



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: PD05-0016 – Burnett Park LLC

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

Contact Person: Tim Chamberlain

Phone Number: (916) 358-3608

Property Owner’s Name and Address: Burnett Park LLC, P.O. Box 5650, El Dorado Hills, CA 95672

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

Project Agent’s Name and Address: James Losch, 2319 Sanford Court, Rescue, CA 95672

Project Engineer’s / Architect’s Name and Address: Patterson Development, 6610 Merchandise Way,
Diamond Springs, CA 95619

Project Location: North side of Estepa Lane, 200 feet east of the intersection with Cambridge Road in the Cameron Park area.

Assessor’s Parcel No: 082-543-03

Zoning: Limited Multifamily Residential District with Planned Development and Aviation overlays (R2/PD/AA)

Section: 33 **T:** 10N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: Multifamily Residential (MFR)

Description of Project: Development of a six unit multi-family residential development to include: one duplex and one fourplex each consisting of 2-story construction. The six units are comprised of 7,932 square feet of habitable floor area and 1,602 square feet of garage floor area. The project proposes seventeen (17) off-street parking spaces to include six (6) garage spaces, six (6) spaces in tandem with each garage, four (4) common parking spaces, and one (1) handicap space; and 6,850 square feet of common area open space with no common area amenities.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	R2/PD/AA	MFR	Undeveloped land
North:	R2/PD/AA	MFR	Apartments and town homes
East:	R2/PD/AA	MFR/PF	Apartments, town homes and undeveloped lands.
South:	R1/AA	HDR	Single Family Residential
West:	R1/AA	HDR	Single Family Residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site consists of 0.53-acres, with no site improvements. Predominate vegetation is annual grasses. No trees or shrubs are located on-site. The property is located at an average elevation of 1,285 feet above mean sea level. The average slope of the property is 12 percent. The project site is located within the Cameron Park Airport Safety Zone 3 and located in the Rare Plant Mitigation Zone 1.

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

1. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District: Fugitive Dust Plan required.
2. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Improvement Agreement, grading and encroachment permit.
3. El Dorado County Planning Services: Aviation and Noise Easement Agreement.
4. Cameron Park CSD: CC&R’s, architectural review and park impact fees required.

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
X	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality	X	Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems	X	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: April 20, 2007

Printed Name: Tim Chamberlain For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: April 20, 2007

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from a residential infill project on a 0.53-acre lot with road frontage improvements in the Cameron Park area.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The 0.53-acre project site is located at 3045 Estepa Lane, approximately 200 feet west of the intersection with Cambridge Road in the Cameron Park area. The project area lies at an elevation of approximately 1,285 feet above mean sea level. The surrounding properties contain multifamily and single-family residential units. To the east approximately 800-feet is the Cameron Park Lake, and approximately 2,450-feet to the east is the Cameron Park Airport.

Project Characteristics

This proposal is to construct 6 apartment units on 0.53-acre property with a Planned Development application. The units would consist of one two story duplex and one two story four-plex apartment complex. Onsite parking and landscaping would be part of the overall site improvements. The new encroachment onto Estepa Lane would meet all requirements requested by the Cameron Park CSD Fire Department and the El Dorado County Department of Transportation.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the site is provided by an existing paved road. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation would require street frontage improvements including sidewalk. Parking would be provided on site by surface and apartment unit garages. The project has been conditioned to comply with these requirements. Please see Item XV in the Initial Study checklist for a discussion of traffic impacts.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site would be serviced by public water and sewer systems. Power utilities and telephone service have been extended to the site by local utility companies.

3. Population

The proposed residential units would not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of off site and on site road improvements including grading. Construction access to the site would be from Estepa Lane via Cambridge Road.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading and encroachment from the Department of Transportation and obtain an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan from the Air Quality Management District.

Project Schedule and Approvals

This Initial Study is being circulated for public and agency review for a 30-day period. Written comments on the Initial Study should be submitted to the project planner indicated in the Summary section, above.

Following the close of the written comment period, the Initial Study will be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency will also determine whether to approve the project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

A 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. The project is for six two story apartment complexes clustered as a duplex and a four-plex arraignment on 0.53-acres. Surrounding the property are existing apartments and single-family residential units located in an area that is zoned for single family and multifamily residential units.

- a. **Scenic Vista.** The project site is located on the north side of Estepa Lane approximately 200 feet west of Cambridge Road. The property is devoid of any tree canopy, however, sits above Estepa Lane approximately 4-feet with an average slope of 12%. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and the site does not provide a scenic vista. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.¹ There would be no impact as a result of the Planned Development.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site.²
- c. **Visual Character.** The proposed project will be designed to be architecturally compatible with the surrounding apartments and residential units in the vicinity. The property is not readily visible from an off-site public view (Cambridge Road).
- d. **Light and Glare.** The project proposes to utilize individual residential unit entry door light fixtures and potentially internally illuminated numerical address light fixture for each unit. No additional outdoor light fixtures are proposed. There will be no additional light and glare produced from the proposed project. All proposed lighting shall adhere to El Dorado County lighting standards requiring all outdoor lighting to be shielded as to direct the source of light downward and focus onto the property or directly reflect upon any adjacent properties or roadways. Therefore, the impacts of existing and future light and glare as seen from Estepa Lane would be less than significant.

¹ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1.

² California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>).

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

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

Discussion:

A 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. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not considered to be “Farming” – it is considered Urban and Built Up Land. Based upon the soil classification, the parcel is ill suited for cultivated agricultural due to the thin mantle of soil material. The Planned Development will not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses and there would be no loss of productive agricultural land or conflict with agricultural uses.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The property is not located within a Williamson Act Contract and the project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The site is classified as Urban and Built-up land under the Farmland Mapping Program.

Finding

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. For this “Agriculture” category, there would be no impact.

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

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.

a-c.

Air Quality Plan and Standards. Improvements to the on-site and off-site road improvements could generate short-term fugitive dust and exhaust from construction equipment. Short-term air quality impacts result from emissions generated by construction related equipment. Emissions of NO_x and ROG from construction equipment are the primary pollutants. However, short-term thresholds for these would most likely not exceed 82 pounds per day as identified as a significant threshold for air quality impacts for El Dorado County and would require conformance to District Rule 523. Construction fugitive dust emissions would be considered not significant and estimation of fugitive dust emissions would not be required if complete mitigation is undertaken as part of the project (or mandatory condition of the project) in compliance with the requirements of Rule 403 of the South Coast AQMD, such that there would be no visible dust beyond the boundaries of the project. (EDC APCD-CEQA Guide, 1st Ed, 2002) In addition, the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District would require road construction activities to be in conformance with District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2 for fugitive dust prevention and track out prevention as well as Rule 300 for open burning if applicable. Prior to any road grading and road improvements, an approved Fugitive Dust Plan would be required prior to issuance of a grading permit. If road improvements meet the requirements of the District Rules, the grading and road improvements would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash or odors.

The proposed project would create additional vehicle traffic and emissions, however, the 2004 General Plan EIR addressed the County’s growth by 2025 and factored in vehicle emissions including in-fill projects. The average daily vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would be approximately 60 trips based on the national average trip generation rates of 10 trips per dwelling unit. Vehicle emissions are regulated by various local, state, and federal

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

government agencies. At the local level the Air Quality District adopts and enforces regulations to control stationary source emissions as well as the regional ozone problem in conjunction with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). At the state level, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) sets emission standards for motor vehicles and oversees the actions of all the Air Districts in the state in regard to the control of stationary-source emissions. Together, the air district and CARB have the responsibility for attaining and maintaining the California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) and national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The Air Districts and CARB work jointly with EPA on the federal level to develop and implement the State Implementation Plan (SIP), which is designed to achieve and maintain the NAAQS. EPA has the authority under federal law to step in if the state authorities do not meet their obligation in this regard. Other agencies including the Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG) and the County of Department of Transportation (DOT) also join in efforts to improve air quality through a variety of programs. Based on Table 5.11-6, 2004 General Plan EIR, Air Quality, indicate vehicle emissions and air quality are improving from 1980 to 2010. (El Dorado County General Plan EIR, May 2003, Section 5.11-9-18). Therefore, short-term and long-term air quality impacts would be less than significant.

d-e.

Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors. Due to the multi-family and single family residential density in the area, sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, care facilities are not located within the immediate vicinity. Common types of facilities known to produce odors include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfill, transfer station, asphalt batch plant and manufacturing plants. The proposed project would not generate or produce objectionable odors. Short-term heavy equipment emissions generated by the on-site and off-site road improvements would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash or odors based upon an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan conforming to District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2 and Rule 300 as applicable. The proposed road improvement work would not include any features that would be a source of substantial pollutant emissions that could affect sensitive receptors or generate objectionable odors. Therefore, long-term impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the proposed project would not impact air quality. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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	

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			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/b) The project would 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 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 would 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 would identify whether these species exist 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. With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below, impacts on special-status plants would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

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

MITIGATION MEASURES

1) 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. This study shall be submitted to Planning Services for review prior to issuance of a grading permit.

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 the development would not impact 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 urbanized neighborhood, the project would 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 would 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 would 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
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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:

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-d. A cultural resource study was prepared for the proposed project in November 2004.³ The survey report concluded that no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features or artifacts were found, nor any significant historic buildings, structures or objects discovered.

Although no sites have been identified within the project area, it is possible that historic activities have obscured evidence of them. If artifacts or unusual amounts of stone bone or shell should be uncovered during grading activities, work should be halted and a qualified archeologist should be consulted for an on-site evaluation. If the bone appears to be human, California law mandates that the El Dorado County Coroner be contacted. If the bone is likely to be Native American in origin, the coroner must contact the Native Heritage Commission. Although there is a low probability of finding human remains or other cultural resources, there is always a possibility; therefore project conditions will be incorporated to reduce impact to a less than significant level.

Finding

Based upon the archaeological survey report prepared for the site, it is determined that all feasible conditions have been incorporated in the project to reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance. For this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

Cultural Resources Study of Estepa Drive Project, Lot 158, 159, 160, 163, By: Dana E. Supernowicz, November, 2004.

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

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

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 ground shaking, 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

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

- 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. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.⁴ No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.⁵ There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are two known faults within the project vicinity; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated in the middle of the West and East Bear Mountain Fault zone. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.⁶

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 50 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 50 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey.⁷ While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

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.⁸ The project site is relatively flat and based upon the soil survey and metamorphic rock comprising the site, there would be no risk of landslide. There would be no impact.⁹

The proposed project would not include uses that would pose any unusual risk of environmental damage either through the use of hazardous materials or processes or through structural design that could be subject to groundshaking hazard. There would be no significant impacts that could not be mitigated through proper building design, as enforced through the County building permit process, which requires compliance with the Uniform Building Code, as modified for California seismic conditions. There would be no impact.

⁴ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)* May 2003, p.5.9-29.

⁵ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

⁶ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)*, May 2003, p.5.9-5.

⁷ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002.* (<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha>)

⁸ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)*, May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.

⁹ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)*, May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.

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

b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** 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. During site grading and construction of any onsite and off site road improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

The project includes on-site and off-site road improvements to meet fire safe standards as addressed in the “Design and Improvement Standards Manual. Access to the site is provided from Estepa Lane a paved road serving the proposed six unit apartments on the property.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the proposed project and has placed conditions of approvals onto the proposed project. These condition requirements include a final drainage study that shall be incorporated into the improvements plans, grading plans that incorporate erosion control measures, and a soils and geologic hazards report. Best Management Practices pursuant to Department of Transportation requirements shall be followed during grading and construction to insure that Impacts to soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

d. **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The project site has been classified per the USDA Soil Survey as Rescue extremely stony sandy loam, 3 to 50 % slopes, eroded. This soil has stones on 3 to 15 % of its surface. The thickness of the surface layer is only 3 to 8 inches. Including in mapping are small areas of Metamorphic rock and Serpentine rock land. Surface runoff is medium to rapid, and the erosion hazard is moderate to high. There would be no significant impacts that could not be mitigated through proper building design, as enforced through the County building permit process, which requires compliance with the Uniform Building Code. There would be no impact.

e. Waste water would be conveyed off the property through EID connections. No on-site septic systems are proposed. There would be no impact.

Finding

No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the proposed Planned Development either directly or indirectly. For this “Geology and Soils” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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				X

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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?			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. **Hazardous Substances.** No hazardous substances are involved with the Planned Development. Temporary use of heavy equipment for road improvements will be required. A diesel fuel storage tank may be located on site for the heavy equipment. The potential storage and transport of diesel fuel in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment would require an approved hazardous material business plan issued from the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. Said hazardous material business plan would identify potential impacts to the environment and require mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Based on the amount of road improvements required and the duration of heavy equipment on site and off site to complete the road improvements, and that fuel storage will most likely not occur, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant with an approved hazardous materials business plan.

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

- b. **Creation of Hazards.** The Planned Development will not create any foreseeable new hazards or hazardous materials.
- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.¹⁰ There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is located within in Safety Zone 3 of the Cameron Park Airport. The proposed project is located approximately 2,450 feet west of the Cameron Park Airport and is found to be consistent with the policies of the Cameron Park Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** Cameron Park Airport is the closest airport to the project site and no other recognized private airstrips are in the vicinity. There would be no impact.
- g. **Emergency Response Plan.** The parcel is accessed via Estepa Lane approximately 200 feet west of Cambridge Road in the Cameron Park Area. Fire response and fire safety issues have been reviewed by the Cameron Park Fire Department and require a fire flow of 2,250 gallons per minute for a two-hour duration with a 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure. Cameron Park Fire Department has two fire stations. The main fire station is located approximately 3 miles away from the project site. The Cameron Park Fire Department serves and 8 square mile area with an average response time of 8 minutes 90 percent of the time for a population of 18,800. According to federal and state regulations and guidelines for response time goals, established response-time goals for the west slope. In urban areas, response time should be 10 minutes 90% of the time. The project site is well within the parameters for response time identified in the 2004 General Plan EIR. Furthermore, the Fire Department has placed conditions of approval for the proposed project. There would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.
- h. **Fire Hazards.** The project site located in an area classified as having a moderate fire hazard.¹¹ The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan Policy 6.2.2.2 requires development to meet defensible space requirements adhere to fire code building requirements. The project would require three hydrants to provide the required fire flow. The one existing on-site hydrant can be used to meet a portion of this requirement and two new hydrants will be required. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

Finding

No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the Planned Development either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

¹⁰ California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List, accessed September 23, 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004.

¹¹ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.8-4.

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?		X	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		X	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		X	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X
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 storm water 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 & f. **Water Quality Standards.** The project would not involve disturbance to water bodies and would require public water service, and would therefore have no effect on surface or groundwater quantity or quality. The proposed project would generate waste water; however, would be connected to a public waster water treatment facility. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Groundwater.** There would be no increased demand on groundwater resources as a result of the proposed project. There would be no impact.
- c. **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit storm water runoff and discharge from a site. The Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed project and finds that an drainage and erosion control plan is warranted for the proposed project. Appropriate runoff controls such as berms, storm gates, detention basins, overflow collection areas, filtration systems, and sediment traps shall be implemented to control siltation, and the potential discharge of pollutants into drainages. The drainage and erosion control measures addressed in the erosion control plan would reduce erosion to less than significant.
- d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** The proposed project would modify the existing drainage pattern on the property. Currently, the on site drainage includes infiltration and water runoff to a dirt lined culvert along Estepa Drive. A grading and drainage plan would need to be submitted and approved prior to site development. The drainage plans shall demonstrate that future post development storm water discharge levels from the project would remain at existing storm water discharge levels and detention basins would be permanently maintained. The drainage plan shall adhere to the County’s drainage manual. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Storm Water Run-off.** The proposed project would require an approved drainage plan. The plan shall address storm drainage during construction and proposed Best Management Practices (BMP’s) to reduce erosion and alter quality degradation. All on-site drainage facilities shall be constructed using El Dorado County Minimum Construction Site Storm Water Management Practices and to the satisfaction of El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT). BMP’s shall be implemented throughout the construction process and permanent BMP’s shall be included in the grading plan. The grading plan shall be submitted to the Resource Conservation District (RCD) and DOT for recommendations in reducing or mitigating erosion and sediment from the project site. The County would not issue building permits until DOT approves the final grading and erosion control plans and the grading is completed. Revegetaion would be required as part of the grading activities and the establishment of project site approved landscaping would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.
- g, h, & i. **Flooding.** The level project site is situated in an area of undulating terrain at an elevation of approximately 1,285 feet above sea level. There are no 100-year flood hazard areas at or adjacent to the site other than the Cameron Park Lake. The site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is not in an area subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. There would be no impact.
- FIRM.** The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0725 C, last updated December, 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

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

Finding

No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the Planned Development either directly or indirectly. For this “Hydrology” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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. **Established Community.** The project site is surrounded by single and multi-family residential dwelling units. The project site is located within a community region and serviced by Cameron Park Community Services District. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact.
- b. **Land Use Plan.** The parcel is designated Multifamily Residential (MFR and zoned for Limited Multifamily Residential with Planned Development and Airport Safety District overlay (R2-PD-AA). Both MFR and R2 allow single family and multifamily residential uses. The proposed project is consistent with the designated Land Use and zoning designations for multifamily residential. There would be no impact.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is not located in an ecological preserve mitigation area established for the Pine Hill rare plants or red-legged frog core area. There would be no impact.

Finding

The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan policies for residential and agricultural uses. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning

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

designations for use of the property. No significant impacts are expected. For this “Land Use” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present.¹² The project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.¹³ There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect existing uses. There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the proposed Planned Development either directly or indirectly. For this “Mineral Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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	

¹² California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.

¹³ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.

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

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X

Discussion:

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

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

a-d. **Noise Standards.** The on-site construction activities and off-site road improvements would generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment, trucks, bulldozer) at a potentially significant level (greater than 55 dB L_{eq} and 75 dB L_{max} between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 GP table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in community regions-construction noise). Construction operations for on-site and off-site improvements would require adherence to construction hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7 p.m. during weekdays and would require the heavy construction equipment to install the latest noise reduction technologies available. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant. The long-term noise impacts would be related to current vehicle traffic along Estepa Lane which would be under the maximum noise level thresholds in the 2004 General Plan table 6-1 of 60 dB L_{dn} /CNEL or less. The road improvement activities would occur weekdays during daylight hours and would not involve extensive use of heavy equipment that would be a substantial source of noise or vibration at the residence or adjacent residences. No known changes in traffic-generated noise levels along Estepa Lane will occur. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

e & f. **Airport Noise.** The project site is located within the Cameron Park Airport land use plan. The project site is located approximately 1,850-feet west of the 55-60 CNEL noise contour line. Small general aviation aircraft fly over the Cameron Park area on a regular basis, however, typically follow a route that lines up with the runway landing area. The project site is approximately a half mile away from the airport and that aircraft noise from take off and landings are significantly reduced based on the distance from the point source and existing vegetation such as tree canopy in the vicinity that help shield the noise as well as topography and residential buildings in the area. However, interior noise levels would be required to attain 45 L_{dn} /CNEL, dB to be consistent with the maximum allowable noise exposure for transportation noise sources addressed in the 2004 General Plan. An Avigation and Noise Easement Agreement would be required to be recorded prior to building occupancy. Airport noise impacts would be less than significant.

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

Finding

No impacts to noise are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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. **Population Growth.** The project site is in an area zoned for residential use, utility services are available at the project site. The site is accessed directly off Estepa Drive, water and sewer service is available. No housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required. The proposed project would create six residential units on a 0.53 acre parcel and is found consistent with the provisions in the Multifamily residential land use designation. There would be no impact.

Finding

The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other government services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 project site is within the Cameron Park Fire District. The closest fire station is located approximately 3 miles away from the project site. The 2004 General Plan EIR indicated that Cameron Park Fire Department has 18 paid fire fighters and 15 volunteers with a staffing ratio of 1 fire fighter per 1,000 residents. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection.** No new or expanded law enforcement services would be required. There would be no significant impact.

c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the Cameron Park CSD, and is therefore subjected to fees in lieu of land dedication for parks. There are no components of the proposed project that would include any permanent population-related increases that would substantially contribute to increased demand on schools, parks, or other governmental services that could, in turn, result in the need for new or expanded facilities. There would be no impact.

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

Finding

As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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. **Parks and Recreation.** The proposed project would require park in lieu fees instead of lands dedicated for parks and recreation purposes. The proposed project will not include any increase in permanent population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. There would be no impact.

Finding

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Recreation” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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	
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

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

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

a&b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** Estepa Lane is not listed in the 2004 General Plan for roads and highways needing level of service improvements. General Plan Policy TC-Xd of the Transportation and Circulation Element addresses Level of Service (LOS) thresholds. For County maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in Community Regions. Policy TC-Xe: Worsen is defined as a 2% increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or the addition of 100 or more daily trips, or the addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour. The proposed project consists of 6 residential units. Typical Average Daily Trips (ADT’s) for urbanized single family residential are 10 vehicle trips per unit with lower ADT’s or 8.3 on average in rural outlying areas. Based upon 10 trips per residential unit multiplied by 6 units equates to 60 vehicle trips per day on average. DOT has concluded that the proposed project would not change current vehicle trip rates and would not measurably affect traffic volumes or levels of service on a permanent basis such that County standards would be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project site is within an airport safety zone. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.

d. **Hazards.** The project site is readily accessible from Estepa Lane. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access.** The project site receives access from Estepa Lane which connects to Cambridge Road. A loop road system exists in which alternative routes are available. Off-site road improvements are being requested to increase Estepa Lane road width pursuant to El Dorado County’s Design and Improvement Standards Manual 101B and fire safe regulations and are being placed upon the conditions of approvals prior to map recording. Based upon the required road improvements there would be no disruption of emergency access to and from the existing residence or those in surrounding parcels. There would be no impact.

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

- f. **Parking.** On-site parking would be provided for each unit including guest parking. There would be no impact.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected because such features are not present at or adjacent to the project site. There would be no impact.

Finding

As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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;

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

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

a. **Wastewater.** There exists a 6-inch sewer line in Estepa Lane and has adequate capacity to service the project. The project would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. Storm water runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). There would be no impact.

b., d., e. **New Facilities.** An 8-inch water line exists in Estepa Lane. A looped water line extension from the existing 8-inch water line in Estepa Lane will be required to meet minimum fire flows for the project. There would be no impact.

c. **Storm Water Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation, the project would be required to receive an approved drainage plan consistent with the provisions of the drainage manual. Potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

f & g. **Solid Waste.** An increase of solid waste generated from the proposed residential units will occur. 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 waste materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.

County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. For residential development curb-side trash and pick-up of recyclable materials is provided by a local provider contracting to the property owner for the service. For multi-family, commercial, and industrial development some on-site separation of materials is required and areas are required to be set aside for the storage of solid waste in accordance with Ordinance No. 4319. Impacts would be less than significant.

h. **Power.** Power and telephone facilities are currently in place and will be utilized at the project site. No further expansion of power anticipated from project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

No significant utility and service system impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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. As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have no significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources as mitigated. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be no significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV).
- b. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts related to 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, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant. The project's contribution to changes in the visual environment has been mitigated to less-than-significant levels through project design. The cumulative contribution to the view shed would not be considerable.
- c. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people 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 the El Dorado County Planning Department in Placerville.

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.)