

**EL DORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: January 25, 2007

Item No.: 9.a.

Staff: Daniel Hamilton

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT/REZONE/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

FILE NUMBER: AZ05-0002/PD06-0031

APPLICANT: Mercy Housing

OWNER: Sherrod Family Trust

REQUEST:

1. Amendment to General Plan changing the land use designation from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Multi-Family Residential (MFR);
2. Rezone from One-acre Residential (R1A) to Multi-family Residential-Planned Development (RM-PD); and
3. Conceptual plans for the development of a 70-unit apartment complex.

LOCATION: On the south side of Runnymede Drive, approximately 500 feet east of the intersection with El Dorado Road, in the Diamond Springs/El Dorado area, Supervisorial District 3 (Exhibit A).

APN: 327-160-47

ACREAGE: 6.97

GENERAL PLAN: Medium Density Residential (MDR) (Exhibit B)

ZONING: One-acre Residential (R1A) (Exhibit C)

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Mitigated Negative Declaration

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Recommend conditional approval

BACKGROUND: A grading permit was issued to prepare the site for the proposed project in 2004 under a design review application (DR03-0014S). At that time a negative declaration was prepared. That document addressed potential impacts of the grading activities only and not the potential impacts of the proposed residential development. The grading permit listed conditions of approval and mitigation measures which limit the scope and duration of grading activities and adequately address the environmental impacts generated by the activities. The applicant has not yet undertaken any grading on the site. The mitigation measures from the CEQA negative declaration for the issuance of the grading permit are included as Attachment 3 to this staff report. Mitigation includes requirements for protective fencing, soil import and export restrictions, air quality protections, biological resource protections, and protection of stormwater runoff quality. These measures are incorporated by reference with a condition of approval of the development plan.

The project was submitted to the County on October 14, 2005, as a General Plan amendment and rezone application. The application was amended in late spring 2006 to add a planned development overlay (PD06-0031), allowing for a revised CEQA analysis consistent with the development plan proposed by the applicant. A development plan was submitted in summer 2006, and the application was subsequently revised consistent with the proposed changes.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Project Description: AZ05-0002/PD06-0031 is an application for a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Multi-Family Residential (MFR), rezone from One-acre Residential (R1A) to Multi-family Residential-Planned Development (RM-PD), and approval of a conceptual development plan for up to 80 units of attached multifamily housing units in seven buildings with 149 parking spaces, landscaping, and community open space. An approximately 1800 square foot community center will also be constructed for the management office and resident recreation. The purpose of the conceptual plan is to limit the focus of the environmental document to what is proposed to be constructed, and to provide for approval of the General Plan amendment and zoning for the purposes of financing and grant applications. Mercy Housing typically uses state and federal grants, along with other public financing, to lower the development costs to provide a more affordable housing product. A final planned development application with all of the required details consistent with this preliminary approval will be required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission at a future date.

Project design drawings include the realignment of Runnymede Drive, the primary source of access to the site, to reduce traffic impacts. Approval of the realignment of Runnymede Drive also received prior approval in 2004. Because the development plan is part of the project, the environmental analysis for the project focuses on impacts associated with the proposed development plan only, as opposed to the maximum development allowed under the General Plan and zoning designations.

Site Description: The 6.97-acre parcel is currently vacant and undeveloped. Site access is currently provided by a sloped trail that connects to Runnymede Drive. The slope varies on the parcel, with the terrain ranging from gently to steeply sloping. The site is flat in the center, and is steeply sloped on three sides of the property. The parcel is mostly covered by grass and sporadic shrubs. Mixed oak and pine trees are present on adjacent properties, near property lines for the subject parcel. No

oaks are contained within the site. Commercial and multi-family residential uses are adjacent to the site.

Adjacent Land Uses:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	R1A	MDR	Undeveloped
North	R1A	MDR	Undeveloped
South	MP/R1A	MFR	Mobile home park (Crestview)
East	R1A	MDR	Undeveloped
West	C/R1A/CG	C	Dental and Health care offices

The site is adjacent to existing multi-family residential, in the form of the mobile home park, to the south of the site. The land uses proposed in the project would not conflict with the professional office uses to the west of the site. The project would aide in the development of additional circulation routes through the area, as the realignment of Runnymede and the extension of entrance driveways would improve overall vehicular access to the area.

Planned Development and Design: The development of the proposed project would create seven residential buildings, from two to three stories in height, across the site. Additionally, a community center, landscaping, parking areas, and other site improvements would be constructed as part of the project. The development plan submitted for the project, required as part of the planned development zone, provides elevation drawings of each proposed structure in relation to the surrounding land uses and land development patterns.

Buildings on the site are organized around a community center and parking areas. Open space, which comprises 30 percent of the project site, is scattered throughout the development in the form of landscape strips, common recreational open space, and preserved open hillsides. There are 7 residential buildings within the site with heights ranging from 38 to 40 feet. Building finishes would be in a combination of stucco and hard siding with composite shingle roofs. Colors on the building exteriors would include various shades of white, brown, and yellow, consistent with color schemes submitted as part of the application. Buildings 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 would be 166 feet in length, and 43 feet deep. Buildings 4 and 6 are smaller and contain fewer units. Heights in these buildings remains at 40 feet, but widths reduce to 132 feet as each building contains fewer units. Balconies or patios are located on the front of each unit with open air staircases located at each end of the buildings.

Parking is provided in surface parking spaces located throughout the project site. Uncovered parking spaces generally run along building fronts and backs with one centralized parking area surrounding the community center. The parking is slightly in excess of the required number of spaces, and would be sufficient to serve the residents and visitors of the complex.

The previously approved grading permit, which was issued in 2004 (valid through July 2007), would result in the flattening of the central portion of the project site, leaving the substantial slopes along the property boundaries intact. These areas are proposed for preservation in this application as well. The hillsides would provide for natural buffering between the proposed project and the less intensive single-family residential use adjacent to the site. The hillsides are also protected between the undeveloped property to the east and the existing Crestview Mobile Home Park to the south. Site layout would divide the development from the existing commercial uses to the west of the project site, although these uses are considered compatible and substantial buffering is not needed to limit noise, traffic, and other environmental factors.

General Plan: The MFR designation permits “high-density, multifamily structures, such as apartments ... and multiplexes.” Additionally, the designation also specifies that the lands “shall be in locations with the highest degree of access to transportation facilities, shopping and services, employment, recreation, and other public facilities.” The project is located less than two blocks from State Highway 50, has health, banking, and shopping facilities within a few blocks away. This project is located within the El Dorado/Diamond Springs Community Region.

Policy 2.2.5.3 requires the County to review proposed zone changes against a set of 19 criteria, along with the general direction of the Plan. These are reviewed as follows:

- 1. Availability of an adequate public water source or an approved Capital Improvement Project to increase service for existing land use demands; and*
- 2. Availability and capacity of public treated water system;*

Discussion: An El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) Facility Improvement Letter, dated October 13, 2005, states that adequate water supplies and facilities are available to serve the proposed project. The project would require 54.5 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of water, within the 2,434 units available in the Water Supply Region as of January 2005.

- 3. Availability and capacity of public waste water treatment system;*

Discussion: An El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) Facility Improvement Letter, dated October 13, 2005, states that an extension of an eight-inch sewer force main of adequate size and a sewer lift station must be constructed in order to adequately serve the proposed project. The lift station and portions of the eight-inch line would be placed off-site, connecting to the existing system in place along Runnymede Drive. Construction of the lift station and extension of the eight-inch line would ensure adequate infrastructure to meet sewer service demands. Upon completion of the lift station by the applicant, it will be turned over to EID for maintenance.

- 4. Distance to and capacity of the serving elementary and high school;*

Discussion: The project site is located within the Mother Lode Union School District, approximately two miles from Herbert Green School. The affected school district was contacted as part of the initial consultation process, and specific comments were adequately addressed. There is existing capacity for elementary and high schools proposed to accommodate student populations from the project.

5. Response time from nearest fire station handling structure fires;

Discussion: The Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District is responsible for providing fire protection to the subject site. As such, the District has reviewed the proposal and indicated that adherence to the applicable building and fire codes, as well as conditions of approval regarding the installation of proper fire lanes, installation of automatic fire sprinkler systems, provision of established fire flow, installation of a Knox box, installation of fire hydrants, necessary fire department connections, and construction of road improvements shown on the development plan, would satisfactorily address all fire related safety issues. No response time concerns are present.

6. Distance to nearest Community Region or Rural Center;

Discussion: The project site is located within the El Dorado/Diamond Springs Community Region. As proposed, the project is an in-fill residential project adjacent to compatible existing and planned residential and commercial land uses.

7. Erosion hazard;

Discussion: According to the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974, the erosion hazard of soils at the subject site is moderate to high. As indicated earlier, the site has been issued a grading permit with mitigation measures incorporated to address impacts related to erosion and siltation. Mass pad grading would occur on the site. Construction on the graded site would not result in additional soil erosion, as the site would be leveled at that point. With the slopes removed, the potential for soil erosion is less than significant.

8. Septic and leach field capability;

Discussion: The proposed lots would be served by municipal sewage disposal systems of the El Dorado Irrigation District. A Facility Improvement Letter, dated October 13, 2005, indicates that the site can be served adequately by existing facilities. No septic systems or leach fields are proposed.

9. Groundwater capability to support wells;

Discussion: The project will be served by EID public water facilities. No wells are proposed.

10. Critical flora and fauna habitat areas;

Discussion: The prepared environmental document, attached as Exhibit M, discusses the biological issues at the subject site under Biological Resources. There are no critical flora and fauna habitat areas that would be affected by the proposed project.

11. Important timber production areas:

Discussion: The project is not located in or near an important timber production area.

12. Important agricultural areas;

Discussion: The project is located on lands within the urbanized area west of Placerville. There is no active agricultural use on the project site or surrounding properties. The proposed project would not impact any important agricultural areas.

13. Important mineral resource areas;

Discussion: The General Plan has designated the site as not containing mineral resources. The project would not impact any important mineral resource areas.

14. Capacity of the transportation system serving the area;

Discussion: The El Dorado County Department of Transportation reviewed the submitted traffic study and concluded that incorporation of mitigation measures, along with the recommended conditions of approval, would sufficiently address project traffic issues. Improvements to Runnymede Drive and driveway entrances to the site will establish adequate infrastructure in the area. There is sufficient capacity in the transportation system to adequately serve the area.

15. Existing land use pattern;

Discussion: The project area is surrounded by existing residential and commercial land uses, including a mobile home park, commercial offices, and a single-family residence. The parcels to the east of the project site are currently undeveloped. The surrounding commercial development is within a single-story office building, while the mobile home park south of the site is located atop the hillside in individual mobile homes and associated community buildings. The approximate density of the mobile home park is 15 dwelling units per acre, with the mobile homes clustered to allow for retention of surrounding open space and vegetation.

The proposed multi-family project would result in the construction of apartment buildings on the site, at a gross density of approximately 10 units per acre. This development will be of a size and scale similar to the mobile home park but denser and more intense than the commercial development. The height and massing of the project would also be greater than that of surrounding development which would represent a more intense development pattern than currently exists. While the height and scale of buildings is higher than that of surrounding development, the differences are not substantial enough to result in incompatibility among the uses or to appear as out of place. The proposed project is compatible with existing land use patterns within the project area.

16. Proximity to perennial water course;

Discussion: There are no known perennial water courses on the site. Construction is not expected to impact waterways in the area.

17. Important historical/archeological sites; and

Discussion: The proposed project is located in an area that is urbanized and has been previously disturbed by grading and development. There are no known historical or archaeological sites in the vicinity of the proposed project. The project would not impact any historical or archaeological sites.

18. Seismic hazards and present of active faults.

Discussion: 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 in El Dorado County. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, 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 standards.

19. Consistency with existing Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions.

Discussion: No Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions are effective within the project area.

The land to be developed is capable of supporting the proposed densities, and urban services are available to the project site. There are no known important environmental habitats or areas of concern on the project site. The proposed rezoning and planned development are consistent with the existing land uses in the area. All responsible agencies are able to serve the property. Conditions attached to this staff report provide necessary project components needed to ensure adequate levels of service by each of the service providers.

Policy 2.2.5.21 requires that the project be designed to avoid incompatibility with adjoining land uses, existing and permitted, adjacent to the project site. The project is compatible with adjoining land uses, as discussed above. The development of two and three story multi-family residential buildings on the site would represent an increase in the intensity of development in the area, but the uses would be compatible and complimentary. The buildings have been clustered in the middle of the site to allow for natural hillside buffers between this and adjacent properties, and 30 percent of the site has been dedicated to open space to fulfill the requirements of the –PD Zone.

Other vacant adjoining lands are zoned for single-family residential (R1A) use but have yet to be developed. At the densities permitted by the R1A zoning designation, it is likely that such properties would develop at a density of one single-family residence per acre. This development would be at a density and intensity well below this project, although the location of single-family residences adjacent to this project would be compatible. Adequate buffers between properties and appropriate vegetative screening would ensure that the lighting and noise generated by the project would not adversely affect future homes on these adjacent sites.

Policy 7.1.2.1

Development or disturbance shall be prohibited on slopes exceeding 30 percent unless necessary for access. The County may consider and allow development or disturbance on slopes 30 percent and greater when reasonable use of the property would otherwise be denied.

The project site contains some slopes that are greater than 30 percent. The site will be graded for development to allow the structures to be built in the center of the site, with the slopes on the sides. A grading permit for the site was issued on July 22, 2004, and extended on June 22, 2006, by the Planning Commission. Thus, the current grading permit is valid through July 22, 2007, and the approvals and environmental documentation for that permit remain in effect. Once the site has been graded, this project would not have any development on any slopes of 30 percent or greater.

Policy 7.4.4.4

For all new development projects that would result in soil disturbance on parcels that are over an acre and have at least 1 percent total canopy cover by woodlands habitats, the County shall require mitigation.

No trees are expected to be removed on the project site; therefore, this policy does not apply.

Policy 5.2.1.3

All medium-density residential, high-density residential, multifamily residential, commercial, industrial and research and development projects shall be required to connect to public water systems when located within Community Regions and to either a public water system or to an approved private water systems in Rural Centers.

As conditioned, the project has been required to connect to EID, and EID has indicated that it will serve the proposed development.

Policy 5.2.1.2: An adequate quantity and quality of water for all uses, including fire protection, shall be provided for with discretionary development.

Discussion: Upon annexation, the El Dorado Irrigation District would provide water to the subject site. According to the *Facility Improvement Letter* prepared by the El Dorado Irrigation District, October 13, 2005, “in terms of water supply, as of January 1, 2005, there were 2,434 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) available in the [Western] Water Supply Region. Your project, as proposed on this date, would require 54.5 EDUs of water supply.” An eight-inch water line exists in Runnymede Drive, adjacent to the site. Various options are available to extend water service existing infrastructure. There is sufficient water supply for all uses available to serve the project.

Policy 5.7.1.1: Prior to approval of new development, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that adequate emergency water supply, storage, conveyance facilities, and access for fire protection either are or will be provided concurrent with development.

Discussion: The Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District has determined that the minimum fire flow for this project is 1,500 gallons per minute for a two-hour period, at a pressure of

20 psi. The project has been conditioned to require this water pressure prior to issuance of a building permit. The water flows and transportation infrastructure is sufficient to meet District requirements for fire suppression. A Fire Safe Plan, minimum roadway widths, and fire hydrant placement have been required by the District to ensure adequate fire protection infrastructure.

Conclusion: As discussed above, staff finds that the project, as proposed/conditioned with the amendment and rezone, conforms to the General Plan's goals.

Zoning: The project proposes a change in zoning from R1A to RM with a PD combining zone. Under the RM designation, the proposed multifamily dwellings would be a permitted use. The approving authority must find that the project is consistent with the General Plan if the land use designation is amended for this project, and the project would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare or injurious to the neighborhood.

Among comments received from various departments and agencies proposed to serve the project, most indicated an ability to serve the site under the proposed new zoning. The Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District has indicated through telephone correspondence that the project can be served adequately upon joining the Community Facilities District (CFD) covering the area including the project site. All other commenting agencies indicated an ability to serve the project site with the new zoning designation, and no other comments were received indicating that the change in zoning would result in any adverse impacts to overall community health in the area.

Based on comments received from public agencies, the project would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare and would not be injurious to the neighborhood.

Section 17.04.100 of the County Code requires that planned development districts have two parking spaces per dwelling unit. With 70 units, the, minimum parking spaces required are 140 spaces. The community center also needs a minimum of 6 spaces for a total of 146 spaces. The development exceeds the minimum requirements and will have 149 parking spaces.

Under Section 17.18.090 parking lot landscaping and buffering, landscaping equivalent to five percent of the gross area used for parking is needed. This project, as proposed, would have 7.8 percent, exceeding the 5 percent minimum. Total open space on the site, including landscaping, hillsides, and vegetated areas, is approximately 30 percent of the total site area.

Planned Development:

PD06-0031 consists of the conceptual design for seven apartment buildings, up to 45 feet in height and three stories high. The number of units within each structure ranges from 6 to 12, for a total of 0 units. Preliminary estimates indicate that 10 percent of the units would be four bedrooms, 40 percent three bedrooms, 30 percent two bedrooms, and 20 percent one bedroom units. There is adequate parking of 149 stalls for the entire development. There is a community center for use by the residents for recreation, as well as housing the management office. A small park would be built next to the community center.

More detailed plans, including elevations with colors, landscaping, and the final site plan will be provided with the subsequent planned development application that will be necessary prior to

construction. However, this approval would permit the grading of the site as previously approved under DR03-0014S. Section 17.04.030.B establishes specific findings that must be made in order for the County to approve a development plan. These are set forth in Attachment 2.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has prepared an Initial Study (Environmental Checklist with Discussion attached) to determine if the project has a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, staff finds that the project could have a significant effect on air quality, noise, and transportation. However, the project has been modified to incorporate the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study which would reduce the impacts to a level considered to be less than significant. Therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared.

NOTE: This project is not located within or adjacent to an area which has wildlife resources (riparian lands, wetlands, watercourse, native plant life, rare plants, threatened and endangered plants or animals, etc.) However, biological studies are required as a condition of the Grading Permit in order to ensure that no plant and animal species of concern have established habitat on the site, and there is the possibility for such an occurrence. As such, no *de minimus* finding can be made for the project, and the applicant shall be responsible for payment of the DFG review fees, as specified in State law.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to take the following actions:

1. Adopt the mitigated negative declaration based on the Initial Study (Attachment 4) prepared by staff;
2. Adopt the Resolution amending the General Plan, changing the land use designation from Medium Density Residential to Multifamily Residential, based on the findings listed on Attachment 2;
4. Approve the zone change from Residential One-Acre (R1A) to Multifamily Residential with the Planned Development Overlay (RM-PD), based on the findings listed on Attachment 2, subject to the conditions contained in Attachment 2; and
5. Approve the Conceptual Development Plan for an apartment complex of up to 80 units, subject to the conditions contained in Attachment 1.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

[Attachments to Staff Report:](#)

Attachment 1	Conditions of Approval
Attachment 2	Findings
Attachment 3	Mitigation from Grading Permit DR03-0014S
Attachment 4	Mitigated Negative Declaration
Exhibit A	Vicinity Map
Exhibit B	General Plan Land Use Map
Exhibit C	Zoning Map
Exhibit D	Conceptual Site Plan
Exhibit E	Conceptual Design Plan
Exhibit F	Approved Grading Plan
Exhibit G	Site Landscaping Plan
Exhibit H	Elevations for Buildings 1 and 5
Exhibit I	Elevations for Buildings 2, 3, and 7
Exhibit J	Elevations for Buildings 4, 6, and Community Bldg.

ATTACHMENT 1

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

FILE NUMBER AZ05-0002/PD06-0031

1. This general plan amendment, zoned change, and preliminary development plan is based upon and limited to compliance with the project description, the Planning Commission hearing exhibits marked Exhibits D-J, dated January 25, 2007, and conditions of approval set forth below. Any deviations from the project description, exhibits or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the County for conformity with this approval. Deviations may require approved changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.

The project description is as follows: General Plan amendment to change the land use designation from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Multi-Family Residential (MFR), rezone from One-Acre Residential (R1A) to Multi-family Residential-Planned Development (RM-PD), and approval of a conceptual development plan for up to 80 units of attached multifamily housing units in seven buildings, with 149 parking spaces, landscaping, and community open space. A community center will also be constructed for the management office and resident recreation

The grading, development, use, and maintenance of the property, the size, shape, arrangement, and location of structures, parking areas and landscape areas, and the protection and preservation of resources shall conform to the project description above and the hearing exhibits and conditions of approval below. The property and any portions thereof shall be sold, leased or financed in compliance with this project description and the approved hearing exhibits and conditions of approval hereto. All plans (such as Landscape and Tree Protection Plans) must be submitted for review and approval and shall be implemented as approved by the County.

CEQA Mitigation Measures

2. Mitigation Measure AQ-1
 - *A Fugitive Dust Plan Application or Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan Application shall be submitted to and approved by the Air Quality Management District prior to start of project construction.*
 - *Project applicant shall adhere to District Rule 224 Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials.*
 - *Applicant shall submit a list of all proposed architectural coatings to the District for approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All architectural coatings shall adhere to District Rule 215 Architectural Coatings.*

- *Applicant shall submit a list to the District stating which of the standard heavy equipment and mobile source mitigation measures shall be complied with, given intended construction equipment and availability of alternative fuels and vehicles. Said list shall be approved prior to issuance of a building permit.*
- *Prior to construction or installation of any new point source emissions units or non-permitted emission units, authority to construct applications shall be submitted to the District. Submittal of applications shall include facility diagrams, equipment specifications, and emission factors.*

Monitoring – The Air Quality Management District shall review the required submittal documents prior to issuance of permits and shall inspect the construction site as needed.

3. Mitigation Measure Noise-1
Construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on weekends and federally-recognized holidays.
4. Mitigation Measure Noise-2
Motorized construction equipment shall be equipped with intake/exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.
5. Mitigation Measure Noise-3
Noise-generating equipment, including portable power generators and air compressors, should be located at the furthest distance possible from the nearest occupied residence.

Monitoring (for Noise 1, 2, and 3): Planning Services shall review improvement plans to ensure these requirements are placed as notes on the building plans, and shall investigate reports of excess noise.

6. Mitigation Measure Trans-1
 - *The Runnymede access road shall be dedicated to the county.*
 - *The right of way for Runnymede Drive shall be dedicated to the county.*

Monitoring: The Department of Transportation shall review offers of dedication prior to issuance of building permits for the project.

7. Mitigation Measure Trans-2
A pedestrian path/sidewalk shall be provided on Runnymede Drive and on the access road, connecting the project site to the shopping center to the north.

Monitoring: The Department of Transportation shall review improvement plans to ensure that the required sidewalk is included.

8. All mitigation measures identified in the mitigated negative declaration for design review, DR03-0014S, are hereby incorporated by reference.

Department of Transportation

9. The applicant shall submit a site improvement/grading plan prepared by a professional civil engineer to the Department for review and approval. The plan shall be in conformance with the County of El Dorado *Design and Improvement Standards Manual*, the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, the *Drainage Manual*, the *Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance*, and the State of California Handicapped Accessibility Standards. The improvements shall be substantially completed, to the approval of the Department of Transportation, prior to occupancy.
10. Applicant shall pay the traffic impact fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued.
11. Prior to issuance of building permits, the developer shall enter into an Improvement Agreement with the County for, and shall design and construct, the realignment of Runnymede Drive from the easterly boundary of Assessor's Parcel Numbers 327-160-29/46 to El Dorado Road on the alignment set by the 2000 El Dorado Road Interchange PSR. The Agreement may include reimbursement of improvements to Runnymede Drive that are in excess of that needed to access the site, and the requirement for security to guarantee performance of the Improvement Agreement. The construction of the Runnymede Drive realignment shall be substantially complete, as determined by the Department of Transportation, prior to issuance of building permits. The construction of the roadway across Assessor's Parcel Numbers 327-160-29/46 will require procurement of the right of way across that parcel.
12. Prior to occupancy of the first building, the applicant shall construct the following roads in conformance with the Design and Improvements Standards Manual with the following widths:

Road Name	Reference	Road Width	Exceptions/Notes
Runnymede Drive	Standard Plan 101B	36 feet (IOD for 50-foot R/W, plus utility/slope easements)	Type 2 vertical curb and gutter, with 6-foot sidewalks
Access road from Runnymede Drive into site	Standard Plan 101B	36 feet (IOD for 50-foot R/W), plus utility/slope easements, IOD to be rejected	Type 2 vertical curb and gutter, with 6-foot sidewalks

Road widths in the preceding table are measured from curb face to curb face.

13. Sidewalks may be located outside the right-of-way and meander as a means to provide interest and variety in alignment. The alignment and design of the sidewalks shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Transportation prior to issuance of a construction permit. Sidewalks shall be connected to any walk/trail systems in the project

open space areas. Pedestrian easements shall be provided where necessary. Sidewalks shall be installed concurrently with road construction.

14. All curb returns at pedestrian crossing shall include a pedestrian ramp with truncated domes per Caltrans Standard A88A and four feet of sidewalk/landing at the back of the ramp. All curb returns shall be profiled on the improvement plans with elevations shown at least 25 feet before the beginning (BC) and at least 25 feet past the end (EC) of the curb, at the BC and EC, and at a minimum of quarter curve lengths, in a clockwise direction.
15. Applicant shall establish an entity, acceptable to the County, to maintain the access road and sidewalk, through the project and through any intervening parcel(s), to Runnymede Drive, prior to occupancy of any building.
16. Applicant shall provide a driveway, access and encroachment for Assessor's Parcel Numbers 327-160-29/46 onto the site access road, to replace the existing driveway access onto Runnymede Drive. Construction of the replacement driveway shall occur concurrently with road construction. Construction activities shall not block access to said parcel except on a temporary basis as may be necessary during construction working hours.
17. Applicant shall irrevocably offer for dedication, to the County, the portion of the access road on the project site and obtain an irrevocable offer of dedication for the portion of the access road across Assessor's Parcel Number 327-160-30, prior to building permit issuance.
18. As specified in the Conditions of Approval, the subdivider is required to perform off-site improvements. If it is determined that the subdivider does not have or cannot secure sufficient title or interest of such lands where said off-site improvements are required, the County may, at the subdivider's expense and within 120 days of filing the final map, acquire by negotiation or commencement proceedings to acquire an interest in the land which will permit the improvements to be made, including proceedings for immediate possession of the property. In such cases, prior to filing of any final map or parcel map, the subdivider shall submit the following to the Department of Transportation Right of Way Agent, and enter into an agreement pursuant to Government Code Section 66462.5 and provide acceptable security to complete the offsite improvements, including costs of acquiring real property interest to complete the required improvements, construction surveying, construction management and a 20 percent contingency:
 - a. A legal description and plat, of the land necessary to be acquired to complete the offsite improvements, prepared by a civil engineer or land surveyor.
 - b. Approved improvement plans and specifications of the required off-site improvements, prepared by a civil engineer.
 - c. An appraisal prepared by a professional appraiser of the cost of land necessary to complete the off-site improvements.
19. The applicant shall provide a soils report at time of improvement plan or grading permit application addressing, at a minimum, grading practices, compaction, slope stability of

existing and proposed cuts and fills, erosion potential, ground water, pavement section based on TI and R values, and recommended design criteria for any retaining walls.

20. Any import or export of fill material to be borrowed or deposited within El Dorado County shall require an additional grading permit for that offsite grading.
21. The applicant shall provide a drainage report at time of improvement plans or grading permit application, consistent with the Drainage Manual and the Storm Water Management Plan, which addresses storm water runoff increase, impacts to downstream facilities and properties, and identification of appropriate storm water quality management practices to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation.
22. Upon completion of the improvements required, and prior to acceptance of the improvements by the County, the developer will provide a CD to the Department of Transportation with the approved drainage and geotechnical reports in PDF format and the approved record drawings in TIF format.
23. Improvement plan centerline stationing shall conform to as-built plans. If there is any question about the stationing, the Department of Transportation will be the sole authority in setting the stationing.
24. The access road connection to the County road shall have a Type T intersection, as pursuant to El Dorado County Standard Plan 103D.
25. Improvement plans for on-site and off-site road improvements shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and shall be subject to County Department of Transportation approval.
26. A construction permit shall be obtained from the Department of Transportation prior to the commencement of any road construction.
27. Street signs, in conformance with Standard Plan 105 (B-1), shall be installed at Runnymede Drive prior to final inspection of the road construction. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation shall review and approve the type, design, and location of all signs required under this condition prior to installation.
28. A stop sign, pursuant to Standard Plan 105-A, shall be installed at the intersection of El Dorado Road at Runnymede Drive prior to final inspection of the road construction.
29. A "Not a County Maintained Road" sign, 24 inches x 30 inches, black on white, shall be installed on the road leading to the development, at its intersection with Runnymede Drive prior to final inspection of the road construction. On the same post, a W-53 "Not a Through Road" sign shall also be placed.

30. If blasting activities are to occur in conjunction with grading or improvements, applicant shall ensure that such blasting activities are conducted in compliance with state and local regulations.
31. If burning activities are to occur during the construction of the project improvements, applicant shall obtain the necessary burning permits from the California Department of Forestry and air pollution permits from the County prior to said burning activities.

Planning Services

32. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the construction of any building on the site, a new Planned Development application shall be submitted to and approved by the County, consistent with the provisions of Chapter 17.04 of the El Dorado County Code.
33. In the event of any legal action instituted by a third party challenging the validity of any provision of this approval, the developer and landowner agree to be responsible for the costs of defending such suit and shall hold County harmless from any legal fees or costs County may incur as a result of such action, as provided in Section 66474.9(b) of the California Government Code.

The subdivider shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless El Dorado County and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against El Dorado County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of El Dorado County concerning a subdivision, which action is brought within the time period provided for in Section 66499.37.

County shall notify the subdivider of any claim, action, or proceeding and County will cooperate fully in the defense.

34. If human remains are discovered at any time during the grading or improvement phase, the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted per Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.89 of the Public Resources Code. If archaeological artifacts are discovered, the developer shall retain an archaeologist to make recommendations for the treatment of the artifacts. Treatment of Native American remains or archaeological artifacts shall be the responsibility of the developer and shall be subject to the review and approval of the County Planning Director.
35. The project applicant shall construct an extension of an eight-inch sewer force main of adequate size and a sewer lift station in order to adequately serve the proposed project. The lift station and portions of the eight-inch line will be placed off-site, connecting to the existing system in place along Runnymede Drive. Review and approval of engineering plans for such an extension shall be approved by EID and El Dorado County prior to construction.

36. The applicant shall obtain sufficient meters to serve the project from the El Dorado Irrigation District prior to issuance of a building permit.

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District

37. A Fugitive Dust Plan (FDP) Application shall be submitted to and approved by the District prior to start of project construction.
38. The applicant shall adhere to District Rule 224 Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials.
39. The applicant shall submit a list of all proposed architectural coatings to the District for approval prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. All architectural coatings shall adhere to District Rule 215 Architectural Coatings.
40. The applicant shall implement the following conditions to reduce impacts on air quality from equipment exhaust emissions during all construction involved in this project:
 - Use low-emission on-site mobile construction equipment.
 - Retard diesel engine injection timing by two to four degrees.
 - Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline or diesel generators.
 - Use catalytic converters on gasoline-powered equipment.
 - Do not leave inactive construction equipment idling for more than two minutes.
41. Prior to construction/installation of any new point source emissions units or non-permitted emission units (i.e., gasoline dispensing facility, boilers, internal combustion engines, etc.), authority to construct applications shall be submitted to the District. Submittal of applications shall include facility diagrams, equipment specifications and emission factors.

Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District

42. The developer shall meet with the fire protection district to determine where the proper fire lanes shall be installed and identified at the site, to provide for easy access by fire and emergency apparatus during incidents that may occur at the complex.
43. All applicable Building and Fire Codes shall be adhered to and determined when a full set of building and site plans are received by the fire protection district.
44. All residential buildings on the site shall be equipped with an automatic fire sprinkler system. The fire sprinkler system shall extend and cover all areas of the building.
45. A fire flow of a minimum of 1,500 gallons per minute for the duration of two hours at a minimum 20 psi. shall be provided for any future development.

46. A Knox box shall be installed per District Requirements to be monitored with an electrical shunt.
47. A fire hydrant shall be installed, in compliance with the provisions of the C.F.C. Section 903, so that they will be within 150 feet of any portion of any new buildings, in a location acceptable to the fire protection district.
48. Fire department connection placement shall be approved by the fire district.
49. Fire apparatus access roads shall be provided in accordance with Sections 901 and 902.2 for every facility, building or a portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into the jurisdiction when any portion of the facility or any portion of the exterior wall of the first story of the building is located more than 150 feet from the fire apparatus access as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility.

ATTACHMENT 2 FINDINGS

FILE NUMBER AZ05-0002PD06-0031

Based on the review and analysis of this project by staff and affected agencies, and supported by discussion in the staff report and evidence in the record, the following findings can be made:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1.0 CEQA FINDING

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration together with the comments received and considered during the public review process. The Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and is adequate for this proposal. A *de minimis* finding on the project's effect on fish and wildlife resources can be found and the project is therefore not subject to the payment of State Fish and Game fees pursuant to State Legislation (California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4).
- 1.2 The County finds that through feasible conditions and mitigation placed upon the project, impacts on the environment have been eliminated or substantially mitigated.
- 1.3 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services Department - Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.
- 1.4 Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires the County to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The approved project description and conditions of approval, with their corresponding permit monitoring requirements, are hereby adopted as the monitoring program for this project. The monitoring program is designed to ensure compliance during project implementation.

2.0 GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS

- 2.1 In accordance with State law and pursuant to General Plan Policy 2.2.5.3, the County has evaluated the subject rezoning request based on the General Plan's general direction as to minimum parcel size or maximum allowable density and to assess whether changes in conditions are present that would support a higher density or intensity zoning district. The 19 specific criteria found within General Plan Policy 2.2.5.3 have been analyzed with regards to the above-referenced zone change request. Based on this analysis and the

conclusions reached in the staff report, the site is found to be suitable to support the proposed density.

3.0 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT FINDINGS

3.1 The PD zone request is consistent with the general plan.

PD06-0031 is an application to add a –PD combining zone to the proposed Multi-Family Residential (RM) zone. The application of this combining zone is consistent with the policies of the El Dorado County General Plan as discussed in the staff report.

3.2 The proposed development is so designed to provide a desirable environment within its own boundaries

Recreational facilities, a community center, and other on-site amenities have been provided to create a desirable environment within the boundaries of the project site.

3.3 Any exceptions to the standard requirements of the zone regulations are justified by the design or existing topography

No proposed exceptions to the standard requirements of the Multi-Family Residential (RM) zone are included within the application.

3.4 The site is physically suited for the proposed uses.

With previously approved grading on the site, the soils, topography, and other local site factors are appropriate and adequate to accommodate the proposed uses on the site.

3.5 Adequate services are available for the proposed uses, including but not limited to, water supply, sewage disposal, roads and utilities.

Adequate water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, roads, utilities, and other public services are available to the site and each of the proposed residential structures, or will be provided as conditions of approval.

3.6 The proposed uses do not significantly detract from the natural land and scenic values of the site.

Alterations to the topography of the site and construction of new buildings will change the views of and through the site, although these changes will not significantly detract from natural land and scenic values currently existing on the site.



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: AZ05-0002 Mercy Housing Development

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

Contact Person: Daniel Hamilton

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Sherrod Family Trust, 3292 Airport Road, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Stephan Daues, Mercy Housing, 3120 Freeboard Drive, West Sacramento, CA 95691

Project Agent's Name and Address: Arthur Tam and Associates, 300 27th Street, Oakland, CA 94612

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Arthur Tam and Associates, 300 27th Street, Oakland, CA 94612

Project Location: On the south side of Runnymede Road, 500 feet east of the intersection with El Doardo Road, in the Diamond Springs/El Dorado area..

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 327-160-47-100

Zoning: R1A, C (mixed zoning)

Section: 23 **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: MDR

Description of Project: The project is a general plan amendment, rezone, and planned development for the approval of an 80-unit apartment complex along El Dorado Boulevard in western Placerville. The site will be served by public water and sewer through local utilities, as well as by the County sheriff's department and an independent fire district.

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:	R1-A/C	MDR	vacant land
North:	R1A	MDR	vacant land
East:	R1A	MDR	vacant land
South:	MP	MFR	Mobile Home Park
West:	C/R1A/CG	Commercial	Commercial

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 6.97-acre site is characterized by hilly grasslands located in the western Placerville area, southeast of the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and El Dorado Road. The site contains mixed native and non-native grasses and shrubs, along with scattered small trees. Commercial and residential uses surround the property, including a mobile home park, small scale retail and office buildings, and vacant commercial property. A few limited trails traverse the site for pedestrian use. Slopes on the site range from slight to heavy, with significant elevation gains from the east to west..

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado Irrigation District, El Dorado County Fire Protection District, El Dorado County Building Department, El Dorado County Department of Environmental Health

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	X	Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	X	Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation	X	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: December 22, 2006

Printed Name: Daniel Hamilton For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: December 22, 2006

Printed Name: Peter N. Maurer 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

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

Discussion:

- a. The project site is not identified by the El Dorado County General Plan as a scenic vista. The project will change the visual appearance of the hillside on which it is located, as well as the views from surrounding areas. Although there is a visual change, the lack of a scenic vista ensures that there is no impact.
- b. The project site is adjacent to and visible from State Highway 50. The Highway 50 corridor east of Forni Road in Placerville (to South Lake Tahoe) is a state scenic highway. The location of this site at El Dorado Road, two miles west of Forni Road, does not impact the portion of the highway identified in the General Plan as a state scenic highway. There is no impact.
- c. The project will represent a change in the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. The development of the project will result in the creation of eight multi-story buildings of up to 50 feet in height, similar in character and scale to traditional apartment housing. The site is adjacent to Highway 50 and to existing commercial development to the east, on the edge of the Placerville urban area. The change to the visual character of the site and its surroundings does not represent a significant adverse impact to the environment, and the impact is therefore less than significant.
- d. The project will result in the addition of lighting to the area, including that which has the potential to affect nighttime views from adjacent residential areas. The existing lands uses in the vicinity, including street lighting along El Dorado Road, Highway 50, and on commercial and residential buildings, already create a nighttime lighting environment which limits nighttime visibility of the sky. The type and scale of lighting proposed for use, based on information provided by the project applicant, indicates downward oriented lighting in parking areas and on buildings, with light shields installed to reduce light spillage onto adjacent properties or upward to the night sky. The addition of proposed security lighting will result in an increase in ambient lighting in the area, although this impact is not expected to substantially alter the visibility of the nighttime sky. The impact is less than significant.

Finding: It has been determined that there will be no significant impacts to aesthetic or visual resources. Identified thresholds of significance for the aesthetics category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

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

Discussion:

- a. – c. The project is located on lands within the urbanized area surrounding Placerville, and on land previously approved for mass pad grading. There is no active agricultural use on the project site or surrounding properties. The project involves a rezoning of property from Medium Density Residential to Multi-Family Residential, neither of which allow for agricultural use. The lands are unsuitable for use as agriculture, and development of the site will not result in the direct or indirect conversion of agricultural lands to a non-agricultural use. There is no impact.

Finding: It has been determined that the project will not result in significant impacts to agricultural lands, Farmlands or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is developed with commercial and residential uses. For this agriculture category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project will involve the construction of buildings and other improvements at the project site, including the paving of parking lots and sidewalks, installation of mechanical equipment, and landscaping. Both the construction and operation of the project will result in the increased use of vehicle traffic on the site, including construction equipment during

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

construction and resident and visitor traffic during operation. There are no proposed improvements or operational impacts which would result in the obstruction of air quality plans of the County. The impact is less than significant.

- b. Construction and operation of the project will result in the emission of ROG and NO_x and will add pollutants to the local and regional atmosphere. The current thresholds of significance established by El Dorado County identify emissions of ROG and No_x, greater than 82lbs/day as significant. The project has the potential to exceed this threshold without the implementation of mitigation measures. The impact is potentially significant.

The following mitigation measures, recommended by the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Health, will ensure that emissions from the project will be reduced to a level below that of the above referenced threshold.

MITIGATION MEASURE AQ-1

- A Fugitive Dust Plan Application or Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan Application shall be submitted to and approved by the Air Quality Management District prior to start of project construction.
- Project applicant shall adhere to District Rule 224 Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials.
- Applicant shall submit a list of all proposed architectural coatings to the District for approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All architectural coatings shall adhere to District Rule 215 Architectural Coatings.
- Applicant shall submit a list to the District stating which of the standard heavy equipment and mobile source mitigation measures shall be complied with, given intended construction equipment and availability of alternative fuels and vehicles. Said list shall be approved prior to issuance of a building permit.
- Prior to construction or installation of any new point source emissions units or non-permitted emission units, authority to construct applications shall be submitted to the District. Submittal of applications shall include facility diagrams, equipment specifications, and emission factors.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure will ensure that the impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant.

- c. The project will generate air quality pollutants, including particulate matter, ozone, and carbon monoxide, which contribute to cumulative air quality problems in El Dorado County.
- d. Sensitive receptors are defined as those facilities which house persons who have the potential to be more severely affected by airborne pollutants than the general population. Sensitive receptors include hospitals, schools, parks, hospitals, or other land uses where children or the elderly congregate, or where outdoor activity is the primary land use. No hospitals, parks, or schools sit adjacent to the site, and the surrounding land uses are not considered sensitive receptors. Construction of the project will have the potential to release air quality pollutants including particulate matter, residues from construction materials, and emissions from construction equipment into the air. Exhaust from construction equipment dissipates rapidly, and exhausts generated from future development on the project site are not anticipated to cause impacts to sensitive receptors. Impacts to sensitive receptors are less than significant.
- e. Future construction activities would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel powered engines that emit exhaust fumes. However, these emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday, and the exhaust odors would dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity of the equipment. While some persons who live or walk by the construction site may find these odors objectionable, the infrequency of the emissions, rapid dissipation of the exhaust into the air, and short-term nature of the construction activities would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

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

Finding: Although the project has the potential to create significant impacts to air quality, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project design to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, it was determined that no sensitive receptors will be adversely impacted, no objectionable odors will be created, and the project will not obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan. With the inclusion of proposed mitigation measures established thresholds will not be exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project will result in the development of urban improvements on the project site, including the removal of existing grassland habitat and scattered vegetation. Through the County’s General Plan EIR, the County identified areas of biological importance, including the identification of habitat areas known to be suitable for foraging or nesting of protected plant and animal species. This site is not located within an Important Biological Corridor (IBC), Ecological Preserve (EP), or Agricultural District or overlay zone. The site contains no wetlands or other sensitive habitat types, thus reducing the potential for occurrence of special status species.

The site is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2, which covers all properties served by the El Dorado Irrigation District. The location of the property within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2 requires the payment of fees to cover the costs of El Dorado Irrigation District’s regional plant preservation programs. The impacts to habitats for candidate, sensitive, or special status species is less than significant.

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

- b. No wetlands are known to exist on the site, and the project site is not located within an Ecological Preserve, which identifies areas of known wetlands and riparian habitats. The site is hilly and drainage patterns on the site direct water to lower-lying areas on adjacent and nearby properties. Collection of water on-site is not anticipated, and the probability of existence of riparian habitat is considered low. The impact is less than significant.
- c. There are no known wetlands on the site. The site is not located within an Ecological Preserve, which identifies areas of known wetlands and riparian habitats. Site drainage directs water from storms off site, to lower lying adjacent properties. The low likelihood of occurrence of wetlands renders the impact less than significant.
- d. The site is not a known corridor of animal movement. Known corridors are identified in the General Plan EIR as Important Biological Corridors, and are subject to appropriate mitigation to ensure that no impacts to species occur as a result of project development. As this site is not located within an IBC, the impact is less than significant.
- e. The project is subject to multiple biological protection policies adopted by the County, including policies implementing the tree preservation ordinance of the County. Policy 7.4.4.4 and Policy 7.4.2.8 identify the relevant requirements of the County relative to tree preservation. The project is required to comply with these provisions as part of their entitlement process, and compliance is assured through existing mechanisms. The impact is less than significant.
- f. There are no applicable Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans adopted which cover the project site. One such Habitat Conservation Plan is currently under development in the County, although completion of the HCP is expected to occur after project approval. There is no impact.

Finding: It was determined that the project will not result in any significant impacts to biological resources. Although the project is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2, payment of fees will mitigate the impacts to less than significant. It has been determined that additional impacts to biological resources are less than significant. Established thresholds for the biological resources category will not be exceeded by the project and no significant adverse environmental impacts will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

- a. – d. There are no known cultural resources on the project site. Grading permits have been issued for the site, and a separate CEQA analysis was prepared to assess impacts related to site disturbance.

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

The proposed project is located in an area that is urbanized and has been previously disturbed by grading and development. There are no known cultural, archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources in the vicinity of the proposed project.

CEQA presents guidelines at Section 15064.5 and Section 21083.2 for the identification of historical resources and determining their historical significance. The area to be disturbed by the project does not include any cultural resources (e.g., prehistoric sites, historic sites, or buildings) that meet the CEQA criteria for consideration as historical resources or unique archaeological resources.

However, should a previously unidentified or unanticipated archaeological resource be discovered during project construction, the project would be subject to the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 et seq., which protect Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. The impacts are less than significant.

Finding: It has been determined that the proposed project will not result in any significant impacts to cultural resources. If cultural resources are discovered during construction, impacts will be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of the above provisions. For the cultural resources category, established thresholds will not be exceeded by the project and no significant adverse environmental effects to cultural resources will result from the project.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X	
iv) Landslides?		X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?		X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a. The project site is located within the western Placerville area. Soils on the site consist of two types: Boomer very rocky loam (BhC) and Boomer gravelly loam (BhD). The area is not located within an Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The site is not subject to potential risk of strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, rupture, or other impact resulting from earthquake activity. The impact is less than significant.
- b. Erosion hazard on Boomer gravelly loam are rated as moderate, with slope and erosion hazards listed as potential impacts. Boomer very rocky loam is also considered a potential risk for soil erosion. The slopes on the site, combined with the soil characteristics, make the site susceptible to soil erosion.

Grading associated with the development of the site was previously considered in another CEQA document, and mitigation measures were developed to address the risks generated from the mass pad grading proposed to accommodate the improvements called for in this project. The construction on the graded site will not result in additional soil erosion, as the site will be leveled at that point. With the slopes removed, the potential for soil erosion is less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

- c. Boomer very rocky loam and Boomer gravelly loam are common on slopes of 15 percent to 30 percent, and average 4-7 inches in depth. Erosion hazard on Boomer gravelly loam are rated as moderate, with slope and erosion hazards listed as potential impacts. Liquefaction and landslide potential are based on the geologic stability of the site, in addition to the slopes and soil characteristics. The location of the site in a relatively low-risk zone for geologic activity such as earthquakes significantly reduces the risk of liquefaction, landslide, or subsidence. The grading of the site (not part of this project but necessary precursor to the implementation of this project) will further reduce risks associated with these types of ground failure. The resulting impacts are considered less than significant.
- d. The two soil types found on the site, Boomer very rocky loam and Boomer gravelly loam, each have moderate to low shrink/swell potential. Shrink/swell potential is the primary indicator of the expansiveness of the soil, and the moderate to low potential, combined with the low risk associated with geologic activity, reduces the risk associated with adverse impacts to the buildings and persons on the project site to a level of less than significant.
- e. No septic systems are proposed as part of the project. Soil limitations for septic systems are thus unable to result in significant impacts. There is no impact.

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

Finding: It has been determined that no significant impacts will result from geologic or seismological anomalies on the project site. Although there is a high potential for erosion within the site, impacts have been reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that will result in significant impacts. For the Geology and soils category, established thresholds will not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

- (a) - (b) The project will involve the use of potentially hazardous fuels for construction equipment, landscaping maintenance, and cleaning chemicals for internal spaces. The use of these chemicals and fuels is common in urban development and has a very low potential for impacting the natural environment or persons using the site. The use and storage of these fuels and materials is generally safe if directions are followed, and the successful use of such potentially hazardous materials on the site is not considered a significant risk to the environment or persons residing on or using the site. The impact is considered less than significant.
- (c) – (d) The site is not located on a known hazardous materials site. The site has not been previously developed with uses known to store or use hazardous materials, and the site is not listed on any federally or state maintained list of

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

hazardous materials sites. The closest school to the site is more than one-quarter mile away, thus the project does not have the potential to emit or handle hazardous materials near a school site. There is no impact.

- (e) – (f) The closest airport to the project site is the Placerville Airport, located three miles east of the City of Placerville and approximately seven miles east of the project site. There is no impact relative to this or other airports in El Dorado County.
- (g) The project will result in the creation of additional roadway connections to the project site, including the extension of Runnymede Road into the site. The development of the buildings and improvements on the site will not result in any creation of objects or conditions which could interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The impact of the project is less than significant.
- (h) The project will result in the creation of additional structures, and the placement of additional people, in an area with woodlands nearby. The risk of wildland fire impacting the site is considered low, as the structures on site are protected by sprinklers and the area is characterized by urban improvements and lands interspersed with rural grasslands and tree-covered areas. The impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Finding: The proposed project will not expose people or property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials or expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires as discussed above. For the hazards and hazardous materials category, the thresholds of significance will not be exceeded and no significant adverse environmental impacts will result from the project.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard			X

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
delineation map?			
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

Discussion:

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

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

The proposed project area is located within the limits of unincorporated El Dorado County. The project area is located within the 1,265-square mile Cosumnes River watershed, which encompasses the southern region of El Dorado County, extending from its headwaters at the Iron Mountain Ridge in the Sierra Nevada, west to its confluence with the Sacramento River in Sacramento County (El Dorado County, 1998).

- a. The proposed project would consist of the construction of seven multifamily residential buildings and a community center, in addition to parking spaces, landscaping, and associated improvements. The project would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program, which requires the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize water quality impacts from construction projects. BMPs applicable to the project are included in the project site plans, which are available for public review at the El Dorado County Department of Transportation. The project site plans include a series of required BMPs to ensure that water quality standards are not violated during construction and site grading activities. Required BMPs related to grading and drainage includes but are not limited to
- Adequate erosion control practices would be installed to ensure that sediment in excess of pre-project site conditions would not leave the project site.
 - Areas involving extensive grading and shaping would require stockpiling and re-use of topsoil to provide adequate re-vegetation.
 - The project engineer would identify erosive velocities in water conveyance structures. Where necessary, riprap or similar practices would be required.

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

- An erosion control plan would be reviewed with the Resource Conservation District and a County Department of Transportation representative.
- b. Due to the use of BMPs as required by El Dorado County and the NPDES permit, construction activities associated with the improvements would cause less than significant impacts to water quality and would not violate any existing waste discharge requirements. The project would result in the creation of substantial new impervious surfaces on the site. The most substantial change to the recharge of groundwater in the area will result from the grading activities previously considered in the approval of the grading permit and the associated CEQA document. The addition of building pads, driveways, and other impervious surfaces to the site will slightly reduce the potential recharge on the site. However, this impact is considered to be minor in nature. The impact is less than significant.
 - c. As discussed above, the creation of impervious surfaces will alter the drainage patterns on the site. The grading associated with the previously-approved grading plan will significantly affect on-site drainage, although impacts related to that permit were considered in a previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration. The creation of impervious surfaces will alter drainage patterns, resulting in an increase in runoff to the storm drainage system. The creation of additional runoff from the project will be directed toward planned stormwater drainage facilities, and will not result in substantial erosion or siltation. Standard Best Management Practices will be required as part of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which will offset all major erosion and siltation impacts. The impact is less than significant.
 - d. As discussed above, the creation of impervious surfaces will alter the drainage patterns on the site. The grading associated with the previously-approved grading plan will significantly affect on-site drainage, although impacts related to that permit were considered in a previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration. The creation of impervious surfaces will alter drainage patterns, resulting in an increase in runoff to the storm drainage system. The creation of additional runoff from the project will be directed toward planned stormwater drainage facilities, and will not result in potential increases in on-site or off-site flooding. Standard Best Management Practices will be required as part of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which will ensure that runoff is appropriately directed to the stormwater management system. The impact is less than significant.
 - e. See discussion under item d. above. The project grading has been previously approved for the site, and the construction and operation of the proposed improvements will not result in the creation of conditions which could exceed the capacity of the planned stormwater drainage system. Project drainage plans indicate that the stormwater system is of a sufficient size and design to accommodate projected runoff in all conditions. The impact is less than significant.
 - f. See discussion under items a. through e. above. There are no unique conditions of the project which will result in a substantial degradation of water quality on- or off-site. The potential for impact is considered less than significant.
 - g. The site is located in Flood Zone C, as designated on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), Panel #060040 0750 B, prepared and distributed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Flood Zone C designates areas not within the 100-year floodplain. Thus, no housing is proposed within a 100-year floodplain. There is no impact.
 - h. See discussion under item g. above. The site is not within a 100-year floodplain, as identified by FEMA. There is no impact.
 - i. The site is not located within an inundation area of any levee or dam, as identified in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR or maps provided by the California Department of Water Resources. The placement of people and structures on this site does not represent any significant exposure to risk of injury from flooding. There is no impact.
 - j. The project site is not located near any significant water body, including lakes, rivers, or oceans. The potential for impact resulting from a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is dependent on location near a water body with the potential to displace significant quantities of water. This site is not at risk of such impacts. There is no impact.

Finding: It has been determined that no significant hydrological impacts will result from the proposed project. Impacts to hydrology and water quality will be limited by the incorporation of BMPs and the implementation of an SWPPP as outlined

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

above. With the inclusion of BMPs and an SWPPP in the project plans, the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance for hydrology and water quality. No significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

- (a) The project will not divide an established community. This site is located in an unincorporated area west of Placerville, in an area characterized by commercial and residential development interspersed with rural uses. The construction and operation of the proposed project will not divide this area. There is no impact.
- (b) The project includes a change to the land use designations in the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance to ensure consistency with the proposed project. The remaining aspects of project development are consistent with the policies set forth in the regulations of El Dorado County, including the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. With the changes in land use designations associated with the project, there is no conflict with any policy adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. The impact is less than significant.
- (c) The project does not fall within the boundaries of any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. There is no impact.

Finding: It has been determined for the land use and planning section, the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance, and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

- (a) – (b) The project site is not identified in the General Plan as the location of any known mineral resources. El Dorado County designates sites known to contain mineral resources with a –MR combining zone district, to ensure identification of such sites. This site does not contain the –MR combining zone district. The development of the

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

proposed project will not limit the ability of future interested parties to extract mineral resources from the site, should such resources become known to exist on the site in the future. There is no adverse impact to mineral resources.

Finding: It has been determined that no impacts to any known mineral resources will occur as a result of the project. Identified thresholds of significance for mineral resources will not be exceeded, and no significant, adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL;
 - Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
 - Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- a. The noise requirements for residential development are set forth in the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. The maximum allowable noise exposure for transportation noise sources for residential properties is 60 decibels (L_{dn} /CNEL), while the noise level performance protection standards for noise sensitive land uses is 55 decibels during normal daytime hours. Because the transportation noise sources limitations are higher and the project is located very close to State Highway 50, this standard is the appropriate threshold for analysis of noise impacts to the site.

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

The noise impacts to the proposed project, as well as impacts from project construction on adjacent properties, are generated primarily from the traffic noise on State Highway 50 and the noise created by construction equipment and vehicles during building of the project. Existing limitations set forth in the General Plan require mitigation to offset the impacts created by Highway noise on the residents of the project, as well as impacts created on adjacent residents by construction activities from the project site. The generation of noise by the nearby Highway 50 and from the project construction is sufficient to create a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURE NOISE-1

Construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on weekends and federally-recognized holidays.

MITIGATION MEASURE NOISE-2

Motorized construction equipment shall be equipped with intake/exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.

MITIGATION MEASURE NOISE-3

Noise-generating equipment, including portable power generators and air compressors, should be located at the furthest distance possible from the nearest occupied residence.

Following mitigation, it is estimated that the project will not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan with incorporated mitigation. The impact is less than significant after the mitigation measures are applied.

- b. The project will not result in the generation of substantial groundborne vibrations. The grading associated with the improvement of the site was fully considered in an earlier CEQA document for the issuance of the grading permit for the site. Excessive vibrations resulting from construction typically occur from grading activities. Construction of roadways and site improvements, including buildings, will not result in excessive vibrations at the site or on surrounding properties. The impact is less than significant.
- c. See discussion under item a. above. The project would create temporary noises associated with construction activities, although these activities are regulated by the existing General Plan noise requirements in Tables 6.1 and 6.2 of the General Plan. The operation of the project will create a slight increase in ambient noise levels, through the operation of air conditioning and heating equipment and regular use of automobiles by residents and visitors of the complex. These noises will not create a substantial increase in the ambient noise levels of the environment in surrounding areas. The impact is less than significant.
- d. See discussion under items a. and c. above. The project would create temporary noises associated with construction activities. These activities, and the noises generated by construction, are reduced through the incorporation of mitigation measures included in item a. above, and are subject to the noise level limits established in the General Plan. With the mitigation measures included earlier in this section, the temporary impacts to the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project are less than significant.
- e. – f. The closest airport to the project site is the Placerville Airport, located three miles east of the City of Placerville and approximately seven miles east of the project site. There is no impact relative to this or other airports in El Dorado County.

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

Finding: It has been determined that the incorporation of short-term construction mitigation measures will reduce impacts due to noise to less than significant. No identified thresholds of significance will be exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

(a) The project will result in the direct addition of population to the site and the area through the construction and operation of 80 residential housing units. This has the potential to add 200-300 additional persons to the area, based on unit sizes and average household sizes in the area. This increase in population is not expected to have a significant impact on the environment in and of itself. Impacts related to the addition of these persons on environmental conditions are discussed throughout the Initial Study. The impact is less than significant.

(b) – (c) The project will not result in the loss of any existing housing or the displacement of any persons from the site. There is no impact.

Finding: The project will not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project will 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 will not be exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

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

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

Discussion:

- a) Fire protection services will continue to be provided to the site by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District. The District has impact fees in place to cover the costs of expansion of services to include the buildings and persons to be located on the site, and the project is subject to payment of these fees to offset such costs to the District. The impact is therefore considered less than significant.
- b) Police protection services will continue to be provided to the site by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department. The addition of persons and structures to the site will create an increased demand for services to the site, and could affect response times and abilities to other areas of the County. The impacts associated with the development of the site are offset by the payment of impact fees intended to cover the costs of new impacts created by development, and the project is subject to payment of these fees. The impact is therefore considered less than significant.
- c) School services to the site will be provided by the Placerville Union School District for kindergarten through 8th grade, and El Dorado Union High School District for 9th through 12th grade. The project will add school-age children to the district, creating additional demand on facilities and programs. School impact fees have been developed and adopted by the school districts to offset the impacts created by new development, including the costs of new facility construction, staffing, and program development. The project will be subject to these fees, offsetting the impacts to the school districts. The impact is therefore considered less than significant.
- d. Recreation facilities for the project site are primarily within the City or Placerville. There are approximately 100 acres of parks within the Placerville area. Limited on-site recreational facilities are provided for residents on site. This impact is discussed in further detail in section XIV Recreation. This impact is less than significant.
- e. There will not be any significant impacts to other government services. This impact is less than significant.

Finding: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Applicable fees will be paid to public service providers to reduce any potential impacts. No public service thresholds of significance will be exceeded and no significant adverse impacts to public services will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or

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

- Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- a. Recreational facilities for the project site are primarily within the City or Placerville. There are approximately 100 acres of parks within the Placerville area. The proposed project will add 250-300 residents to the area. The additional use of regional parks by this development is not expected to result in substantial physical deterioration. This impact is less than significant.
 - b. The project does not include the expansion of existing recreational facilities, or the creation of new recreational facilities. There is no impact.

Finding: No significant impacts to recreation or open space will result from the project. For the recreation section, the thresholds of significance will not be exceeded, and the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?		X	

Discussion:

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
- Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
- Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.

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

- a. The proposed project would create 538 average daily trips and 50 PM peak hour trips. A traffic study was prepared for this project by Fehr & Peers, completed in July 2006. El Dorado County Department of Transportation has stated that the project is consistent with the General Plan and EIR, and no additional improvements are required to mitigate for the project's cumulative off-site impacts.

Street improvements which are planned as part of the project include the relocation of Runnymede Drive. The project is required to construct the realignment of Runnymede Drive per 2000 PSR for the El Dorado Road interchange, however improvements to Runnymede Drive that are in excess of that needed for access to the site are subject to a reimbursement that is to be negotiated with the County of El Dorado.

The project will be required to incorporate the following mitigation measures in order to minimize traffic related impacts:

MITIGATION MEASURE TRANS-1

1. The Runnymede access road shall be dedicated to the county.
2. The right of way for Runnymede Drive shall be dedicated to the county.

Incorporation of the above mitigation measure will reduce impacts to traffic to a level of less than significant.

- b. A traffic study was conducted for the proposed project, by Fehr and Peers, in July 2006. This study found traffic conditions as follows; Existing conditions peak hour intersection operations within the study area operate at LOS C or better. Existing conditions with project peak hour intersection operations are predicted to operate at LOS C or better. Baseline conditions for the year 2011 peak hour intersections operations without the project are projected to operate at LOS D or better. Baseline conditions for the year 2011 peak hour intersections with project are projected to operate at LOS D or better. The proposed project will not result in or worsen Level of Service "F" traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection. This impact is less than significant.
- c. The proposed project will not cause a change in air traffic patterns. Increased air traffic as a result of the proposed project is considered less than significant. This impact is less than significant.
- d. All road improvements proposed as part of the project will conform to all Department of Transportation standards for safety including "Design and Improvement Standards Manual" the "Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance," the "Drainage Manual" the "Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance" and the State of California Handicapped Accessibility Standards. This will require adherence to Standard Plan 101B for Runnymede Drive as well as the access road to Runnymede Drive. Compliance with the rules and regulations discussed above will reduce any impacts to safety to less than significant. Impacts due to incompatible uses are considered less than significant. This impact is less than significant.
- e. Emergency access will be provided to the project site by the project entrance from Runnymede Drive. Circulation through the project site will be provided by parking areas and drives throughout the site. The project will not interfere with emergency access to surrounding developments. This impact is less than significant.
- f. Parking for the proposed project will be on-site. Impacts to already existing parking facilities in the surrounding community are considered less than significant. This impact is less than significant.

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

- g. There are no bicycle routes within the project vicinity. In the traffic study conducted by Fehr and Peers, it was found that the project is not expected to disrupt or discourage transit use. El Dorado County General Plan policy TC-4i, 5b&c requires sidewalks on all commercial and residential developments connecting to adjacent commercial areas and other facilities.

MITIGATION MEASURE TRANS-2

A pedestrian path/sidewalk shall be provided on Runnymede Drive and on the access road, connection the project site to the shopping center to the north.

Incorporation of the above mitigation measure will reduce impacts to alternative transportation to a level of less than significant.

Finding: It has been determined that the implementation of the above mitigation measures will reduce impacts to traffic and transportation to less than significant. Environmental impacts resulting from the proposed mitigation measures are less than significant. Identified thresholds of significance will not be exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
 - Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
 - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
 - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a. Wastewater service will be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District. El Dorado Irrigation District is required to adhere to all local, state and federal regulations regarding the treatment of wastewater. These regulations are sufficient to ensure impacts to wastewater treatment are less than significant.
 - b. Water and wastewater services will be provided by El Dorado Irrigation District. Water service will require the construction of a water line extension connection from the existing 8-inch water line located on Runnymede Drive. Sewer service will require an extension of facilities of adequate size to connect to an 8-inch sewer force main on El Dorado Road. Additional sewer facilities will also include a new sewer lift station. Impacts due to construction of these facilities are discussed in sections III Air Quality, VIII Hydrology, XV Traffic and other relevant sections. Construction of all onsite and offsite facilities shall be completed by the developer. This impact is considered less than significant.
 - c. The proposed project will require the construction of on-site storm-water facilities. The creation of additional runoff from the project will be directed toward planned storm water drainage facilities. The project grading has been previously approved for the site, and the construction and operation of the proposed improvements will not result in the creation of conditions which could exceed the capacity of the planned storm water drainage system. Project drainage plans indicate that the storm water system is of a sufficient size and design to accommodate projected runoff in all conditions. Additional discussion of storm water impacts is given in section VIII Hydrology and Water Quality, impacts d. and e. This impact is less than significant.
 - d. Water service will be provided by El Dorado Irrigation District. As of January 1, 2005 there were 2434 equivalent dwelling units available in the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region. This project would require 54.5 additional equivalent dwelling units. There is sufficient water supply to serve the project. This impact is less than significant.
 - e. El Dorado Irrigation District will provide wastewater service to the project. There is an 8-inch sewer force main in El Dorado Road. In a Facility Improvement Letter from the El Dorado Irrigation District dated October 2005, this sewer line has adequate capacity (to serve the project), at this time. This impact is less than significant.
 - f. – g. The site receives solid waste collection and disposal services from El Dorado Disposal Service, Inc. The solid waste collection company is required to ensure adequate disposal sites for the solid waste collected within its service boundaries, and the waste generated from this project will be deposited at area landfills with sufficient capacity to accommodate the demand. The impact is less than significant.

Finding: No significant impacts will result to utility and public service systems from development of the project. For the utilities and public service section, the thresholds of significance will not be exceeded, and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

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

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment by creating potentially significant impacts to air quality. Construction and operation of the project will result in the emission of ROG and NOx and will add pollutants to the local and regional atmosphere. The project has the potential to exceed this threshold without the implementation of mitigation measures. **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** addresses this impact by incorporating dust control measures, as well as limiting building and paving materials. In addition, this impact is reduced by requiring the use of alternative fuels. Impacts to other resource areas, including biological, cultural, water quality, noise and population have been found to be less than significant. The proposed project will not substantially degrade the quality of the environment.
- b. There are no impacts from the proposed project that are potentially significant when considered under cumulative conditions. The proposed project is planned in an area with similar visual character. Air quality impacts will be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of **MM AQ-1**. The project site and surrounding uses are not agricultural in nature, so there is no loss of farmland as a result of the project. Public service providers in the project area will not be significantly impacted by the project, nor will the project result in the direct or indirect increase in population in the area. The project will have potentially significant impacts to transportation, but will not result in degradation of Level of Service within the project area. Impacts due to the proposed project will not result in significant cumulative impacts.
- c. The project will cause impacts to traffic within the project area. These impacts include the increase in traffic, adding 538 average daily trips and 50 PM peak hour trips. These impacts will be mitigated by **MM Trans-1** which requires the relocation of Runnymede Drive, access to Runnymede drive and the right of way all be dedicated to the county. The project will not result in degradation of Level of Service within the project area. The project will also cause potential impacts to pedestrian traffic; however these impacts are reduced by the incorporation of **MM Trans-1** which requires the project to construct sidewalks for connection to surrounding development. Incorporation of these mitigation measures reduces traffic impacts to less than significant. Other impacts which may affect humans include aesthetic, noise, hazards, public services and recreation. Impacts in these areas have been found to be less than significant; therefore the proposed project will not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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.)

Mitigation Measure Agreement for AZ05-0002 Mercy Housing Apartments

As the applicant, owner, or their legal agent, I hereby agree to amend the above named project by incorporating all required mitigation measures, as identified in the related Environmental Checklist, which are necessary in order to avoid or reduce any potentially significant environmental effects to a point where clearly no significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

I understand that by agreeing to amend the proposed project through incorporation of the identified mitigation measures, or substantially similar measures, all potentially adverse environmental impacts will be reduced to an acceptable level and a "Proposed Negative Declaration" will be prepared and circulated in accordance with County procedures for implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). I also understand that additional mitigation measures may be required following the review of the "Proposed Negative Declaration" by the public, affected agencies, and by the applicable advisory and final decision making bodies.

I understand the required mitigation measures incorporated into the project will be subject to the El Dorado County Mitigation Monitoring program adopted in conjunction with the Negative Declaration, and that I will be subject to fees for the planning staff time to monitor compliance with the mitigation measures.

This agreement shall be binding on the applicant/property owner and on any successors or assigns in interest.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Planning Director or his assign, representing the County of El Dorado, and the applicant/owner or his legal agent have executed this agreement on this _____ day of _____, _____.

El Dorado County Planning Services
Daniel Hamilton AICP, Senior Planner

Signature of Applicant / Owner / Agent:

By _____

Print Name and address below

Print Name and title above

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING			
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Agency	Time Frame
AQ-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Fugitive Dust Plan Application or Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan Application shall be submitted to and approved by the Air Quality Management District prior to start of project construction. • Project applicant shall adhere to District Rule 224 Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials. • Applicant shall submit a list of all proposed architectural coatings to the District for approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All architectural coatings shall adhere to District Rule 215 Architectural Coatings. • Applicant shall submit a list to the District stating which of the standard heavy equipment and mobile source mitigation measures shall be complied with, given intended construction equipment and availability of alternative fuels and vehicles. Said list shall be approved prior to issuance of a building permit. • Prior to construction or installation of any new point source emissions units or non-permitted emission units, authority to construct applications shall be submitted to the District. Submittal of applications shall include facility diagrams, equipment specifications, and emission factors. 	El Dorado County Air Quality Management District	Prior to issuance of a building permit
NOISE-1	Construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on weekends and federally-recognized holidays.	Building Department	Ongoing during project construction
NOISE-2	Motorized construction equipment shall be equipped with intake/exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.	Building Department	Ongoing during project construction
NOISE-3	Noise-generating equipment, including portable power generators and air compressors, should be located at the furthest distance possible from the nearest occupied residence.	Building Department	Ongoing during project

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING			
			construction
TRANS-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Runnymede access road shall be dedicated to the county. • The right of way for Runnymede Drive shall be dedicated to the county. 	Department of Transportation	Prior to occupancy
TRANS-2	A pedestrian path/sidewalk shall be provided on Runnymede Drive and on the access road, connection the project site to the shopping center to the north.	Department of Transportation	Prior to approval of Improvement Plans