

**EXHIBIT J**



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** PD06-0004/Estepa Lot 159

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

**Contact Person:** Roman Anissi, Senior Planner

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

**Project Owner's Name and Address:** Burnett Park LLC, PO Box 5650, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** James Losch, 2319 Sanford Court, Rescue, CA 95672

**Project Location:** The property is located on the north side of Estepa Drive 500-feet northwest of the intersection with Cambridge Road in the Cameron Park area.

**Assessors Parcel No(s):** 082-531-21

**Parcel Size:** .58-acres

**Zoning:** Limited Multi-family Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD) **Section:** 28 **T:** 9N **R:** 9E

**General Plan Designation:** Multi-Family Residential (MFR)

**Description of Project:** Planned Development (PD) to construct a six-unit multi-family rental project located on a .58-acre lot within the PD overlay.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
North:	R2-PD	MFR	Multi-Family Residential
East:	R2	MFR	Multi-Family/Under Construction
South:	R1	HDR	Single-Family Residential
West:	R2-PD	MFR	Multi-Family Residential/Vacant

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The site gently slopes between an average elevation of 1290-feet and 1314-feet and contains small rock outcroppings. Portions of the .58-acre parcel have been previously disturbed or graded. Natural erosion has also affected parts of the site. Less than ten percent of the area is covered by oak tree canopy and a limited amount of groundcover along the project area includes chamise, Manzanita, toyon, and disturbed grasslands. Seasonal drainage and wetlands do not exist on-site.

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

El Dorado County: Department of Transportation, Building Services, Cameron Park Fire Department, Environmental Management, Resource Conservation District, and Air Quality Management District. El Dorado Irrigation District.

**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. The environmental factors checked below contain mitigation measures which reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

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

**DETERMINATION**

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

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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: December 5, 2006

Printed Name: Roman Anissi, Senior Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: December 5, 2006

Printed Name: Peter Maurer, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista.

- a) No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway will be affected by this project.
- b) The project is not located along a defined State Scenic Highway corridor and therefore will not impact scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources based on the location of the project. This project blends the existing site outcroppings into site design.
- c) The proposed project will not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This project incorporates sensitive landform and grading concepts to balance the site and compliment the site and the surrounding area. The project protects most rock outcroppings and boulders in place and provides proper landscaping to enhance the visual qualities of the site.
- d) With exception to potential patio lighting, common area lighting is not proposed for this project. As a result, patio lighting must meet lighting ordinance standards and must be shielded to avoid potential glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area. Impacts from outdoor lighting will be less than significant.

**FINDING:** The project proposes sensitive and landform grading techniques and will contribute to the character of the neighborhood. This project will have a less than significant impact for the ‘Aesthetics’ category.

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

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

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
Contract?			
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			✓

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
  - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
  - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a) There is no conversion of choice agricultural to nonagricultural lands and there is no impairment of agricultural productivity of agricultural lands.
- b) The PD will not reduce available agricultural lands. There is no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and this project is not under and does not conflict with a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) No existing agricultural lands will be converted from agricultural uses as a result of this project.

**FINDING:** This PD will have no impacts on agricultural lands and will not impact properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is largely urbanized and the project site is well suited for a multi- family development project. This project proposes no impacts to the ‘Agriculture’ category.

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

**Discussion:**

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

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
  - Emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
  - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>). Activities related to the processing of this PD in order to construct six apartment units will create a less than significant impact on air quality. Typical conditions for project approval are included in the project permit that will require implementation of grading and construction measures to reduce the likelihood of defined particulate matter to a level of less than significant. The project and conditions of approval will conform to the County’s air quality standards and plan.
- b/c) The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of five standard conditions of project approval, the project will have a less than significant impact on the air quality. The project permit includes certain measures, including requiring a Fugitive Dust Mitigation (FDM) plan to be submitted and approved by the AQMD prior to the approval of grading or construction permits. These measures shall reduce the potential effects in this category to a less than significant level.
- d) The El Dorado County AQMD reviewed the project and identified that no sensitive receptors exist near the project site. Typical conditions of approval are included in the project permit in order to maintain levels of potential exposure to defined particulate matter as referenced by this section to a less than significant level.
- e) Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide. The proposed apartment project will not result in significant impacts resulting from odors.

**FINDING:** Standard County conditions of approval are included as part of the project permit in order to maintain the impacts within the ‘Air Quality’ category to a less than significant level.

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

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;
- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species; or
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

a/b) The project will not impact any riparian habitat and may impact species identified as 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. The project is located within the Mitigation Area 1 and is comprised of gabbro soils; however, it is not located within the County’s adopted Ecological Preserve or within the USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries. A botanical evaluation prepared for project related impacts identifies that the Pine Hill ceanothus is not found on the project site. Although other special-status plant species including the El Dorado bedstraw and the Stebbins’ morning glory are unlikely to be found, these two species along with the Laynes butterweed, Pine Hill flannel brush, Peak rush-rose, El Dorado mule ears, and Red Hills soaproot will need to be surveyed during the bloom season to identify such species on-site. The survey also recommends that species listed on the California Natural Diversity Database to include Jepson’s onion, Big-scale balsamroot, Brandegees’ clarkia, Bisbee Layne’s ragwort, and Oval-leaved viburnum also be surveyed. A bloom period survey for these species will identify whether these species exist or not on this site. Should any special-status plant species be discovered during the bloom period, action must be taken by the project applicant to assure either avoidance or the removal and transplantation to California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and/or the US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) standards for such plant species. The botanical evaluation also identifies payment of in-lieu fees for impacts within Mitigation Area 1 along with the mitigation identified below based on special-status plants will reduce impacts in this category to a level that is less than significant for this project.

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

**1) Prior to the approval of grading and/or improvement plans, a qualified biologist shall conduct an on-site botanical survey during the bloom period of special-status plants to determine if such plants exist on the project site.**

**In the event that special-status plants are found and impacts to the species cannot be avoided, the applicant shall obtain approval from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and/or the US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) for the removal of found special-status plants. The applicant shall provide evidence in writing from the CDFG and/or the USFWS that removal of found special-status plants occurred to the satisfaction of the affected agency.**

**2) Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall make an in lieu-fee payment of \$3,982.50, or the fee in effect at the time of building permit issuance, for construction of a six-unit multi-family residential development within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1.**

- c) The project is located to the west of the Cameron Park Lake. This site is not adjacent to nor does it comprise of drainages, wetlands, rivers or lakes, and there will be no impacts to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.
- d) The parcel is an infill parcel that is surrounded by similar development. Because the project is located in an urbanizing neighborhood, the project will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- e/f) The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, and does not conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Because the project site is less than 1-acre in size and provides a canopy of less than 10-percent, this project is not subject to the tree preservation policy regarding the retention of oak woodland. The Ecological Preserve regulations of the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan Policy for rare, threatened, and endangered species identifies that a project shall avoid disturbance or fragmentation of important habitats to the extent reasonably feasible. For this project, the infill nature of the site and the project mitigation measures that address Pine Hill Endemics and provide preservation procedures for discovery of such endemics to meet California Department of Fish and Game standards will lower impacts in this section to a less than significant level.

**FINDING:** This site is not located within the County’s adopted Ecological Preserve or within the USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries. Mitigation in the form of an in-lieu fee payment and discovery, avoidance and/or removal procedures of special-status plants to the satisfaction of the California Department of Fish and Game and/or US Fish and Wildlife Services are included in this study and in the project permit. There will be no fragmentation of biological habitats with this project. By assessing in-lieu fees commensurate with the parcel size and requiring mitigation based on the scope of work, this project shall meet adopted local, state, and/or federal policies in place for biological and ecological preservation. The mitigation included for this project will reduce the level of impact to a level of less than significant in the ‘Biological Resources’ category.



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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a/b) The applicant submitted a “Cultural Resources Study of Estepa Drive Project Lot 158, Lot 159, Lot 160, and Lot 163 APNs 082-531-20 thru 22 and 082-543-03, Cameron Park, CA” prepared by Historic Resource Associates in November 2004. The report provides a site assessment for subsurface and cultural resources. According to the study the site was previously disturbed by prior grading and a thorough site assessment revealed no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts. The report recommends no further cultural resource investigations for this project. Based on the report findings, mitigation measures are not required or included. Instead, typical procedures addressing accidental subsurface discoveries are included as permit conditions. The conditions implement discovery procedures during project grading and improvement activities.

c) The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil strata or locales. A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata and this project does not consist of these types of strata.

d) Because of the limited area of the project site, there is a small likelihood of any accidental discoveries of human remains for projects located outside of a dedicated cemetery. During grading and improvement activities, typical procedures that address accidental discovery or recognition of human remains occurring outside of a dedicated cemetery are included in the project permit. Mitigation is not required and impacts in this category remain at a level of less than significant.

**FINDING:** A potential to find historic, archaeological, prehistoric, and/or human remains outside of a designated cemetery is not likely with this project. Minor grading and improvements are required. The implementation of typical discovery procedures addressing accidental discovery are included, and by doing so, this project will have a less than significant impact on the ‘Cultural Resources’ category.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- 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) According to the *Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas* (Jennings, 1994) and the *Peak Acceleration from*

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

*Maximum Credible Earthquakes in California* (CDMG, 1992), no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones (Special Study Zones) are located on the project site. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impacts to future development in the project area will be offset by compliance with *Uniform Building Code* earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variations in slope. By considering all of the components in this category, the potential for a mudslide or landslide is not likely to affect the project or the site. Impacts in this category are considered to be less than significant.

- b) Project grading is required on-site. Off-site grading and subsurface improvements will occur within Estepa Drive for water main upgrades and road frontage improvements. All grading activities shall comply with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. By implementing procedures from the ordinance, the project impacts in this category shall be reduced to a less than significant level.
- c) The soil classification on the project site is Rescue extremely stony sandy loam, 3 to 50 percent slopes, eroded. This soil has stones on 3 to 15-percent of its surface and the thickness of the surface layer is only 3 to 8-inches. The surface run-off is medium to rapid. This soil is mainly used for watershed, and is typically covered with chamise brush (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). Any grading or improvement activities must comply with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* which will reduce potentially impacts for soil erosion or loss of topsoil to a level that is less than significant.
- d) According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*, erosion hazard of soils at this site is moderate to high. However, no expansive soils are found at this project site. Since all grading and improvement activities must conform to the *County of El Dorado Grading Standards* any impacts within this category will remain at level that is less than significant.
- e) This project shall connect to the 6-inch public sewer line located within Estepa Road. County’s Environmental Management and the El Dorado Irrigation District have identified adequacy and capacity for the project related disposal system connecting to the public sewer system. Impacts associated to the connection are taken into account in this review and the use of a septic system is not proposed for this project.

**FINDING:** A review of the soils and geologic conditions that exist at this site provides a good understanding of subsurface site conditions and conditions that can be expected during development and following the development of this site. By incorporating adopted County grading policies and procedures and conforming to the *Uniform Building Code* during construction and building plan reviews, this project will reduce any impacts from geological or seismological event to a less than significant level. For the ‘Geology and Soils’ category, the project has been found to have a less than significant level of impact.

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			✓
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			✓
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			✓

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

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			✓
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		✓	
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		✓	
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			✓

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
  - Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
  - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a) No significant amount of hazardous materials will be used for the project. Any hazardous materials used at the project site must comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*.
  - b) No significant amount of hazardous materials will be used for the project. The project does not expect to experience any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
  - c) As proposed, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
  - d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there will be no impact from hazardous materials.

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

- e) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and this project is located within two miles of a public airport. The project has been reviewed based on the applicable policies of the Cameron Park Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) Overflight Safety Zone 3. The CLUP identifies that multi-family residential development as being compatible within the Safety Zone 3. By processing a PD application, the density of six units are considered compatible based on the location of the project outside of the flight path and the existence of similarly developed parcels adjacent to the project site. Airport noise contours of the CLUP do not affect this project. As with all projects located within the CLUP influence area, an Avigation and Noise Easement will be recorded regardless of the location of a site located within the least sensitive areas of the CLUP. Effects within this section will remain less than significant with the approval of this project.
- f) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights in the vicinity of the project site.
- g) This project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. This project has been reviewed and considers the location of the nearest fire station, as well as the road circulation that serves the site and the availability of fire hydrants that will be installed to help with fire suppression. The County’s Emergency Response Plan incorporates elements of the emergency response and evacuation procedures and includes reference to fire safety and circulation, as well as applicable contact and safety procedures linked to state and federal agencies responsible for emergency preparedness and response. The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) is responsible for maintaining the El Dorado County Emergency Management Policy and the County Sheriff’s Office is responsible for operating the County’s Office of Emergency Service (OES) for the entire County. The main El Dorado County Sheriff’s Office is located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.
- h) The Cameron Park Fire Department reviewed the project and will require the installation of three (3) fire hydrants within 150-feet of the building. Other conditions for approval have also been added for necessary fire safe improvements. This project shall install a looped water system on-site because of the pressure that will be necessary for fire flow. In lieu of a looped water system, the Cameron Park Fire Department and El Dorado Irrigation District can approve an upgrade to the existing water line to meet minimum fire flow and water delivery standards. With the installation of a water delivery system to provide adequate fire flow protection for the project, this project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area.

**FINDING:** The site is located within the least sensitive area of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Cameron Park Airport Overflight area referenced as Safety Zone 3. A multi-family six unit residential project within Safety Zone 3 is appropriate for this site and can be considered with the PD process. As with all projects, an effective fire flow delivery system will be installed at for this project to limit the potential of an adverse effect from wildland fire impacts. For the ‘Hazards and Hazardous Materials’ category, the project proposes a less than significant impact. This project will not expose people or property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and/or will not expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) Any grading and improvement plans required by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) shall be prepared to conform to County of El Dorado *Design and Improvement Standards Manual*, the *Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, the *Drainage Manual*, and the *Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance*. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained within the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be achieved during grading and improvement activities. On- and off-site facilities must be designed to County standards and must meet the policies of the ordinance. In particular, should development include installation of permanent storm drains or erosion control measures then project specific design measures must be incorporated to meet County standards in order to control, reduce, and/or eliminate off-site or downstream run-off and sedimentation.
  - b) There is no evidence that the project will substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. El Dorado County Environmental Management reviewed an El Dorado Irrigation Facilities Improvement Letter (FIL) submitted by the applicant. The FIL identifies that an adequate, safe, and reliable water source is available for this project through connection to the public water system. The six unit project must connect to the existing 8-inch water line located within Estepa Drive and must create either an on-site looped water system or suitable system to be reviewed and designed to meet the EID and Fire Department standards prior to its installation. The water delivery system will provide the proper fire flow for this project.
  - c) There is no evidence that the grading or any ground disturbance associated with the project will substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on- or off-site. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* identifies specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply to this project.
  - d/e) Compliance with the standards and requirements that are contained within *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* will limit potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site, and will limit erosion and siltation to a less than significant level.
  - f) The project will not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. Stormwater and sediment control measures outlined by the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during any grading or improvement activities. Such measures shall be incorporated into any grading and improvement plan. Measures addressing permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control are required to be implemented during grading and improvement activities for this project.
  - g/h) The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0725C, December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain.
  - i) The site is not located downstream from any dam and is not located in any area protected by levees. The project site is located west of the Cameron Park Lake and because this project is situated at a much higher elevation than the lake, effects of hazards associated to dams and/or levee system failures is not likely to impact this project. The Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) maps designate this site as Flood Zone Category C which allows development of residential uses at this location and within the Category C designation.
  - j) There is no potential for impacts from seiche or tsunami, or from mudflow at this site.

**FINDING:** Impacts in the ‘Hydrology and Water Quality’ category will be less than significant for this project.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
  - Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
  - Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
  - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
  - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a) The project will not create any physical divisions of an established community. The project will enhance the community by providing an appropriate multi-family infill project on a vacant lot within an urbanizing community. This project provides adequate density that fits with the surrounding pattern of development. Overall, this project will contribute to the success of the neighborhood by providing appropriate development and a fitting site design.
- b) As proposed, the project is consistent with specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted 2004 El Dorado County General Plan. The project meets or exceeds all required development standards for the Limited Multi-Family Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD) zone and the Multi-family Residential (MFR) General Plan land use designation. The PD application considers appropriate density of six units within Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport Overflight area. The review of the project finds that this design is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and will not expose people to public health, safety, and/or welfare concerns. As designed, this project fits well within framework of the adopted General Plan as well as within the Cameron Park Community Region.
- c) As discussed in the ‘Biological Resources’ category in Section VI of this study, the request for a PD will have a less than significant effect on biological resources because of the location of the site and the mitigation measures included for the project.

**FINDING:** For the ‘Land Use Planning’ category, a less than significant impact is proposed by this project based on the mitigation measures outlined in the Biological Resources category IV. In addition, this project meets El Dorado County’s policies for development of a multi-family project within the CLUP. This multi-family project fits within the framework of the existing community and the policies established for a multi-family residential project located within the Cameron Park community.



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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- a) The project site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) as mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology and is not classified or affected by any Mineral Resource overlays of the El Dorado County General Plan.
- b) The western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2 contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves that have been identified and calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that this site does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value.

**FINDING:** No impacts to any known mineral resources or deposits will result with approval of this project. The project is found to have no impacts in the ‘Mineral Resources category.

<b>XI. NOISE.</b> <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		✓	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		✓	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓	

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

<b>XI. NOISE.</b> <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?			✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			✓

**Discussion:**

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

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

a/c) The project will not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The location of the project within the Cameron Park Airport Overflight area and outside of the noise contours of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) will not expose people to excess noise levels. All future residential development on this project must meet the general noise level and related performance standards established by Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 of the General Plan through the building permit review process.

b/d) The project is not located within the sensitive noise contours established for the Cameron Park Airport. People on this site or in close proximity to this site will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of the project. Any noise associated to project grading and improvement activities shall be limited and temporary with all related construction activities limited to 7 am to 5 pm weekdays, and 8 am and 5 pm on Saturdays. Construction will be prohibited on Sundays and holidays for this project.

e) This project is located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport. However, the site is located outside of the flight path and the noise contours established by the CLUP and will not be subjected to excessive noise from the facility. No mitigation is required and the multi-family development must meet the general noise level and related performance standards established by Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 of the General Plan.

f) The project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip and will not experience noise from a private airport.

**FINDING:** For the ‘Noise’ category, the project is not located within the noise contours of the Cameron Park Airport and is not subject to any special consideration for noise. Project related noise shall be temporary and all construction activities shall be limited to certain times and days of the week. There will be a less than significant impact for this category.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a) This project will have a minimal growth-inducing impact for the area. Constructing six rental apartment units on a vacant parcel will increase the population of the area by a small number. As with similar smaller-scale projects, this project will contribute to a full-range of development impact fees prior to the issuance of building permits. These fees will be collected to off-set costs associated to public facilities and public services and by doing so impacts in this category will be reduced to a less than significant level.
- b) There will be no displacement of housing stock with the construction of this project. This project proposes to add housing opportunities by providing six rental units where currently a vacant property exists.
- c) The site is a vacant infill parcel that will be developed with new multi-family rental units. There will be no displacement of people with the approval of this project. By approving this project, there is no need to create replacement housing elsewhere because this project will provide additional rental units for the community.

**FINDING:** The project will not displace any individuals or remove existing housing and will add to the available rental housing stock that is needed for the region. The project will have a less than significant increase in population by either directly or indirectly inducing a growth in population with the construction of six rental units. There will be no imbalances based on the limited population growth compared with the availability of community resources with this project. For the ‘Population and Housing’ section, the project proposes to have a less than significant level of impact.

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

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a) **Fire Protection:** The Cameron Park Community Service District via the Cameron Park Fire Department provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the district from meeting its response times for the project and will not impact the response time for the service area. Building Services shall review future requests for building permits to ensure that proper Fire Safe Standards for access, fire flow, and overall fire safety are included for the six unit multi-family residential project.
- b) **Police Protection:** The project site will be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. No specific minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. Providing six additional rental units will not significantly impact current police response times for the project or for the service area.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Rescue Union School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The PD application and materials were sent to the affected school district for review and comment. No comments or mitigation measures were received by the school district. The addition of six apartment units will have an incremental increase in student body and school impact fees will be collected during the building permit review phase in order to offset potential school enrollment impacts to a level that is less than significant.

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

- d) **Parks:** The project will add an incremental number of housing units and will create a negligible increase in the population and does not require developing new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method and procedures to account for required land and/or dedications of parklands. This section also identifies the in-lieu fee option available for residential projects. For this project, the PD includes a condition of approval requiring that in-lieu fees for park-impacts be assessed consistent with the procedures outlined by Section 16.12.090 during the processing of building permits.
- e) Other local services such as libraries will experience minor impacts. The impacts are expected to be incremental and shall be less than significant for the category.

**FINDING:** Adequate public services are available to serve the project and there is no potential for a significant direct or indirect impact due to the construction of six multi-family rental units. For the ‘Public Services’ category, the project proposes a less than significant impact.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
  - Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- a) Because the project proposes only six units, the impacts to the neighborhood and/or regional parks are considered less than significant. Based on the six multi-family units the project will not create a significant draw on area-wide neighborhood or regional park resources. For this project, in-lieu fees shall be assessed for park impacts and by doing so, there is no potential for a substantial physical deterioration of neighboring or regional recreational facilities.
  - b) The project does not propose any on-site recreational facilities and is not required to construct any new facilities or expand any existing recreation facilities with the request for a PD for this project.

**FINDING:** A less than significant impact to recreation and/or open space will result from the project. For the ‘Recreation’ category, the six unit multi-family residential project will have a less than significant impact.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
  - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
  - Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.
- a) The County’s Department of Transportation determined that this project will not generate a significant level of trips to require a traffic study and/or any mitigation. Approval of this PD application will require traffic impact fees to be paid during the building plan review phase based on project related trip generation for six units. The development of this project will not create an excess load or capacity on the surface streets in the area. The existing road network is capable of handling the expected added vehicular trips.
  - b) The County’s Department of Transportation determined that approval of the PD and the construction of a six-unit apartment project would not have a significant impact on the Level of Service (LOS) standards established by El Dorado County for roads or highways. The project shall be required to contribute traffic impact fees during the building permit review process to address the scope and added vehicular trips expected from the six units.
  - c) The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity.

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

- d) The area is developed with exiting single- or multi-family residential uses. The project proposes minimal, if any, public road or right-of-way improvements and no design features exist for such improvements that would create hazards for the project or the area. A multi-disciplinary team reviewed the project and found that no such hazards exist, and the project is well suited for the site and the area.
- e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access to any potential residential structure. The site is in close proximity to Estepa Drive and emergency response can easily access the site from existing public roads and a new shared access driveway that will be installed to serve Estepa Lots 158 and Estepa Lots 159. On-site access drives and aisles are designed to meet County Fire Safe and Department of Transportation standards. The Cameron Park Fire Department reviewed the project and will require the installation of three (3) fire hydrants to be located no further than 150-feet away from the buildings. This installation along with the suitable site access will lower impacts in this category to a less than significant level.
- f) The project exceeds the minimum parking standards by providing a total of 18-off street parking space where 13-spaces are required. The site also accommodates handicap parking commensurate with project density.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**FINDING:** As discussed, this project proposes a less than significant impact in the ‘Transportation/Traffic’ category. The site provides suitable access for vehicular and emergency vehicles and provides adequate facilities for fire safety. The area provides an appropriate network of surface streets and a road network that can readily accommodate this project. Any increase in vehicular trips for this project will be addressed by the payment of traffic impact fees to be assessed during the building permit review phase for the six rental units.

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

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

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			✓

**Discussion:**

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
  - Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
  - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
  - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a) No significant wastewater discharge or surface run-off will result from the proposed PD.
  - b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required because of the project.
  - c) On-site storm water drainage facilities will be installed and maintained on the project site in order to control, reduce and/or eliminate run-off. All storm water drainage facilities shall be built to conform to *County of El Dorado Drainage Manual* standards and will be required to not exceed the existing site discharge levels.
  - d) The El Dorado Irrigation District has identified that an available water source and capacity exists within the public water system. A connection to the existing 8-inch public water line located within Estepa Drive will be required. A Facilities Improvement Letter (FIL) identified adequate capacity and referred to installation of an on-site looped water system because the project is required to maintain 2250 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch for a period of 2-hours. In lieu of a looped system, another suitable means to provide sufficient fire flow and pressure can be requested by the applicant to be reviewed and approved by the EID and the Cameron Park Fire Department prior to installation. The looped system and/or the acceptable alternative have been considered in the review for environmental impacts. It is expected that the alternative to a looped system will provide for an upgrade for the existing 8-inch water line located within Estepa Drive. Such an upgrade shall occur within the Estepa Drive right-of-way and the effects based on the improvement both on and-off-site, impacts for this project will remain below a level of significance in this section and/or the Biological Resources Category IV in this study.
  - e) The El Dorado Irrigation District has identified available capacity for wastewater disposal and treatment. The applicant will be required to connect to the existing 6-inch sewer line located within Estepa Drive.
  - f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of



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

43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.

- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the proposed lots will be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space is available at the site for solid waste collection.

**FINDING:** A less than significant impact will occur ‘Utilities and Service Systems’ category with the approval of this project. Adequate water and wastewater connections to the public system are available for this project.

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

**Discussion:**

- a) Without mitigation, there is a potential that this project will degrade the quality of the environment or reduce the number of a rare plant community. However, based on the mitigation outlined for this project that address special-status plants on-site, the effects in this category will be less than significant. Other environmental elements referenced within this section will not be affected. Refer to Biological Resources Category IV for mitigation procedures.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as “two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Based on the analysis in this environmental review, it has been determined that other projects in the area may have a cumulative effect. In particular, concurrent development of the adjacent Estepa Drive Lot 158 parcel will have a less than significant and minor cumulative effect on all categories of this review except for the Biological Resources Category IV, Land Use Planning Category IX, and Mandatory Findings of Significance Category XVII. Mitigation outlined in the Biological Resources category IV will reduce potential cumulative effects on the environment in this and the affected categories to a level that is less than significant.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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 Development Services Department, Planning Services in Placerville:

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report  
 Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report  
 Volume II - Response to Comment on DEIR  
 Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR  
 Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR  
 Volume V - Appendices

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume I - Goals, Objectives, and Policies

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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.)

Botanical Survey, Estepa Projects PD06-0003 and PD06-0004, Cameron Park, CA November 8, 2006. Sycamore Environmental Consultants.

Cultural Resources Study of Estepa Drive Project Lot 158, Lot 159, Lot 160, and Lot 163 APNs 082-531-20 thru 22 and 082-543-03, Cameron Park, CA, November 2004. Historic Resource Associates.