staff reviewed the current California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) on June 17, 2019 (Shingle Springs Quadrangle) and found no additional listed species within the project area.¹

(b) and (c) No Impact. There are no riparian habitats or sensitive natural communities in the vicinity of project-related improvements.

(d) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction of the proposed fire and vehicular access turnaround adjacent to the north project boundary will not substantially interfere with native wildlife migration in the area. The project site area is characterized as primarily rural residential, with both disturbed and vegetated areas. It is not considered a wildlife migration corridor, and therefore is not expected to result in impacts to wildlife migration corridors. The site is not located within an Important Biological Corridor identified by the El Dorado County General Plan. The proposed project will not cause significant reduction in the ecological functions of the site because the habitat in the area are already disturbed by human activities. Due to soil disturbance and potential tree removal associated with construction of the proposed fire and vehicular access turnaround, there could be potential impacts to the nesting of migratory birds and raptors. Biological Resources Mitigation Measure #BIO-1, below, is therefore included to avoid potential impacts.

(e) and (f) No Impact. There will be no conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The site is not located within an approved habitat conservation plan area. Any oak tree removal associated with the project will be consistent with Chapter 130.39 (Oak Resources Conservation) of the County Ordinance Code.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: All vegetation clearing including removal of trees and shrubs shall be completed between September 1 and February 14, if feasible. If vegetation removal and grading activities begin during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey of the project footprint for active nests. Additionally, the surrounding 500 feet shall be surveyed for

active raptor nests where accessible. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 14 days prior to commencement of ground-disturbing activities. If the pre-construction survey shows that there is no evidence of active nests, a letter report shall be prepared to document the survey. If construction does not commence within 14 days of the pre-construction survey, or halts for more than 14 days, an additional survey is required prior to starting work.

If nests are found and considered to be active, the project biologist shall establish buffer zones to prohibit construction activities and minimize nest disturbance until the young have successfully fledged. Buffer width will depend on the species in question, surrounding existing disturbances, and specific site characteristics, but may range from 20 feet for some songbirds to up to 500 feet for raptors. If active nests are found within any trees slated for removal, then an appropriate buffer shall be established around the trees and the trees shall not be removed until a biologist determines that the nestlings have successfully fledged or until the nest is no longer active. In addition, a pre-construction worker awareness training shall be conducted alerting workers to the presence of and protections for the active avian nests. If construction activities are proposed to begin during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31), a survey is not required and no further studies are necessary.

Monitoring Requirement: This mitigation measure shall be noted on grading and construction plans. Planning Services shall verify the completion of a pre-construction raptor survey prior to issuance of grading and building permits or approval of subdivision improvement plans, as applicable.

Monitoring Responsibility: El Dorado County Planning and Building Department.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

(a, b) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Regulatory Setting - Applicable State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Assembly Bill (AB) 52

AB 52, which was approved in September 2014 and effective on July 1, 2015, requires that CEQA lead agencies consult with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project, if so requested by the tribe. The bill, chaptered in CEQA Section 21084.2, also specifies that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

Defined in Section 21074(a) of the Public Resources Code, TCRs are:

a. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
   a. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
   b. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
TCRs are further defined under Section 21074 as follows:

a. A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a TCR to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape; and

b. A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a “nonunique archaeological resource” as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a TCR if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

Mitigation measures for TCRs must be developed in consultation with the affected California Native American tribe pursuant to newly chaptered Section 21080.3.2, or according to Section 21084.3. Section 21084.3 identifies mitigation measures that include avoidance and preservation of TCRs and treating TRCs with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource.

In general, significant impacts are those that diminish the integrity, research potential, or other characteristics that make a TCR significant or important. To be considered a TCR, a resource must be either: (1) listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, on the national, state, or local register of historic resources, or: (2) a resource that the lead agency chooses, in its discretion, to treat as a TCR and meets the criteria for listing in the state register of historic resources pursuant to the criteria set forth in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c). A substantial adverse change to a TCR would occur if the implementation of the project would disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a TCR such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired.

Several complete record searches were conducted by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) in July and August 2019 and review of NCIS records found that four previous studies were completed within the current project site; three studies were completed in 1998 and one additional study was completed in 2014. According to the files at the NCIC, the site has a moderate to high sensitivity for both historic and prehistoric resources. However, there were no National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), National Historic Landmark (NHL) or California Historic Landmark (CHL) listed sites within the project area. Although the above records searches indicated moderate to high sensitivity for both prehistoric and historic resources, a recent 2019 survey of the project site found no new significant or potentially significant historic or cultural resources within the project footprint. However, the 2019 study provided project-specific recommendations to permanently protect previously identified TCRs from future development as further discussed below.

The Ione Band of Miwuk Indians, the Nashville-El Dorado Miwok Indians, the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians (Shingle Springs Rancheria), the T’si-Akim Maidu Tribe, the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, the Wilton Rancheria, the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (Auburn Rancheria), the El Dorado County Wopumnes Nisenan-Mewuk Nation and the Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe were notified of the proposed project and given access to all project documents, via certified mail. No other tribes had requested to be notified of proposed project for consultation in the project area at the time. With the exception
of the Auburn and Shingle Springs Rancherias, none of these tribes submitted comments or expressed any site-specific concerns regarding the project.

On June 12, 2018, the Auburn Rancheria submitted comments requesting consultation regarding the project. However, the Auburn Rancheria submitted a second letter on July 11, 2018, and in that letter, requested any consultation be deferred to the Shingle Springs Rancheria. On June 28, 2018, the Shingle Springs Rancheria also submitted comments requesting consultation in identifying any Tribal Cultural Properties (TCPs) that may exist within the project’s area of potential effects.

In March and May 1998, two cultural resource studies were completed by Historic Resource Associates (HRA) for a previous project located on the same 134-acre site. Those studies identified several potentially significant cultural resources in close proximity. In 1998, the Shingle Springs Rancheria was consulted at length regarding identified tribal cultural resources found on one discrete portion of the project site. As part of that previous study, all tribal-related artifacts found at that site were given to the Shingle Springs Rancheria in 1998 per their request. In 2014, an additional study by HRA consolidated the above potentially significant resources into one multi-component site identified as P-9-1943/CA-ELD-1389/P.

Due to the passage of time, HRA completed a supplemental study in June, 2019 to revisit the previously identified cultural resources identified in 1998 and consolidated in 2014. At that time, HRA did not find any new significant or potentially significant historic or cultural resources within the project footprint. However, the 2019 HRA supplemental study reviewed previously identified tribal cultural resources within multi-component site P-9-1943/CA-ELD-1389/P and provided site-specific recommendations to permanently protect significant resources from future development. These recommendations have been incorporated into the project as mitigation measures MM TRI-1 and MM TRI-2 as shown below. Incorporation of these mitigation measures would ensure impacts to Cultural Resources under categories (a) and (b) would be reduced to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure TRI-1:**

In the event archeological resources are discovered during grading and construction activities, the applicant shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until an archaeologist can examine the find in place. If the find is determined to be a “unique archeological resource”, contingency funding, and a time allotment sufficient to allow recovering an archaeological sample or to employ one of the avoidance measures may be required under the provisions set forth in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code. Construction work could continue on other parts of the project site while archaeological mitigation takes place.

If the find is determined to be a “unique archeological resource”, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item in accordance with Section 21083.2(b-k). Any additional costs as a result of
complying with this section shall be borne by the project applicant. Grading and construction activities may resume after appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined a “nonunique archeological resource”.

**Monitoring Requirement:** Planning Services shall verify this note is included on applicable grading permit(s) and/or project improvement plans prior to issuance of grading permit(s) or approval of project improvement plans.

**Monitoring Responsibility:** El Dorado County Planning and Building Department.

**Mitigation Measure TRI-2:** No development or soil disturbance shall be permitted within the Prehistoric Component of the site identified as P-9-1943/CA-ELD-1380/P. The two discrete portions of the Prehistoric Component shall be shown on the final parcel map and designated as “sensitive non-disturbance area”. The locations of the two sensitive non-disturbance areas shall be depicted as shown on Figure 4 of the August, 2019 Cultural Resources Study completed by Historic Resource Associates.

**Monitoring Requirement:** Planning Services shall verify the sensitive non-disturbance area is accurately shown on the final map prior to map recordation.

**Monitoring Responsibility:** El Dorado County Planning and Building Department.

**MANDATORY FINDINGS**

a. No impacts have been found that would reduce potential wildlife or plant habitat on the site, reduce wildlife or plant populations below self-sustaining levels, or restrict the range or migratory habits of a rare or endangered animal. Impacts to cultural or archaeological resources would be less than significant.

b. No cumulative impacts from the project are anticipated.

c. No environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly will occur as a result of construction activities related to the project.
SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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 130 - County Code)

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinances (Title 120 - 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.)