



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Bel Air Market Expansion (Z06-0042/PD06-0027/DR90-0031R)

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

Contact Person: Rommel Pabalinas, Senior Planner

Phone Number: (916) 358-3638

Property Owner's Name and Address: Best/SCV Cameron Park c/o Best Properties
2580 Sierra Blvd, Suite E Sacramento, CA 95825

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Rauschenbach Marvelli Becker Architects
c/o Mark Marvelli
2580 Watt Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825

Project Agent's Name and Address: Same as applicant

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Same as applicant

Project Location: Located within the Goldorado Shopping Center, south of Palmer Drive east of Cameron Park Drive, and north of U.S. Highway 50, in the Cameron Park area.

Assessor's Parcel No: 083-456-10

Zoning: Commercial (C)

Section: 2 & 3 **T:** 9N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: Commercial (C)

Description of Project:

Background

Goldorado Shopping Center was conditionally approved under Design Review DR90-0031 on March 14, 1991. The shopping center consists of various commercial uses ranging from major anchor commercial tenants (Bel Air and Longs Drug store), to various restaurants, shops, boutiques and banks. On March 19, 1997, a staff level revision to the approved design review (DR90-0031S) was approved for a minor expansion (1,200 square feet) to the front portion of the store.

Project Proposal

The project consists of the following:

1) Design Review Revision DR90-0031R: The proposed revision include a 9,777 square feet expansion of the existing Bel Air Market from 50,345 square feet to 60, 122 square feet, and a minor modification of the front elevation of the store. The expansion consists of areas in the front and rear mezzanine (storage/mechanical) rooms and offices totaling 1,800 square feet. The expansion to the ground floor area is to be 7,977 square feet and would include areas for coolers, freezers and storage. The existing internal sales area would be reconfigured adding rows of shelving for products. The building expansion conforms to the setback requirement of the affected rear yard area of five feet.

A new depressed loading dock, measuring 30 feet x 80 feet, would be constructed, one loading dock would be removed, minor re-landscaping would occur in the rear of the building, and a retaining wall shall be constructed along the exterior wall of the expansion. The proposed project would require an additional 39 parking stalls for the entire shopping center. Currently, the center contains 639 spaces which exceed the required amount of 603. The proposed expansion would require four additional parking spaces. The applicant is proposing to re-stripe the parking lot to accommodate the parking spaces. (Exhibit D)

Modifications to the façade include rebuilding of the wooden trellis, renovation to gable feature, installation of a new automatic sliding door and aluminum framing, and replacement of various attached wall signs.

2) Rezone Z06-0042: Rezone of property from Commercial (C) to Commercial-Planned Development (C- PD) to establish a combination Planned Development (-PD) district with the underlying Commercial zoning for the subject property.

3) Planned Development Permit PD06-0027: A planned development for evaluating the excess in Floor-Area-Ratio (FAR) over the 0.25 maximum allowed required in General Plan Policy 2.2.1.5. The proposed expansion of the Bel Air Market would result in an increase of the entire floor area within the entire Goldorado Shopping Center (resulting gross building area of 160,687 square feet over 612,090 net square feet of the entire development); as a result the FAR is increased 0.24 to 0.26. The policy states that the 0.25 FAR may be exceeded if the project is analyzed through the PD process and that project impacts are avoided, mitigated to the same or greater extent than the 2004 General Plan EIR, or are found not to be substantially more severe than impacts analyzed in the 2004 General Plan EIR. A supplemental analysis of each impact has been provided by the applicant included as Attachment A.

Improvements

In addition to the construction of the expansion and façade modifications, the applicant proposes to re-stripe the parking lot to meet the required stall count for the project and the entire center. As a result of the expansion, the perimeter landscaping in the rear will be reconfigured affecting approximately seven ornamental trees, which shall be replaced by new ornamental trees. A retaining wall will be installed bordering the exterior wall of the expansion. Existing sewer and water infrastructures and services shall continue to be provided by El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Cameron Fire Protection District indicated that, given the expansion of the facility, the existing fire suppression system (i.e., hydrants) on site is adequate, thereby not necessitating any upgrade other than the internal system. Internal electrical and plumbing upgrades shall be verified during building permit process. There are no off-site improvements required for the project.

Agency Comments

The project was distributed for agency consultation on August 29 and December 1, 2006; a subsequent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), discussing various project comments and issues, was conducted with the applicant and responding agencies on October 9, 2006 and December 27, 2006. Comments are provided with this document as Attachment C.

Cameron Park is designated by the County as an area requiring a design review of various commercial, industrial, and multifamily projects to ensure quality architectural design, site layout, and safety. The reviewing and advisory body appointed in this area is the Cameron Park Design Review Committee (CPDRC). The CPDRC reviewed and recommended approval of the project on September 11, 2006 (Attachment C).

Project Site and Surrounding Property Information

Setting

The project site is within the Goldorado Shopping Center located south of Palmer Drive, east of Cameron Park Drive, and north of Highway 50. The site is developed with commercial anchor and in-line tenants with uses ranging from restaurants, grocery and drug stores, boutiques and banks. The center is served by an on-site parking, loading areas, and landscaping. The shopping center is accessed at four points off Palmer Drive and one at Cameron Park Drive (Exhibit A). The site is within Ecological Preserve Area 1 which is an area with potential occurrence for specific "rare" endemic plants (Pine Hill plants) based on the soil composition (serpentine or gabbroic soil type). However, the proposed expansion would occur on existing pavement and would not impact any undisturbed or undeveloped soil.

Site Information

Tables 1 and 2 details the specific land use information for the site and the surrounding properties.

Table 1. Project Site Land Use Information

	Goldorado Shopping Center	Project Site
General Plan Designation	Commercial	Commercial
Zoning and Overlay Designations	Commercial and Design Control Overlay	Commercial and Design Control Overlay
Current Use	Commercial	Commercial (Bel Air Store)
Size (in acres)	14.05	4.14
Rare Plant Mitigation Area	Mitigation Area 1	Mitigation Area 1
School District	Buckeye Union	Buckeye Union
Fire District	Cameron Park Fire District	Cameron Park Fire District
Water/Sewer District	El Dorado Irrigation District (EID)	El Dorado Irrigation District (EID)

Table 2. Surrounding Properties Land Use Information

	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation	Overlay Zoning Designation	Existing Use
North	Commercial	Commercial	Design Control (DC)	Commercial
East	Commercial	Commercial	Design Control (DC)	Commercial
South	Commercial	Commercial	Design Control (DC)	Commercial
West	Commercial	Commercial	Design Control (DC)	Commercial

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

1. El Dorado County Department of Transportation
2. El Dorado County Development Services (Building Division)
3. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District
4. Cameron Park Fire Protection 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.

	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: March 26, 2007

Printed Name: Rommel Pabalinas For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: March 26, 2007

Printed Name: Gina Hunter

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, 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.

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 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. U.S. Highway 50 from the eastern limits of the Forni Road/Placerville Drive interchange to South Lake Tahoe has been designated by Caltrans in April of 1985 as a State Scenic Highway. General Plan Policy 2.6.1.1 suggests the need for establishing standards and to preserve the scenic resources along U.S. 50.

- a- c. The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway or in an area identified as Scenic Resources. The proposed expansion and facade modifications would maintain the existing commercial use on the property and conform to the adjacent similar uses and designations. The project has been reviewed and approved by the Cameron Park Design Review Committee for architectural design. Therefore, the project would have no impact to scenic vista or visual character of the area.
- d. The proposed expansion to the rear of the building would include installation of wall lighting. Upgrades of the wall signs would also produce lighting. In both cases, the amount of light would predominantly be limited within the existing commercial center. Therefore, the impacts from light and glare from this proposed project are considered to be less than significant.

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 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-c. The proposed project is commercial in nature and is located on and surrounded by properties designated commercial. Therefore, the project would have no impacts on Agricultural resources.

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 nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, 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 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.

El Dorado County is within the area of Sacramento Region designated as Mountain Counties Air Basin. According to the Sacramento Regional Ozone Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP) this region is considered to be non-attainment with Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), 24-hour PM10, and Nitrous Oxide (NO_x) in accordance to federal and state standards. The County is in attainment of Carbon Monoxide (CO) and Sulfur (SO_x) and Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) for ambient air quality standards. General Plan Goal 6.7 details specific air quality policies involving project design, implementation of best management practices and promoting public awareness of air quality.

a-c) Air quality in El Dorado County is regulated by various local, state and federal government agencies. The County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) at the local level is responsible for ensuring air quality conditions in the County through comprehensive program of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation and promotion of understanding air quality issues. The strategy for clean air includes preparation of plans for attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning sources of air pollution, issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution, inspection of stationary sources of air pollution and response to complaints, monitoring of ambient air quality conditions. AQMD's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment: Determining Significance of Air Quality Impacts under California Environmental Quality Act* provides an outline for quantitative and qualitative analysis for the estimation of construction and operational emissions and mitigation measures to reduce impacts.

El Dorado County Environmental Management- Air Quality Management Division reviewed the project for conformance to AQMD's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* (Attachment B). Based on the type and scope of the project, the division reviewed the project based on initial project screening for NO_x, SO₂, ROG, and PM10 emissions during operational and construction stages of the project. The Division determined that the commercial expansion would be below the threshold of potentially significant effects for the type of development (Shopping Center @ 62,000 square feet). Additionally, the Division concluded that the project will have insignificant impacts to air quality subject to standardized District Rules 223 and 223-1 (Fugitive Dust Plan), 224 (Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials), 300 (Open Burnings), 215 (Architectural Coatings) and Heavy Equipment and Mobile Source Measures (Attachment B).

The applicant provided a supplemental air quality analysis further evaluating potential additional air quality impacts associated with expansion exceeding the of F.A.R threshold of .25 for commercial development. In the analysis, Sycamore Environmental Consultants concluded and confirmed the determination of the AQMD, stating the project would have less significant effect on air quality impacts to the AQMD standard measures incorporated into the project (Attachment A).

As discussed above, the project has been reviewed by the AQMD for potential air quality impacts and determined that the project poses less than significant impact subject to the District standards and measures. Therefore, the project anticipates less than significant impact.

- d) Sensitive receptors are identified as facilities that house or attract children, elderly, people with illnesses and others sensitive to effects of air pollutants. Examples of these facilities include hospitals, schools and convalescent homes. The project is within the vicinity of a potentially sensitive receptor (Eskaton Lodge at Cameron Park) located west of the project, north on Palmer Drive and east of Cameron Park Drive. This assisted living facility provides independence living with on-site nursing and medical needs for residents 65 years or older. AQMD's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* currently does not provide specific guideline regulating uses that may affect the sensitive receptor. However, California Environmental Protection Agency California Air Resources Board (CARB)'s *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (2005)* has developed siting standards for sensitive receptors with respect to specific land uses that may pose significant air quality effects (see Table 3 below).

Table 3. Siting Standards for Sensitive Receptors

Source Category	Advisory Recommendations
Freeways and High-Traffic Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day.
Distribution Centers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center (that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week). • Take into account the configuration of existing distribution centers and avoid locating residences and other new sensitive land uses near entry and exit points.
Rail Yards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a major service and maintenance rail yard. • Within one mile of a rail yard, consider possible siting limitations and mitigation approaches.
Ports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid siting of new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of ports in the most heavily impacted zones. Consult local air districts or the ARB on the status of pending analyses of health risks.
Refineries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid siting new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of petroleum refineries. Consult with local air districts and other local agencies to determine an appropriate separation.
Chrome Platers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a chrome plater.
Dry Cleaners Using Perchloroethylene	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of any dry cleaning operation. For operations with two or more machines, provide 500 feet. For operations with 3 or more machines, consult with the local air district. • Do not site new sensitive land uses in the same building with perc dry cleaning operations.
Gasoline Dispensing Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). A 50 foot separation is recommended for typical gas dispensing facilities.

Using the table above, the most related impact source to the receptor in proximity of the project is State Highway 50. As a result, this assisted living facility inherently has an existing elevated risk for exposure to emissions from the highway. In contrast, the proposed project is commercial in nature, within an existing shopping center, and is determined to have less than significant impact to air quality, as determined by and subject to AQMD standards. Therefore, impact to sensitive receptor would be considered less than significant.

e) *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* consider uses that cause detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public that may cause injury, health effects, and injury to business or property, to potentially have significant impacts resulting from odors. Table 3.1 of *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* below detail the common facilities that are known to produce odors that potentially could cause detriment, nuisance or annoyance to the public. These facilities are limited to industrial and waste disposal type of land uses. Commercial developments are not considered odor generating uses. Therefore, since the proposed project is commercial in nature, no odor impacts are anticipated.

Table 3.1 Common Types of Facilities Known to Produce Odors

Wastewater Treatment Plant	Chemical Manufacturing
Sanitary Landfill	Fiberglass Manufacturing
Transfer Station	Painting/Coating Operations (e.g., auto body shop)
Composting Facility	Food Processing Plant
Petroleum Refinery	Rendering Plant
Asphalt Batch Plant	Coffee Roaster

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 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-f. The Bel Air Market is located within the Goldorado Shopping center. There are no important biological resources or habitat exists on the property that would be disturbed on site. In preparation for the project

construction, minor grading, re-paving, and replanting of ornamental trees within the affected perimeter landscaping. Therefore, there would be no effect does not anticipate any impact to Biological Resources.

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. Bel Air Market is within an existing Goldorado shopping center developed approximately 15 years ago. The proposal includes an expansion of the footprint area at the rear of the existing building amounting to 7,977 square feet (approximately 235' x 30'). Submittal of construction plans (i.e. grading, improvement plans, building) shall be required for review and approval by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation and Development Services. Given the existing developed nature of the site, the project does not anticipate any impacts to cultural resources. However, standard construction condition, noted below, would be included on all of the construction plans to ensure protection of discovered human remains:

In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission.

There would be no impact to Cultural Resources.

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

Discussion:

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-e. There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults (e.g. Melones fault zone and east of the East Bear Mountains fault zone) have been mapped.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located.¹ The project site is commercially developed with existing pavement and supporting infrastructure and foundation underneath the existing building.

All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. Given the developed nature of the project site, the project may include minimal grading necessary for construction of the foundation and other improvements. Nevertheless, the project is required to submit construction plans

that may include a geotechnical report for review and consideration by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation and El Dorado Development Services-Building Division during the building permit process.

There would be no impact related to septic systems because the existing facility is served by El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). There would be no impacts to geologic resources.

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 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.- c Bel Air Market provides a variety of services and sale of consumer products and goods. Some of these products may include products containing chemicals that may be considered hazardous. The sale, distribution and consumption of these products are regulated by various Federal, State and local standards.

The proposed expansion includes areas for mechanical equipment, storage, condenser and boiler rooms. AQMD has imposed standard conditions of approval requiring securing of district permits prior to construction or installation of any new point source emissions. There are no schools within one (1) mile of the project site that would be impacted by any emissions. Therefore, the project anticipates less than significant impact.

- d.-h. The project site is not identified as a hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, therefore, the project does not anticipate any impact.

Cameron Park Airport, a public airport, is located approximately 1 ½ miles northwest of the project site. The project is outside of the airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

Bel Air is within the Goldorado Shopping Center which has five (5) access points, two (2) of which directly connects to the store off Palmer Drive. The developed site has adequate fire suppression system according to the Cameron Park Fire Protection District, which is located approximately one (1) mile away from the site. There would negligible or no disruption of emergency access to and from the proposed project. There would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.

The map of El Dorado County Fire Hazard Zones identifies the project site as being located in an area of moderate risk. Though located in an urbanized community of Cameron Park, the site is immediately surrounded by commercial land designations and uses. Therefore, there would be no impact from wild land fires.

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				X

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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?				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.

a & f. The project is within a developed shopping center served by an existing system of storm drainage, water and sewer, which will not be impacted by the proposal. Any interior structural, plumbing or electrical modifications and upgrades associated with the expansion shall be incorporated in subsequent building permit plans, subject to permitting review and determination by the County and other pertinent agencies.

The project is not within the vicinity of levee or dam or any body of water that would result to a seiche or tsunami.

Therefore, no project impacts are anticipated from or to these resources.

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 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-c. The project is an expansion and minor modification of the existing Bel Air Market. It would not divide, but would seek to provide better service to the established community of Cameron Park. The proposal would conform to the commercial land use designation of the property. Moreover, it would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan. The project would not have any impacts on existing land use.

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

a & b. The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

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	

XI. NOISE. <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?			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-f. In addition to the ambient noise level borne from the shopping center, vehicular noise exists from the contiguous Palmer and Cameron Park Drives and Highway 50. The project anticipates a short term increase in noise levels during construction, regulated by Noise policies in the General Plan which limits construction hours to 7 AM to 7 PM. Given its location, the noise will be primarily limited within and offset by noise from the commercial center, surrounding properties with commercial uses, and Highway 50.

In evaluating the potential noise effects associated with the expansion, the applicant provided a supplemental acoustical analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn and Associates. Specifically, the analysis was based on the General Plan Policy 6.5.1.1 where noise sensitive land uses are proposed in areas exposed to existing or projected exterior noise levels (transportation sources) exceeding the levels in Table 6.1 of the policy (see below) an acoustical analysis shall be required as part of an environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be included in the project design (Attachment A).

Land Use	Outdoor Activity Areas ¹ L _{dn} /CNEL, dB	Interior Spaces	
		L _{dn} /CNEL, dB	L _{eq} , dB ²
Residential	60 ³	45	--
Transient Lodging	60 ³	45	--
Hospitals, Nursing Homes	60 ³	45	--
Theaters, Auditoriums, Music Halls	--	--	35
Churches, Meeting Halls, Schools	60 ³	--	40
Office Buildings	--	--	45
Libraries, Museums	--	--	45
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	70	--	--

Notes:

¹ In Communities and Rural Centers, where the location of outdoor activity areas is not clearly defined, the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land use. For residential uses with front yards facing the identified noise source, an exterior noise level criterion of 65 dB L_{dn} shall be applied at the building facade, in addition to a 60 dB L_{dn} criterion at the outdoor activity area. In Rural Regions, an exterior noise level criterion of 60 dB L_{dn} shall be applied at a 100 foot radius from the residence unless it is within Platted Lands where the underlying land use designation is consistent with Community Region densities in which case the 65 dB L_{dn} may apply. The 100-foot radius applies to properties which are five acres and larger; the balance will fall under the property line requirement.

² As determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

³ Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB L_{dn}/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB L_{dn}/CNEL may be allowed provided that available exterior noise level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with this table.

Noise sensitive receptors (i.e. residential dwellings, nursing homes, hospitals) are land uses with indoor and/or outdoor activities that may be subject to stress or significant interference from noise. Industrial, commercial, and agricultural uses are not considered sensitive to ambient noise. Based on Table 6.1, exterior sound levels from transportation sources up to 60 dBA CNEL are compatible with noise sensitive land uses.

As further discussed in the Transportation/Traffic section below, the proposed expansion would result in increase of 378 daily vehicular trips. Acoustical calculations were conducted estimating the existing and the anticipated traffic noise level, at 75-feet from the centerlines of the roadway near the residences and assisted living facility along Palmer Drive. The analysis includes averaging of vehicular speed on Cameron Park and Palmer Drive and quantifying the mix and type of vehicles.

As determined, the increase by 378 vehicle trips would result in a vehicular traffic noise increase up to 0.1 dBA. It is considered that sound level variations of less than 3.0 dBA are not detectable by typical human ear. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to the ambient noise environment.

The project site is not within the airport land use plan. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no aircraft-related noise impacts. Construction noises are anticipated to be short term, operational noise would be contained within the building, and associated traffic related noise is considered insignificant. Therefore, the impacts would be considered less than significant.

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 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-c. The project is commercial in nature and seeks to enhance its customer service. The project would not impact the population count of Cameron Park.

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

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. The project is within the Cameron Park Fire Protection District. The proposed expansion requires a building permit subject to review and approval by the District for any internal upgrades of fire suppression; the District indicated that the existing project site suppression (i.e. fire hydrant system) would be adequate for the entire shopping center. The project site has five existing accesses of the contiguous public streets, which can be accessed during emergency situations. Therefore, the project anticipates less than significant impact to fire protection services.
- b.-e. No new or expanded law enforcement, school or park services would be required. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated. .

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
 - Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- a-b. The proposed project does not include any increase in population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

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	

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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.

As required by El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT), a Traffic Impact Analysis was conducted by Kimley-Horn Associates evaluating the potential environmental effects by the project to existing transportation infrastructure in the vicinity of the project using DOT *Traffic Impact Study Protocols and Procedures* (Attachment A). Specifically, the analysis of significant environmental impacts focused at intersections and its effects to the existing Level of Service (LOS). Project impacts are determined by comparing conditions with the proposed project to those without the project. Impacts to intersections are created when traffic from a project forces the LOS to all below a specific threshold or conditions at intersection operating at LOS F or worsened. General Plan TC-Xd states that LOS for County maintained roads and State Highways within the unincorporated area of the County shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Region. The project site is located within the Cameron Park Community Region.

The analysis evaluated intersections at Cameron Park and Palmer Drives, Cameron Park Drive @ US 50 west and east bound ramps, and three (3) driveway points (onto the project) along Palmer Drive. The number of vehicular trips borne by the projected was determined using the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation*. As detailed in Table 4 below, the project anticipates 378 new daily trips with 25 trips occurring during the PM peak.

Table 4. Proposed Project Trip Generation

ITE Land Use (Code)	Units (ksf)	Total Daily Trips	PM Peak-Hour				
			Trips	%	IN Trips	%	OUT Trips
Existing Shopping Center (820)	150.9	8,877	822	48%	395	52%	427
Proposed Shopping Center (820)	160.7	9,255	857	48%	411	52%	446
Subtotal New Trips		378	35		17		18
Pass-by Reduction (30%) ¹			-10		-5		-5
Net New External Trips:		378	25		12		13
<i>Source: Trip Generation, 7th Edition, ITE.</i> ¹ <i>Trip Generation Handbook, 2nd Editions, ITE.</i>							

Using the County's *Protocol*, the traffic analysis shall: a) review the project's consistency with the underlying land use designations and b) determine if the project magnitude is within the amount of development anticipated in the traffic study for the 2004 General Plan; if the project falls within the anticipated traffic under the 2004 General Plan, the Plan's analysis would serve as the basis for the project.

As determined, the commercial project is consistent with the land use designation (commercial) under the General Plan. Table 5 below details the applicable vehicular trip data for the project site (designated as Traffic Zone No. 164) under the 1998 General Plan data (similar site data is used as basis for the 2004 General Plan) and the projected trips by the year 2025. According to Table 4, the project anticipates a generation of 378 daily trips and 25 PM trips. The project is within the amount of development which was anticipated in the traffic study for the General Plan.

Table 5. Traffic Analysis Zone #164 Trips

Year	ADT	PM
1998	11,058	1,197
2025	14,546	1,498
<i>Allowable Change</i>	<i>3,488</i>	<i>301</i>
Project	378	25
Consistent with GP 2004?	Yes	Yes
<i>Source: Dowling Associates, Inc.</i>		

Based on the above criteria and the *County's Protocols*, the project would not trigger the requirement to be evaluated against the General Plan analysis for 2025. Therefore, the LOS analysis was conducted for the study of intersections for PM peak hour based on the following scenarios: Existing Conditions, Existing plus Proposed Conditions, Existing plus Approved Projects (2011) Conditions, and Existing plus Approved Projects (2011) plus Proposed Project Conditions. The following tables detail the results of the analysis.

Existing LOS				Existing and Existing Plus Proposed Project Levels			
Intersection	Traffic Control	PM Peak-Hour		Intersection	Traffic Control	PM Peak-Hour	
		Delay (Seconds)	LOS			Delay (Seconds)	LOS
Cameron Park Drive @ Palmer Drive	Signal	32.4	C	Cameron Park Drive @ Palmer Drive	Signal	32.4 / 33.1	C / C
Cameron Park Drive @ US-50 WB Ramp/Country Club Drive	Signal	26.6	C	Cameron Park Drive @ US-50 WB Ramp/Country Club Drive	Signal	26.6 / 27.5	C / C
Cameron Park Drive @ US-50 EB Ramps	Signal	20.7	C	Cameron Park Drive @ US-50 EB Ramps	Signal	20.7 / 21.2	C / C
Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (West)	TWSC*	38.1 (WB)	E	Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (West)	TWSC*	38.1 (WB) / 40.7 (WB)	E / E
Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (North)	TWSC*	15.0 (NB)	C	Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (North)	TWSC*	15.0 (NB) / 15.1 (NB)	C / C
Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (East)	TWSC*	14.0 (NB)	B	Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (East)	TWSC*	14.0 (NB) / 14.2 (NB)	B / B
* Control delay for worst minor approach (worst minor movement).				Results in this table are presented in Existing / Existing plus Proposed Project format.* Control delay for worst minor approach (worst minor movement).			

Existing Plus Approved Project (2011) Conditions				Existing Plus Approved Project (2011) Plus Proposed Project Conditions			
Intersection	Traffic Control	PM Peak-Hour		Intersection	Traffic Control	PM Peak-Hour	
		Delay (Seconds)	LOS			Delay (Seconds)	LOS
Cameron Park Drive @ Palmer Drive	Signal	16.2	B	Cameron Park Drive @ Palmer Drive	Signal	16.2 / 16.5	B / B
Cameron Park Drive @ US-50 WB Ramp/Country Club Drive	Signal	59.3	E	Cameron Park Drive @ US-50 WB Ramp/Country Club Drive	Signal	59.3 / 60.7	E / E
Cameron Park Drive @ US-50 EB Ramps	Signal	39.1	D	Cameron Park Drive @ US-50 EB Ramps	Signal	39.1 / 39.8	D / D
Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (West)	TWSC*	38.1 (WB)	E	Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (West)	TWSC*	38.1 (WB) / 40.7 (WB)	E / E
Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (North)	TWSC*	15.0 (NB)	C	Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (North)	TWSC*	15.0 (NB) / 15.1 (NB)	C / C
Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (East)	TWSC*	14.0 (NB)	B	Palmer Drive @ Site Driveway (East)	TWSC*	14.0 (NB) / 14.2 (NB)	B / B
* Control delay for worst minor approach (worst minor movement).				Results are in Existing plus Approved / Existing plus Approved plus Proposed Project format.* Control delay for worst minor approach (worst minor movement).			

The analysis concluded that the project *would not* cause intersections that are operating at acceptable levels of service without the project to fall below the previously existing operational threshold (LOS E) with the addition of the proposed project. Therefore, the associated project impacts would not result to substandard operations at the study intersections. DOT has imposed a standard condition requiring payment of applicable traffic impact fees at the time building permit is deemed complete.

Based on this similar analysis, given the relatively minimal vehicular trips triggered and in consistency with the threshold established by the General Plan, the excess in F.A.R does not create significant impacts at the transportation facilities analyzed for the project.

- a & b. Based on the above discussion, the implementation of the project would not result in substandard operation at the affected intersections in the vicinity of the project and is deemed consistent with the applicable General Plan policies and the *County's Protocol*. Therefore, the impacts would be considered less than significant.
- c.-e. The project is not within an airport safety zone and, therefore would not present an air traffic hazard. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There are no additional road infrastructures associated with the project. The project is located within an existing shopping center that has five (5) points of access that can be used for emergency purposes. The site is adequately provided with existing on-site parking. The site has existing pedestrian access and on-site pedestrian/bicycle circulation connecting with the proposed Class II Bike Lane along Palmer Drive. This connection with the Class II Bike Lane would facilitate continuity with adjacent project, schools, parks and other facilities. No Impact is anticipated

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	
h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.			X	

Discussion:

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

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

a-c. The proposed expansion and modification to an existing facility would not exceed waste water treatment system requirements and would not require construction of additional waste water or drainage system.

d-h. Goldorado Shopping Center is within the El Dorado Irrigation District's services for sewer and water. The developed site is also served by a storm drain system provided by El Dorado County. Internal plumbing systems upgrades shall be reviewed during building permit process subject to County and EID's approval. Power, telecommunication and waste disposal services currently exist and are anticipated to increase insignificantly. Impacts to these services and systems are considered less than significant.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:				
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. Implementation of the project would result in an expansion and minor modification of the Bel Air Market within the existing developed areas of the Goldorado Shopping Center.
- b-c. Based on the analysis provided and discussed above, the project would anticipate less than significant individual and cumulative environmental effects subject to the standards project conditions imposed on the project.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Supplemental Studies (Air Quality, Noise and Traffic Analyses)
- B. Agency Comments

EXHIBITS:

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. General Plan Land Use Map
- C. Zoning Map
- D. Project Plans (Overall and Detailed Site Plans, Preliminary Grading Plans, Overall and Detailed Floor Plans, Exterior Elevations)

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

El Dorado County 2004 General Plan
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 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
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.)