



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: AZ06-002, DR06-008, PD07-005/ Rite Aid at Cameron Ranch

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

Contact Person: Mel Pabalinas

Phone Number: 916-358-3638

Property Owner's Name and Address:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) APN 102-110-01,-11
Celtic Properties (c/o Chip Philbin)
4561 Oxbow Ridge Place
Fair Oaks, CA 95628 | 2) APN 102-110-13
Starbuck Road 56, LLC
730 Alhambra Blvd Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95816 |
|--|---|

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Same as Property Owner (#1)

Project Agent's Name and Address: Gene Thorne & Assoc.; 3025 Alhambra Drive, Suite A Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:

- 1) Engineer- Same As Project Agent
- 2) Architect- RHL Design Group
3001 Douglas Blvd. Suite 210
Roseville, CA 95661

Project Location: Northwest corner of Green Valley Road and Starbuck Road

Assessor's Parcel Nos: 102-110-01, 11, 13

General Plan Designation: APN 102-110-13 Multi-Family Residential (MFR); 102-110-01, 11 Commercial (C)

Zoning: APN: 102-110-01 and 11: Commercial (C) and Planned Development (PD), Design Corridor (DC) and Airport Safety District (AA) overlays
APN 102-110-13: Multifamily (R2), Design Corridor (DC) and Airport Safety District (AA) overlays

Sections: 21 and 28, **T:** 10N, **R:** 9E

Description of Project:

Background

Under Boundary Line Adjustment application BLA05-112, an equivalent exchange of land in the amount of .22-acres between APN 102-110-11 and 102-110-13 was approved on June 6, 2006 and recorded on December 20, 2006 (document number 2006 87263). The boundary adjustment was necessary in order to create a regular shape lot. The .22- acre portion transferred and merged with APN 102-110-11 and maintained a General Plan Land Use Designation of Multifamily Residential, Zoning Designations of Multifamily (R2), and Zoning Overlay districts which include Planned Development (-PD), Design Corridor (-DC) and Airport Safety (-AA). The .22-acre portion transferred and merged to APN 102-110-13 maintained the General Plan Designation of Commercial, Zoning Designations Commercial (C) and Zoning Overlay districts including -PD, -DC and -AA. Exhibit D (Assessor's Parcel Map) depicts the subject parcels in their original configuration prior to the Boundary Line Adjustment. Exhibit E (recorded Boundary Line Adjustment Map) shows the resulting parcels after the adjustment. Parcel 1, which is yet to be assigned a tax assessor's parcel number, is the site for the proposed retail development.

Project Proposal

The proposal consists of the following:

- 1) A General Plan amendment (AZ06-002), amending the land use map designation of the affected portion of exchanged lands under APN102-110-11 from Multi-Family Residential (MFR) to Commercial (C) and APN 102-110-13 from Commercial to Multi-Family Residential. The amendment would accommodate the proposed commercial development;
- 2) A Rezone (AZ06-002), of the portion of land to be exchanged under APN 102-110-11 from Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Community-Airport Safety District (R2-DC-AA) to Commercial-Planned Development-Design Community-Airport Safety District (C-PD-DC-AA); and portion of APN 102-110-13 from Commercial-Planned Development-Design Community-Airport Safety District (C-PD-DC-AA) to Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Community-Airport Safety District (R2-DC-AA). The rezone corresponds to the proposed General Plan Amendment identified in 1);
- 3) A planned development (PD07-005) for the construction and operation of a 17,272 gross square foot commercial retail/pharmacy store (Rite Aid) in accordance with Section 17.02.010 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed facility would be served by on-site landscaping, lighting, loading, drive-thru, drainage, signs, and parking. The facility would have two points of access: a right-in, right-out access driveway along Green Valley and a full access driveway along Starbuck Roads. Public water and sewer services would be provided by El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Under Planned Development Permit, the project would be requesting a deviation from the five (5) foot-wide landscape planter along the northern property line (adjacent to residential zoning district) and additional landscaping under Section 17.18.090;

- 4) A design review (DR06-008) of the proposed commercial retail/pharmacy store in accordance with Section 17.74.010 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance;
- 5) A design waiver for a reduction of sidewalk width along the project frontage. El Dorado County Design and Improvement Manual require a minimum 8-foot wide sidewalk. The applicant is requesting a reduction to 5 feet in width; and
- 6) A Reasonable Use Analysis determination related to oak canopy cover retention and replacement in conformance to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and associated Interim Interpretive Guidelines. The project would impact 1,205 square feet of oak tree canopy due to a relocated driveway on Starbuck Ranch Road, as required by the Department of Transportation.

Supporting Plans and Reports

The following reduced copies of the project plans are provided: Site Plan (Exhibit F), Preliminary Grading Plan (Exhibit G), Preliminary Drainage Plan (Exhibit H), Preliminary Landscaping Plan (Exhibit I), Photometric Plan (Exhibit J), Elevation /Floor Plan (Exhibit K), Sign Plan (Exhibit L) and Roof Top layout (Exhibit M).

The following reports and analysis are provided: Traffic Analysis (Attachment 1), Biological Resources Evaluation/Tree Survey Plan (Attachment 2), Air Quality Analysis (Attachment 3), Noise Analysis (Attachment 4), and Preliminary Drainage Report (Attachment 5).

On-site and Off-site Improvements

Implementation of the project would include associated on and off-site improvements. Based on a submitted preliminary grading plan, the site would be graded utilizing on-site soil with imported soil in the amount of 2,680 cubic yards. A retaining wall, ranging from 3' to 6.5' tall, would be constructed along portion of its frontage on Green Valley Road supporting the necessary finished pad for the facility. A system of storm drain pipes, drain inlet, and manholes are proposed on site connecting to the existing culvert pipes under Green Valley Road.

The facility would be served by on-site parking, loading, and drive thru areas. On-site landscaping, refuse, and lighting would be provided in accordance to corresponding zoning ordinance standards. A five-foot wide meandering sidewalk along Starbuck Road extending along Green Valley Road is proposed to be constructed on-site with easement rights to be granted to the County. As mitigation for the anticipated facility noise, a sound wall is proposed along the northern and western property line adjacent to the residential district: the northern sound wall measures eight foot and 320 feet long while the western wall varies from six (6) to eight (8) foot tall at an approximate length 120 linear feet. A monument sign is proposed at the entrance along Green Valley Road.

The facility proposes to connect to existing El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) water and sewer utility lines in the vicinity of the project site. According to the Facility Improvement Letter (FIL) issued by EID, the facility would be required two (2) equivalent dwelling units (EDU) of water supply. In order to acquire this service, the project is required to extend the existing 8 inch water line along Starbuck Road to the project site providing 1,750 gallons per minute (gpm) with a residual pressure of 20 psi. The facility would be required to connect to the six-inch sewer line existing on site. A Facility Improvement Plan would be submitted to EID detailing required improvements in accordance to EID's standards.

As conditioned by the Department of Transportation (DOT), the project is required to construct improvements along its frontages. On Green Valley Road, the applicant would construct a four (4) foot wide raised median for the west bound left turn lane, widening of pavement for two 12-foot westbound lanes, a five-foot shoulder for a bicycle lane. The entrance on Green Valley Road would be constructed in accordance with Standard Plan 110 (Special Commercial Frontage Entrance) of the Design and Improvement Manual.

On Starbuck Road, the applicant would construct a meandering sidewalk, AC dike, widening of the existing pavements to accommodate new curb and gutter, stripe a 50-foot northbound left turn lane into the project site, a northbound through and right turn lane from Green Valley Road onto Bentley Drive, 50-foot striping southbound left turn lane onto Green Valley Road and stripe 36-foot wide left turn pocket lane into the Starbuck Road driveway entrance. This entrance would be constructed based on Standard Plan 110 Special Commercial Frontage Entrance. As conditioned, a Commercial Site Improvement and Grading Plan would be submitted to various agencies for review and consideration.

Development Standards

Table 1 below details the required development standards applicable to the project.

Table 1. Development Standards

Development Standard	Regulation Reference	Standard Requirement	Proposed Project
Use	El Dorado Zoning Ordinance Section 17.32.020	Retail/Pharmacy	Retail/Pharmacy
Parking	El Dorado Zoning Ordinance Section 17.18.060	58 stalls (minimum)	58 stalls
Building Coverage	El Dorado Zoning Ordinance Section 17.32.040B	60% (maximum)	24%
Lighting	El Dorado Zoning Ordinance Section 17.14.170	- Lighting screening and shielding - Lighting standards - Building Lighting	Consistent (See Photometric Plan)
Landscaping	El Dorado Zoning Ordinance Section 17.18.090	- Minimum landscape buffer - Quantity of Trees - Types of Trees	Consistent (See Landscape Plan) ^{A,C}
Height	El Dorado Zoning Ordinance Section 17.32.040	50 feet (maximum)	25 feet, 8 inches
Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.)	General Plan Policy 2.2.1.5	.25 (maximum)	.25
Setbacks	El Dorado Zoning Ordinance Section 17.32.040D	- Front:10 feet - Side/Rear:5 feet - Interior Lot Line ^B	Consistent (See Site Plan)
Signs	Chapter 17.16	- Wall Signs - Sign Area	Consistent (See Sign Plan)

NOTES

- A. Notes: The Landscape Plan includes an area reserved for on-site mitigation of the impacted oak tree canopy;
- B. The proposed retail facility conforms the interior lot line requirement under 17.14.090 of the El Dorado County Zoning Code
- C. The Planned Development Permit includes a request for an exception from landscape standards under 17.18.090A

Agency Comments

The project was distributed for agency consultation on June 29, 2006 and August 2, 2006; a subsequent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting, discussing various project comments and issues, was conducted with the applicant and responding agencies on August 21, 2006. The project was heard by the Cameron Park Design Review Committee (CPDRC) on August 10, 2006 and February 26, 2007. Agency comments are provided with this document as Attachment 6.

Project Site and Surrounding Property Information

Setting

The project site is located at the northwest corner of Green Valley Road and Starbuck Road at an elevation of 1,360' above sea level. The site gently drains towards the south of the site. Vegetation consists of ruderal grass and a row of Oak trees along the eastern boundary. The site is developed with an abandoned wooden accessory building accessed via a dirt pathway off Green Valley Road.

The site is within the Ecological Preserve Area 1 which represents areas with potentially occurrence of endemic plants (Pine Hill plants) based on the soil composition (serpentine or gabbroic soil type). The soil type identified on the project site is Rescue, which is characterized by its well-drained condition underlain by gabbrodiorite rocks. Rescue is very stony sandy loam, ranging within 3-15% slope and dark reddish brown. Permeability is moderately slow, runoff is slow to medium and occurrence of erosion is slight to moderate.

The site is approximately ¾ mile north of the Cameron Park Airport. Based on the Cameron Park Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), the project is within the Safety Zone 3 and outside of 55 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour.

Land Use Information

Table 2 below details the project site's land use information.

Table 2. Project Site Land Use Information

	Project Site
General Plan Designation	APN 102-110-13 Multi-Family Residential (MFR); APN 102-110-01, 11 Commercial (C) <i>(If approved, project site would have a General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial and Multi Family Residential)</i>
Zoning and Overlay Designations	APN: 102-110-01 and 11: Commercial (C) and Planned Development (PD), Design Corridor (DC) and Airport Safety District (AA) overlays APN 102-110-13: Limited Multifamily (R2), Design Corridor (DC) and Airport Safety District (AA) overlays <i>(If approved, the project site would have a Zoning and Overlay Designations of Multifamily Residential (R2) and Commercial (C) and overlay Planned Development (PD), Design Corridor (DC) and Airport Safety District (AA))</i>
Current Use	Abandoned Wooden Building
Size	1.61 net acreage (1.81 gross acre) (after the Boundary line Adjustment)
Rare Plant Mitigation Area	Mitigation Area 1
School District	Rescue Union
Fire District	Cameron Park Fire Department
Water/Sewer District	El Dorado Irrigation District (EID)
Airport	Cameron Park Airport (within Safety Zone 3)

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

Table 3 below details the land use designation and existing uses of the properties surrounding the project site.

Table 3. Surrounding Properties Land Use Information

General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation	Overlay Zoning Designation	Existing Use

North	Multifamily Residential (MFR)	Multifamily (R2)	Design Control (DC), Airport Safety (AA)	Residential
East	Commercial (C) and High Density Residential (HDR)	Commercial	Design Control (DC)	Commercial
South	Commercial (C)	Commercial	Design Control (DC)	Commercial
West	Multifamily Residential (MFR)	Multifamily (R2)	Design Control (DC), Airport Safety (AA)	Residential

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

1. El Dorado County Development Services- Building Department
2. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District
3. El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT)
4. El Dorado Irrigation District (EID)

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		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	X	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: May 14, 2007
 Printed Name: Rommel Pabalinas For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: May 14, 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	

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

I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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.

Cameron Park is designated by the County as an area requiring 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 the project on August 10, 2006 and February 26, 2007 and recommended approval of the proposed architectural and design of the proposed retail facility on the latter date (Attachment 6). Coupled with review for conformance to applicable development standards, the County would consider the advisory comments by CPDRC and forward its recommendation to the hearing body.

a. and b. The project site is not within as area designated scenic vista or scenic resource. Therefore, there would be no impact to scenic vista or scenic resources.

c. and d. The proposed retail facility conforms to the underlying Commercial zoning, identifying the proposed use as permitted by right. The site is bordered by properties to the south, southeast and west with similar land use designation and existing commercial development. The property immediately bordering the project site to the west and north is zoned residential and is currently developed by a small-scale attached residential complex located approximately 165 feet from the northern property line of the project site.

The facility, which includes on-site landscaping, parking, and lighting, would be constructed in conformance with El Dorado Zoning Ordinance ensuring adequate building setbacks, perimeter landscaping, and illumination. New source of light and glare would be produced by the facility; however, as proposed, any impacts from sources of light (ie. poles, sign) would be further minimized by the building setbacks, perimeter wall (ranging from 6 to 8 tall) and landscaping. Therefore, the impacts on the visual character of the area and sources of light would be considered 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

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

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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 located on a properties designated as Commercial and Residential. The proposed development would be located on a commercial property. Similarly, the surrounding properties have similar intense designations of Commercial or Multifamily Residential. There is no William Act Contract on the property and no agricultural lands are subject to conversion to non-agricultural use. Therefore, there would be no impact to 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, would 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);

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

- Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and NO_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, would result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

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 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.

Sycamore Environmental Consultants prepared an Air Quality analysis for the project dated May 24, 2006 and July 7, 2006. (Attachment 3). Based on AQMD's *Air Pollution Control District Guide to Air Quality Assessment* and other district resources, the analysis provides detailed qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the air quality impacts associated with the project and its potential cumulative effects. The implementation of the project would include various construction activities at different stages (ie. site preparation, earthmoving and general construction). The anticipated emissions generated from these activities would include:

- Combustion emissions (ROG, NO_x, CO, Sox and PM₁₀) from heavy duty diesel and gasoline powered equipments and vehicular trips;
- Combustion emissions from heavy-duty diesel fueled equipment containing Diesel PM, which has been identified as potential health risk
- Fugitive dust (PM 100 from soil disturbance or demolition; and
- Evaporative emissions (ROG) from asphalt paving and architectural applications

Demolition and earth disturbance activities may result in airborne entrainment of asbestos, a toxic air contaminant, in areas where there are naturally occurring surface deposits of ultramafic rock. The project site is not located within the Asbestos Review Area.

The analysis dated May 24, 2006 analyzed the proposed land use designation changes for the General Plan Amendment and Rezoning. Given that there is no net change in the developable area in either land use designation, it was concluded that this component of the project would have *no impact* on air quality.

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

Therefore, the following discussion, based on the July 7th report, details the analysis of the of the impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the facility

a. The project has been reviewed by the El Dorado County Management- Air Quality District concluding that the project would have insignificant air quality impacts subject to conformance with the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District Rules 223 and 223-1 (Fugitive Dust Plan), Rule 224 (Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials), and Rule 215 (Architectural Coatings). Therefore, this project anticipates less than significant impact to this resource.

b. ROG, NOx and PM 10 Emissions and Mitigation for Project Construction Activities

The El Dorado County AQMD evaluates the significance of ROG and NOx emissions during construction based on the maximum amount of fuel, diesel, and regular gasoline consumed on the peak equipment use day. In its comment response (Attachment 7), the district recommended standard measures including the use of low-emission on-site mobile construction equipment, use of equipment per manufacturer specifications, and configuration of construction parking to minimize traffic interference.

Sycamore Environmental Consultants analyzed the anticipated emissions for the proposed retail facility. Table 4.1 of the *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* (shown below) demonstrates the range of maximum daily fuel usage for the total of all equipment, vehicles, and portable tools that can be used to ensure less than significant impacts resulting from ROG and NOx emissions.

Table 4.1 Construction Equipment Fuel Use Screening Levels

Equipment Age Distribution	Average Daily Fuel Use Per Quarter (Gal. Per Day)
All equipment 1995 model year or earlier	337
All equipment 1996 model year or later	402
Assumptions: 12.5 g/hp-hr ROG+NOx for 1995 and earlier equipment (from EPA Nonroad Model); 10.5 g/hp-hr ROG+NOx for 1996 and later equipment (Based on EPA and CARB Tier 1 standards). Notes: Determination of fuel use should be documented based on the equipment manufacturer's data. Use linear interpolation between 337 and 402 gal. per day in proportion to distribution of equipment into the two age categories; e.g., 50/50 age distribution yields allowable fuel use of $(337 + ((402-337)/2))$, or 370 gal. per day.	

According to the analysis and using the above information, a linear equation to determine the maximum daily fuel usage is expressed as:

Daily Maximum Fuel Usage = $X(65) + 337$, where

X is the number of 1996 year model and newer equipment divided total number of equipment used; 65 is the difference of the maximum of fuel (in gallons) permitted for model year and newer equipment.

The analysis concludes that that to ensure a less than significant impact to air quality, the bid specifications and construction contract for the project should stipulate the note below.

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

The maximum amount of fuel by equipment use during construction activities are as follows:

- The maximum amount of fuel that can be used in one day if all equipment used is 1995 model year or older is 337 gallons.
- The maximum amount of fuel that can be used in one day if all equipment used is 1996 model year or older is 402 gallons.
- If a combination of 1995 and older and 1996 and newer equipment is used, divide the number of 1996 and newer equipment by the total number of equipment used. Multiply that number by 65. Add that number to 337. The sum is the maximum number of gallons of fuel for use on that day.

Implementation of the above note and the recommended standard conditions of approval by the Air Quality Management District would result in a level of less than significant impact. Moreover, the above note would be included on all grading or improvement plans to be verified by the District, as a condition of the project.

Diesel PM has been identified as a potential health risk. Limiting the amount of diesel fuel consumed during the entire course of project reduces the potential health risks to a less than significant level. Table 4.2 of the *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* (shown below) details the maximum of fuel that can be consumed and ensure less than significant health risks. The factors in determining this maximum is based on the year the equipment was built.

Table 4.2 Fuel Use Screening Criteria for Acceptable Diesel PM Health Risk

PM Control Technology	Maximum Gallons of Diesel Fuel Consumption During Construction Phase
T-BACT applied	37,000
T-BACT not applied	3,700

Notes: For the purposes of this screening test, T-BACT is defined as the use of 1996 and later model year engines in all Diesel construction equipment. Determination of fuel use should be documented based on the equipment manufacturer's data. Maximum gallons of fuel may be interpolated between 37,000 and 3,700 gallons based on the fraction of T-BACT and non T-BACT engines. Risk calculation to support the above screening values is based on fuel use under the "high risk" Prime Engine Scenario in Table 6, Appendix VII, Risk Characterization Scenarios, from the CARB October 2000 "Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles."

According to the analysis and using the above information, a linear equation to determine the maximum daily fuel usage is expressed as:

$$\text{Daily Maximum Diesel Fuel Usage} = X(33,300) + 3,700, \text{ where}$$

X is the number of 1996 year model and newer equipment divided total number of equipment used
 33,300 is the difference of the maximum of fuel (in gallons) permitted for model year and newer equipment

To ensure that the potential health risk posed by Diesel PM is reduced to less than significant impact, the bid specifications and construction contract should stipulate the note below.

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

Prior to approval of construction plans (ie. Grading or Improvement Plans), the following note shall be included:

The maximum amount of fuel by equipment use during construction activities are as follows:

- The maximum amount of diesel fuel that can be used during the project if all equipment used is 1995 model year or older is 3,700 gallons.*
- The maximum amount of diesel fuel that can be used during the project if all equipment used is 1996 model year or older is 37,000 gallons.*
- If a combination of 1995 and older and 1996 and newer equipment is used, divide the number of 1996 and newer equipment in the fleet by the total number of equipment used. Multiply that number by 33,000. Add that number to 3,700. The sum is the maximum number of gallons of fuel for use permitted for the entire project.*

Implementation of the above note and the recommended standard conditions of approval by the Air Quality Management District would result in a level of less than significant impact. Moreover, the above note would be included on all grading or improvement plans to be verified by the District, as a condition of the project.

ROG and NOx Emissions and Mitigation for Project Operation

ROG and NOx emissions from project operations are evaluated for significance under CEQA on daily mass emission basis. Based on the *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*, the significance threshold for ROG and NOx is determined to be 82 pounds/day for each pollutant. Table 5.2 of document lists the type and size of project that are likely to result in significant ROG and NOx emissions.

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

Table 5.2 Projects With Potentially Significant ROG and NOx Operation Emissions

Development Type	Project Size Likely to Generate 82 lbs/day or more of ROG or NOx ¹
Single Family Housing (with fireplaces/wood stoves)	230 Dwelling Units (48 Dwelling Units)
Apartments, low-rise (with fireplaces/wood stoves)	350 Dwelling Units (47 Dwelling Units)
General Office	260,000 Square Feet
Medical Office Building	110,000 Square Feet
Warehousing	825,000 Square Feet
Manufacturing ²	620,000 Square Feet
Industrial Park ²	350,000 Square Feet
Hospital	125,000 Square Feet
Bank/Financial Institution (with drive-thru)	30,000 Square Feet
Quality Restaurant	55,000 Square Feet
Fast Food Restaurant (with drive-thru)	8,000 Square Feet
Office Park	210,000 Square Feet
Convenience Market (24 Hr.)	8,500 Square Feet
Convenience Market (24 Hr.) w/ gasoline pumps	7,600 Square Feet
Supermarket	45,000 Square Feet
Shopping Center	62,000 Square Feet
Motel	480 Rooms
Hotel	490 Rooms
Elementary School	2,100 Students
High School	2,300 Students
¹ Based on URBEMIS7G for Windows, Version 5.1.0; Mountain Counties Air Basin; Rural location; Target year 2002; Maximum daily emissions for Winter conditions (40°F average temperature) or Summer conditions (85°F average temperature), whichever is greater. ² Based on emissions from indirect sources (motor vehicles) only. Emissions associated with manufacturing or industrial processes, if any, must also be accounted	

The methods utilized in reviewing these impacts include the use of software URBEMIS 2002 for Windows 8.7.0 with settings for Mountain Counties Air Basin, Rural Location, target year of 2007 and retail pharmacy (with drive through) as development type. The purpose for this review is to ascertain if the cutoff point shown on the table for supermarket (45,000 gross square feet) could be applied to the project and determine if the project would have a less than significant impact.

The proposed retail pharmacy facility would encompass a gross square footage of 17,272, resulting in estimated emissions of 13.24 lbs/day of ROG and 23.52 lbs/day of NOx. For comparison purposes, a similar sized supermarket was calculated to be an estimated 15.36 lbs/day of ROG and 27.27 of NOx. The estimated operational emissions of a supermarket are slightly greater than that of a retail pharmacy with a drive through. Based on this fact, the use of the supermarket cut point of 45,000 gsf for the retail pharmacy with drive through is consistent with Table 5.2. Therefore, the operation of the retail pharmacy with drive through anticipates less than significant impact resulting from ROG and NOx emissions.

CO, PM10, and Other Pollutant Air Quality Impacts

CO, PM10 and other pollutants are evaluated for significance by comparing the applicable national and state ambient air quality standards (AAQA). AQMD considers emissions of CO, PM10 and other pollutants from project operation significant if:

- The emissions from the project itself would cause violation to AAQS; or
- The emissions contribution plus the background level would result in violation of the AAQS, and either

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

- A sensitive receptor is located within a quarter-mile of the project
- The project's contribution exceeds five percent of the AAQS

AQMD considers development projects of the type and size that are under significance cut-points shown in Table 5.2 for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ and SO₂ are also considered to be insignificant for CO and NO_x emissions. Based on the discussion above, CO and NO_x operation emissions anticipated for the proposed facility are considered to be less than significant impact.

AQMD considers lead, sulfates, and H₂S to be less than a significant except for industrial sources such as foundries, acid plants and paper mills; the proposed facility is commercial in nature. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated from these pollutants.

Visibility impacts are regulated through state and national regulatory programs governing vehicle emissions and through mitigation required for ozone precursors and particulate matter for other development projects throughout the county. AQMD assumes that visibility impacts from development projects in the Mountain Counties Air Basin portion of the county are not significant. Therefore, proposed retail pharmacy would have a less than significant impact.

Toxic Air Contaminates (TAC)

TAC is pollutant considered carcinogenic or non-carcinogenic that poses a potential hazard to human health. These types of pollutants are regulated through state and federal statutes and are mitigated through implementation of best available technologies. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified asbestos, including naturally occurring asbetiforms, as carcinogenic TAC.

Based on the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area Soil Conservation Service, the project site contains Rescue soil type characterized by a very sandy loam, ranging 3-15% slope. Specifically, the site is within an area mapped as "Undesignated Mapped Areas that Probably Do Not Contain Asbestos" and is located over a mile from an "Area More Than Likely to Contain Asbestos" on the "Areas More Likely to Contain Natural Occurrences of Asbestos (NOA) in Western El Dorado County". Moreover, the AQMD Division project response confirms that the site is not within the Asbestos Review Area. Based on this information, an Asbestos Hazard Dust Plan is not required. Therefore, impacts from NOA or TAC are considered less than significant.

c-d. Cumulative Impacts

AQMD considers significant cumulative impacts on air quality to be dependent on project conformance with an approved plan or mitigation program of District-wide or regional application in place for the pollutants emitted by the project. As discussed, the project is consistent with the AQAP based on the following findings:

- the zone change involving the equal exchange of portion of lands does not result in any net change in ROG or NO_x emissions;
- the proposed retail facility does not exceed the "project alone" significance criteria;
- the project is subject to applicable measures and district rules reducing the pollutant emissions;

Additionally, AQMD considers contributions of CO from projects with less than significant impact from ROG and NO_x emissions to be less than significant.

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

Therefore, ROG, NOx and CO contribution to regional cumulative impact is considered to have a less than significant impact.

Sensitive Receptors

According to the *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*, sensitive receptors are identified as facilities that house or attract children, elderly, people with illnesses and others sensitive to effects of air pollutants. Specifically, examples of these uses include hospitals, schools and convalescent facilities. Based on the submitted air quality analysis, the nearest sensitive receptor to the site is a school located at the corner of Bass Lake Road and Foxmore Lane over a mile away. Therefore, air quality impacts on sensitive receptors are considered less than significant impact.

e. Odors

The *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* considers uses that create odors and may cause nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, cause injury, health effects, and injury to business or property, to potentially have a significant impact. Table 3.1 of the *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 listed as odor generating uses. Therefore, since the proposed retail facility is commercial in nature, there would be no odor impacts.

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

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.

Supporting Environmental Reports

The Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report and Tree Survey and Preservation Plan prepared by Sycamore Consultants Inc. details the methodology, background information, and determination of impacts on biological resources, its habitat, and potential wetlands on the project site.

- 1) Wetlands- In accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual (Corp 1987), a delineation was performed at the site on January 2006. The biologist also reviewed the Shingle Springs USGS quad portion of the National Wetlands Inventory Map and the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area. Impacts to wetlands are regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. El Dorado County General Plan Policies (Conservation and Open Space Element) 7.3.3.1 and 7.3.3.4 require delineation, protection and preservation of wetlands. Based on the analysis, it was determined that the site does not contain any wetlands or waters of the US.
- 2) Rare Plants- In evaluation of these resources, the biologist conducted field surveys of the site during its blooming period and researched data from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service

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

(USFWS) and California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). Of specific concern are eight (8) special-status endemic species, known as Pine Hill plants. The species are listed below:

El Dorado bedstraw	<i>Galium californicum</i> ssp. <i>sierrae</i>
Laynes butterweed	<i>Senecio layneae</i>
Pine Hill ceanothus	<i>Ceanothus roderickii</i>
Pine Hill flannel bush	<i>Fremontodendron californicum</i> ssp. <i>decumbens</i>
Stebbins' morning glory	<i>Calystegia stebbinsii</i>
Bisbee Peak rush rose	<i>Helianthemum suffrutescens</i>
El Dorado mule ears	<i>Wyethia reticulata</i>
Red Hills soaproot	<i>Chlorogalum grandiflorum</i>

General Plan Policy 7.4.1.1 (Conservation and Open Space Element) mandates permanent protection of these plants through the establishment and management of ecological preserves consistent with County Ordinance Chapter 17.17 and *USFWS Gabbro Soil Plants for Central Sierra Nevada Foothills Recovery Plan*. The site is identified to be within the Ecological Preserve Mitigation Area 1, based on its “rare” soils composition. In coordination with the Department of Fish and Game, El Dorado County has established (under Board of Supervisors Resolution 205-98) an in-lieu impact fee for any development within Mitigation Area 1. This fee, which is due at building permit issuance, is collected in order to fund the Rare Plant Off-Site Mitigation Program which would seek to acquire and restore rare plant habitat through purchase of fee interests or conservation easements of land. Based on the analysis of potential impacts on rare plant species, it was determined none of the plants were observed on site during the field survey and that the site does not contain habitat for these plants.

3) Other Species- The report further analyzed the potential presence of other habitat of special status species at the site. This lists included Invertebrates, Fish, Reptiles and Amphibians (see Appendix D of the report). Generally, the report concluded that the site did not provide suitable habitat. However, though the report indicates that the project site did not provide suitable habitat for certain species of bird, it did conclude that the removal of existing trees and shrubs on-site could potentially affect the nesting birds of prey and migratory protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Additional discussion is provided below.

4) Oak Woodlands- Development impact on oak woodland canopy is subject to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 (Conservation and Open Space Element) under two options: Option A (Retention/Replacement Standards) and Option B (Conservation Fund). Option B is currently not available.

As shown on Table 4, General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4A and its *Interim Interpretive Guideline* of the policy detail the retention and replacement requirements associated with the affected oak canopy.

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

Table 4. Retention/Replacement Standards under General Plan 7.4.4.4A

Percent Existing Canopy Cover	Canopy Cover to be Retained
80–100	60% of existing canopy
60–79	70% of existing canopy
40–59	80% of existing canopy
20–39	85% of existing canopy
10-19	90% of existing canopy
1-9 for parcels > 1 acre	90% of existing canopy

Table 5 below details the existing oak canopy coverage from the trees on-site and off-site that overhang the project site. The table only reflects the existing canopy on the 1.81-acre site subject for development since no development is proposed on the .22-acre portion subject to residential land use designation change. The textual description of the oak trees is detailed in Tree Survey report.

Table 5. Oak Tree Information on the 1.81-acre project site

TREE ID #	CANOPY SIZE IN FT ²	CANOPY IN %	CONDITION	PROJECT PROPOSAL
T196	1,719	2.2	Good	Retain
T197 ²	984	1.2	Fair to Good	Retain
T198 ²	644	0.8	Good	Remove
T199 ²	561	0.7	Fair to Poor	Remove
T200 ²	2,034	2.6	Good	Retain
Off-site Tree (canopy overhanging site)	961	1.2	NA	Prune
TOTAL¹	6,904	8.8		

1. The site originally contained additional oak tree canopies (approximately 12,000 square feet) previously removed under the prior property ownership. Planning Services Division determined that this canopy is not subject to this environmental review nor is pertinent to this project.
2. Trees T197-T200 are located within County Right-of-Way along Starbuck Road

Based on Table 4, the project is required to retain 90% of tree canopy on the property. The project proposes to impact 1,205 sf of tree canopy (Trees T198 and T199) that would result from the construction proposed access driveway along Starbuck Road. The canopy that would be affected equates to 17% of the entire site, resulting in retention of 83% of the canopy. This would not conform to General Plan 7.4.4.4 Option A.

The *Interim Interpretive Guidelines for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4* was established by the County to clarify the scope and implementation of Option A. These guidelines seek to provide a process in consideration of limited modifications to oak canopy retention and replacement requirements for existing legal parcels, if necessary to ensure reasonable use of the parcels. Specifically, for existing legal lots, where strict compliance with the oak canopy cover retention requirements of Policy 7.4.4.4 could preclude reasonable use of the property due to factors which are unique to the proposed property, such as topographic constraints, configuration of the remaining area useable for development, *access requirements*, lot size, and/or other physical or environmental limitations, the Planning Commission may grant relief to the retention requirements of Policy 7.4.4.4A for the project, subject to findings and pursuant to a noticed public hearing.

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

Given that the project does not meet the required retention requirements of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 A, the applicant is requesting Reasonable Use Analysis in conformance with the *Interim Interpretive Guideline for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4A* (Attachment 7). The basis for the request is that Trees T198 and T199 are located at the site access along Starbuck Road. The proposed entrance was originally located approximately 50 feet north. As required by the Department of Transportation (DOT), the entrance was relocated in order to match the Bentley Drive across Starbuck Road and properly coordinate left-turn traffic in and out of the proposed facility and Bentley Road.

Staff has reviewed the submitted Site Assessment and the Biological Resource Evaluation. The Planning Commission would consider the Reasonable Use request; if approved, the applicant proposes to mitigate the removal of 1,205 sf of canopy on site at a minimum 1:1 ratio. A preliminary Landscape Plan has been provided depicting the minimum replanting and maintenance of oak seedlings. As required by the *Interim Interpretive Guideline*, additional replacement area maybe considered and required by the Planning Commission.

a-c.e. Based on the above discussion, the project site does not contain any species or its habitat protected under California Department of Fish Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regulations. The site does not contain any wetlands regulated under Clean Water Act. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact.

The proposed project or site is not subject to any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d. As discussed above, the biological resource report indicates that the removal of the existing trees and shrubs and construction activities could potentially affect nesting birds of prey and migratory birds, which are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The removal of an active nest during the breeding season, any disturbance that results in nest abandonment, or forced fledgling of nestlings, is considered a take under MBTA. The following mitigation measure is incorporated:

Mitigation Measure 1 (Biological Resources)

Prior to approval of construction plans (ie. Grading, Improvement Plans), the following shall be incorporated as note on the plans:

Within the 30 days prior to clearing and grubbing, if construction begins during the nesting season (February 1st to August 31st):

- A qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey, at the expense of the applicant, for active nests on the project site and in publicly accessible areas within 250 feet to the project site within 30 days prior to construction. A copy of the report shall be submitted El Dorado County Development Services Department- Planning for review and verification. If no active nests are found, then no further action is necessary.*
- If an active nest is found then a 50-foot buffer shall be established around the nest tree, shown on a suitable map, and reported to the El Dorado County Development Services Department- Planning by the biologist. For an active “bird of prey” nest, the buffer shall be 250 feet.*

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

- *The construction contractor shall coordinate and consult with the biologist with the proper installation of stakes or temporary flagging, fencing, etc., at the edge of the buffer, where the buffer crosses the project site. The biologist shall coordinate with El Dorado County Development Services Department- Planning staff for on-site verification and monitoring of the buffering measures. No construction activity shall be allowed in the buffer until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or unless monitoring determines that a smaller buffer will protect the active nest.*
- *The buffer may be reduced if the biologist monitors the construction activities and determines that no disturbance to the active nest is occurring. The size of suitable buffers depends on the species of bird, the location of the nest relative to the project, project activities during the time the nest is active, and other project specific conditions.*

Note: If construction begins outside the February 1st to August 31st of the breeding season, there will be no need to conduct a preconstruction survey for active nests. If a nest becomes active after construction has started, then the bird is considered adapted to construction disturbance. An active nest is a nest which contains eggs or young which have not fledged.

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the required note has been incorporated on the plans prior to approval of the plans. The Division shall coordinate with the applicant and/or biologist, assess the pertinent surveys/studies, and conduct on-site verification for conformance with this measure.

Implementation of this measure would mitigate project impacts to less than significant.

- e. As discussed above, the project does not conform to the General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 involving the oak tree canopy retention/replacement. The implementation of the project would impact 1,205 sf of oak tree canopy. Subject to *Interim Interpretive Guideline for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4A*, the applicant proposes to mitigate and replace the minimum affected canopy within the on-site landscaping for the facility. Based on the replacement formula in the *Interim Interpretive Guideline*, the preliminary landscaping plan indicates planting of 6 saplings of Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*) within the northeastern and western planter area of the site. The saplings shall be grown commercially, planted with formulated fertilizers and irrigation. A performance monitoring of the oak saplings would be conducted by a qualified professional once a year for at least 10 after initial planting. The following mitigation measure shall be incorporated:

Mitigation Measure 2 (Biological Resources)

Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall provide a Final Landscape Plan detailing the required replacement area of the impacted oak tree canopy on-site, in conformance with the Interpretive Guideline for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4A. The applicant shall replace on-site a minimum 1,205 square feet equivalent to the Oak tree canopy impacted by the project. If additional replacement area is required by the Planning Commission, that area shall also be noted on the Final Landscape Plan. The Landscape Plan shall include specific planting, irrigation, mulching, maintenance and monitoring procedures identified in the Tree Replacement Plan (dated February 8, 2006 and updated on January 2, 2007) prepared by Chuck Hughes of Sycamore Environmental Consultants (Certified Arborist WE-6885A).

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

Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall coordinate and enter into an agreement with the County to ensure the long term maintenance and preservation of the replacement trees planted on-site. The agreement shall be reviewed and considered to the satisfaction of County Counsel and the Director. Maintenance and monitoring shall be required for a minimum of 10 years after planting. Trees or other vegetation that does not survive during this period of time shall be replaced by the property owner. Upon execution of the said agreement, a Notice of Restriction detailing this agreement shall be recorded on the property. A proof of recordation of this notice shall be provided to the Planning Services prior to issuance of the building permit.

The applicant or subsequent owner shall provide a report prepared by a licensed landscape architect every two years after the planting reporting on the adequacy of the landscaping. Dead landscaping shall be replaced no later 30 days after submittal of the periodic reports. If landscaping is dead at the end of the 10-year maintenance period, the maintenance agreement shall be extended an additional two years. The owner is responsible for all replanting and long-term maintenance.

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the Final Landscape Plan contain the details of the approved canopy replacement, planting, monitoring specifications identified in the Tree Replacement Plan. In coordination with County Counsel, this Division shall verify the details and execution of the required agreement for the long term maintenance and preservation of the replacement trees. This division shall verify the recordation of the Notice of Restriction, detailing the maintenance and preservation agreement, on the subject property prior to issuance of building permits.

Mitigation Measure 3 (Biological Resources)

As required under General Plan Policy 7.4.5.1 (Conservation and Open Space Element), prior to issuance of grading permit, the applicant shall submit to Planning Services a final tree survey, preservation and replacement plan (conducted by a Chuck Hughes of Sycamore Environmental Consultants (Certified Arborist WE-6885A) approved for the project. These documents shall include, but not limited to, a detailed description of the existing trees on-site, the approved oak tree preservation plan, implementation of construction measures in protection of the preserved trees, and approved mitigation measures for the trees impacted by the project.

MONITORING: Upon submittal of the document, Planning Services shall review the details of the final tree survey, preservation and replacement plan, and verify consistency with the construction grading/improvement plans. During construction phase, the Division shall coordinate with the applicant and/or the certified arborist and conduct on-site verification of implementation of the required construction measures of the preserved trees

Implementation of these measures would mitigate project impacts would be less than significant.

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.

General Plan Policy 7.5.1.3 requires a submittal of cultural resources study as a part of discretionary project application. A Cultural Resources Study was conducted for the entire project site by Dana Supernowicz of Historic Resource Associates. The report details the background research and field survey performed for the project. The study concluded that no significant prehistoric or historic archeological site, features, or artifacts were found nor were any significant historic buildings, structures, or object discovered. No further cultural resource investigations are recommended.

a-c. Based on the above discussion, the project would not impact historical, archeological, or paleontological resources.

d. Standard protocol requires that, 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 would be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The project grading plans shall include this standard as a note on the plans. Planning Services would review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit to ensure project notation and condition. The project would anticipate less than significant impact to disturbance of human remains.

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
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 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.-d. There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.¹ No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or

¹ El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, p.5.9-29.

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

adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.² There would be no impact related to fault rupture. 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 have been mapped. The project site is situated west of the Melones fault zone and east of the East Bear Mountains fault zone. The East Bear Mountains fault zone is associated with the Foothills fault system, previously considered inactive but re-classified to potentially active after a Richter magnitude earthquake measuring 5.7 occurred near Oroville in 1975. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.³

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.⁴ 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.⁵ The project site flat to gently sloped; there would be no risk of landslide.

Development of the project would result in the construction of a new commercial building. 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. Impacts are considered be less than significant.

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 the foundation and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

The project anticipates a cut in the amount 3,050 yd³ and fill amount of 5,730 yd³; an import of soil, approximately 2,680 yd³, would be needed. The source of the import and quality of the import soil would be determined during review of the Improvement/Grading Plans. All required on-site grading is subject to review during the building permit process. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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.

² California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

³ El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, p.5.9-5.*

⁴ 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>)*

⁵ 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
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the site composes of Rescue very stony sandy loam, underlain by gabbrodiorite rocks. These soils are listed as having moderate permeability, slow to medium runoff, and slight to moderate erosion hazard. 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 applicant may be required to submit a site-specific geotechnical study prior to obtaining a building permit for the proposed building construction. The results of the site-specific geotechnical study would be used to ensure that any site-specific conditions related to shrink-swell potential are identified and reflected in project design to minimize the risk to property and people. Impacts are considered less than significant.

- e. There would be no impact related to septic systems because the project would be served by public sewer through El Dorado Irrigation District (EID).

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;

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

- 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, e) Rite Aid 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 commonly regulated by various Federal, State and local regulations.

Cameron Park Airport, a public airport, is located approximately 1 mile south of the project site. The site is within the airport Safety Zone 3 (Overflight Zone) as identified in the Cameron Park Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). Based on the CLUP, the proposed commercial retail/pharmacy facility is considered to be a compatible use. As required under Section 17.038.062 of the Airport Safety (AA) District and conditioned for the project, prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall provide an Avigation and Noise easement granting the right of flight and the right to cause noise, light and other effects associated with the operation of aircraft in the airspace over and above the subject property. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impact.

c, f-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.

The project is not located within a private airstrip. No impact is anticipated

As proposed, the project provides for on-site circulation based on the County development standards with site accesses off Green Valley and Starbuck Roads. Therefore, the project would not impact any 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 residential and 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	

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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 stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

a,b, f-j. Construction of the proposed project would require a submittal of improvement plans detailing the proposed ground disturbance and the standard measures regulating stormwater discharges from the site. Furthermore, a Facility Improvement Plan would be prepared in accordance with EID and Regional Water Quality Control Board standards for water quality and wastewater discharge requirements. Groundwater source would not be utilized for the facility.

The project site is situated in an area of undulating terrain at an elevation of approximately 1,360' above sea level. The site is designated as Flood Zone C (FIRM Panel 060040 0725C), which is defined to be within an area outside of 100-year and 500-year flood plains. 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. Therefore, there would be no impact.

c.-e. An erosion control plan would be required and detailed in the requisite Improvement Plan. This plan would be designed to limit stormwater runoff and discharge from the site. The Regional 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. Compliance with an approved erosion control plan would reduce erosion and siltation on and off site. The project has been conditioned by Department of Transportation (DOT) requiring submittal and review of site improvement/grading permit, which would address grading, erosion and sediment control.

Based on preliminary grading plan, the development of the site would include grading resulting in a pad elevation of 1370.50' (Exhibit G). A preliminary drainage report was prepared based on the El Dorado County Drainage Manual

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

(Attachment 5). Using the mean annual precipitation in the area (30") and the El Dorado Design Rainfall Table, the site was evaluated for 10-year and 100-year event.

The existing flow rate condition for a 100-year storm for the site is approximately 25 cubic feet per second (cfs). Currently, the site takes the full flow to the existing dual culverts along Green Valley Road. Though the culverts in the area able to handle this volume, a detention area, using 48" culverts in 200' length, would be placed detaining the required flow for increase in flow that arises from the development of off-site and on-site. The anticipated rate of flow from the site would be reduced to 20.4 cfs. A final drainage plan would be reviewed for Drainage, Erosion Control and Grading Plans, by the Department of Transportation and Development Services-Building Division. There would be less than significant impact to drainage or from erosion.

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 would result in a construction and operation of a neighborhood retail facility. The request includes a request for an amendment of the site (and adjacent property) General Plan and Zoning land designations from residential to commercial, affecting an equal amount of land on each property. The resulting commercial development would conform to the existing adjacent commercial uses at the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road. The development of the project would conform to applicable El Dorado County General Plan Policies, Zoning Code and Design and Improvement Manual, subject to verification of conformance to project conditions of approval and approval of requisite permits. Therefore, there would be no impact.

The project is not subject to any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. However, as discussed in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is required to mitigate for impacts to existing oak woodlands on site. Though within Ecological Mitigation Area 1, it has been determined that the site does not harbor nor provide for suitable habitat for the Pine Hill rare plants. There would be no impact.

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

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 is present, as determined by the State Geologist. There are no MRZ-2-classified areas within or adjacent to the project site⁶, and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.⁷ There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect proposed uses or be affected by project development. There would be no impact.

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

⁶ California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.

⁷ 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
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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.

The site is primarily undeveloped except for an abandoned wooden building and is immediately surrounded by undeveloped parcels to north and west and commercial uses to the east, south and southeast. The predominant ambient noise source comes from the continuous east-west traffic flow on Green Valley Road, and secondary traffic noise north-south on Starbuck Road.

The Public Health, Safety and Noise Element of the El Dorado County General Plan establishes noise level standard. Specifically, Table 6.1 of the Noise Element details the allowable noise exposure on noise sensitive land uses by transportation sources while Table 6.2 details the noise standards applicable to noise sensitive land by non-transportation sources.

Land Use	Outdoor Activity Areas ¹ L _{dn} /CNEL, dB	Interior Spaces	
		L _{dn} /CNEL, dB	L _{req} , 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.

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

Noise Level Descriptor	Daytime 7 a.m. - 7 p.m.		Evening 7 p.m. - 10 p.m.		Night 10 p.m. - 7 a.m.	
	Community	Rural	Community	Rural	Community	Rural
Hourly L_{eq} , dB	55	50	50	45	45	40
Maximum level, dB	70	60	60	55	55	50

Notes:
 Each of the noise levels specified above shall be lowered by five dB for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring impulsive noises. These noise level standards do not apply to residential units established in conjunction with industrial or commercial uses (e.g., caretaker dwellings).
 The County can impose noise level standards which are up to 5 dB less than those specified above based upon determination of existing low ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site.
 In Community areas the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving property. In Rural Areas the exterior noise level standard shall be applied at a point 100' away from the residence. The above standards shall be measured only on property containing a noise sensitive land use as defined in Objective 6.5.1. This measurement standard may be amended to provide for measurement at the boundary of a recorded noise easement between all effected property owners and approved by the County.
 *Note: For the purposes of the Noise Element, transportation noise sources are defined as traffic on public roadways, railroad line operations and aircraft in flight. Control of noise from these sources is preempted by Federal and State regulations. Control of noise from facilities of regulated public facilities is preempted by California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulations. All other noise sources are subject to local regulations. Non-transportation noise sources may include industrial operations, outdoor recreation facilities, HVAC units, schools, hospitals, commercial land uses, other outdoor land use, etc.

a. and c. (NOTE: The following discussion analyzes several different topics under this section. Consequently, the response and conclusion for each topic would differ from the selected impact determination in the checklist).

An acoustical analysis was conducted by Brown-Buntin and Associates (BBA) for the proposed development project (Attachment 4). Specifically, the factors analyzed for the project involves potential noise impacts from project generated traffic and operation of the proposed facility.

Traffic Noise Impacts

The analysis dated May 25, 2006 evaluated the changed in land use designation affecting the .22-acre of exchanged lands. Using standard noise sampling protocol, modeling based on the Federal Highway Administration Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA RD-77-108), and the current traffic counts for Green Valley and Starbuck Roads, it was determined that traffic noise levels on Green Valley Road is the dominant noise source for uses adjacent the road. The existing traffic noise levels are less than or equal to the ambient noise level. The analysis concluded that the land use designation swap would not generate an increase in noise for the .22-acre portion of land (located along Starbuck Road) changing from commercial to residential. The other .22-care land being changed from residential to commercial would become a part of entire commercially designated site that would accommodate the proposed retail facility and would not significantly increase traffic noise levels at the residential uses between Camarc Drive (located north of the project site) and the proposed project site. Increase in traffic noise levels on Green Valley Road due to the proposed commercially zoned .22 acre of land would not impact the adjoining residential uses. The change in traffic noise impacts for both roadways is considered less than significant.

The analysis dated July 25, 2006 evaluated the potential noise impacts associated with the increase in traffic generated by the project. Specifically, the analysis utilized current sound measuring apparatus and used FHWA RD-77-108 method of predicting traffic noise based upon the noise emission factors of the automobiles, types and volume of vehicles, speed,

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

roadway configuration, and acoustical characteristics of the site. Sound level measurements and concurrent traffic counts were conducted to Green Valley Road and Starbuck Road, at a distance of 50 feet from the roadway centerlines. The purpose of the measurements was to determine the accuracy of the FHWA model in describing traffic noise levels of the project site. Based on the results shown on Table 1 and the close agreement between the FHWA modeling and the actual measurements, it was determined that the FHWA modeling can be utilized in determining future traffic noise impacts.

**TABLE I
 NOISE MEASUREMENT SUMMARY
 AND FHWA MODEL CALIBRATION
 Rite Aid at Cameron Ranch, Cameron Park, California**

Roadway	Distance, Feet	Mic Height, Feet	Posted Speed, mph	Observed Vehicles/Hour			L _{eq} , dB	
				Autos	Med. Trucks	Hvy. Trucks	Measured	Predicted by FHWA Model*
Green Valley Road	50	5	45	624	4	12	65.5	65.6
Green Valley Road	50	15	45	624	4	12	67.7	65.6
Starbuck Road	50	5	35	88	0	2	56	54.9
Starbuck Road	50	15	35	88	0	2	57.7	54.9

* Assumes acoustically "soft" site

Using the traffic volume analysis prepared by KD Anderson for the project, the results of FHWA model was ran to predict the Existing, Existing Plus Project, Year 2011 Without Project, Year 2011 Plus Project, Year 2025 Without Project and Year 2025 Plus Project traffic noise levels for Green Valley, Starbuck Road and Cameron Park Drive. Table II below details the results of the FHWA noise modeling and existing traffic along the roads in the vicinity of the project.

**TABLE II
 FHWA NOISE MODELING INPUTS AND RESULTS FOR EXISTING TRAFFIC AT 50 FEET
 Rite Aid at Cameron Ranch, Cameron Park, California**

Roadway	Segment	ADT	% Med Trucks	% Heavy Trucks	Speed	L _{dn} , dB at 50 feet
Green Valley	West of Bass Lake Road	8400	1	2	45	67.2
Green Valley	Between Bass Lake Road and Cambridge Road	9460	1	2	45	67.7
Green Valley	Between Cambridge Road and Project Access	8920	1	2	45	67.5
Green Valley	Between Project Access and Cameron Park Drive	8710	1	2	45	67.4
Green Valley	East of Cameron Park Drive	6720	1	2	45	66.2
Starbuck Road	North of Project Access	2230	1	2	35	59.0
Starbuck Road	Between Green Valley Road and Project Access	2230	1	2	35	59.0
Cameron Park Drive	Between Meder Road and Green Valley Road	8240	1	2	35	64.7
Cameron Park Drive	Between Oxford Court and Meder Road	16480	1	2	35	67.7
Cameron Park Drive	South of Oxford Court	17150	1	2	35	67.9

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

Based on Table II, except for Starbuck Road north of Green Valley Road, all of the roads analyzed exceed the El Dorado County Noise Element standard of 60 dB for transportation noise sources at a distance of 50 feet from the roadway centerlines.

Using the assumed traffic volumes in Table III, the analysis produced the predicted noise level for each alternative at a reference distance of 50 feet to the centerline depicted in Table IV.

Roadway	Segment	Existing Plus Project	2011 Without Project	2011 Plus Project	2025 Without Project	2025 Plus Project
Green Valley	West of Bass Lake Road	7830	9100	9120	12750	12770
Green Valley	Between Bass Lake Road and Cambridge Road	9540	11910	11990	18920	19000
Green Valley	Between Cambridge Road and Project Access	8950	10130	10370	16410	16650
Green Valley	Between Project Access and Cameron Park Drive	8910	10130	10330	16410	16610
Green Valley	East of Cameron Park Drive	6620	7350	7420	9090	9190

Roadway	Segment	Existing Plus Project	2011 Without Project	2011 Plus Project	2025 Without Project	2025 Plus Project
Starbuck Road	North of Project Access	2360	2010	2140	1480	1610
Starbuck Road	Between Green Valley Road and Project Access	3070	2010	2850	1480	1050
Cameron Park Drive	Between Meder Road and Green Valley Road	8260	9080	9370	11320	11670
Cameron Park Drive	Between Oxford Court and Meder Road	15970	15660	15810	13510	14360
Cameron Park Drive	South of Oxford Court	17230	17700	17780	19370	19450

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

Roadway	Segment	Predicted L_{dn} , dB, at 50 feet				
		Existing Plus Project	2011 Without Project	2011 Plus Project	2025 Without Project	2025 Plus Project
Green Valley	West of Bass Lake Road	66.9	67.5	67.6	69.0	69.0
Green Valley	Between Bass Lake Road and Cambridge Road	67.7	68.7	68.7	70.7	70.7
Green Valley	Between Cambridge Road and Project Access	67.5	68.0	68.1	70.1	70.2
Green Valley	Between Project Access and Cameron Park Drive	67.4	68.0	68.1	70.1	70.2
Green Valley	East of Cameron Park Drive	66.2	66.6	66.7	67.5	67.6
Starbuck Road	North of Project Access	59.3	58.6	58.9	57.3	57.6
Starbuck Road	Between Green Valley Road and Project Access	60.4	58.6	60.1	57.3	55.8
Cameron Park Drive	Between Meder Road and Green Valley Road	64.7	65.1	65.3	66.1	66.2
Cameron Park Drive	Between Oxford Court and Meder Road	67.6	67.5	67.5	66.9	67.1
Cameron Park Drive	South of Oxford Court	67.9	68.0	68.1	68.4	68.4

Table V below shows the predicted changes in traffic noise levels due to the project, as compared to the baseline condition. Based on this table, it was determined traffic noise levels for the year 2025 on Starbuck Road, between Green Valley Road and the project access along Starbuck Road, poses a substantial decrease. Moreover, there are no noise sensitive uses along this segment of the roadway. Therefore, traffic noise levels would be considered less than significant.

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

**TABLE V
 PREDICTED CHANGES IN TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS
 Rite Aid at Cameron Ranch, Cameron Park, California**

Roadway	Segment	Y2011 Without Project Minus Existing	Y2011 With Project Minus Y2011 Without Project	Y2025 Without Project Minus Existing	Y2025 With Project Minus Y2025 Without Project
Green Valley	West of Bass Lake Road	0.6	0.1	2.1	0
Green Valley	Between Bass Lake Road and Cambridge Road	1.0	0	3.0	0
Green Valley	Between Cambridge Road and Project Access	0.5	0.1	2.6	0.1
Green Valley	Between Project Access and Cameron Park Drive	0.6	0.1	2.9	0.1
Green Valley	East of Cameron Park Drive	0.4	0.1	1.3	0.1
Starbuck Road	North of Project Access	-0.7	0.3	-2.0	0.3
Starbuck Road	Between Green Valley Road and Project Access	-1.8	1.5	-3.1	-1.5
Cameron Park Drive	Between Meder Road and Green Valley Road	0.4	0.2	1.4	0.1
Cameron Park Drive	Between Oxford Court and Meder Road	-0.1	0	-0.5	0.2
Cameron Park Drive	South of Oxford Court	0.1	0.1	0.5	0

Note: Shaded cells indicate a potentially significant increase in traffic noise levels.

Operational Noise Impacts

HVAC Noise Levels: The project would generate operational noise through the use of HVAC (fans and compressors) equipment. Particularly, the greatest potential for significant noise effects to occur if this equipment were to be located near sensitive receivers. In this case, the nearest roof mounted HVAC unit would be located about 70 feet from the project site's northern perimeter adjacent to the residentially-zoned property. The roof top Exhibit (Exhibit M) and Table 1 below details the proposed HVAC and compressor units and the associated noise impacts.

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

Table 1. Roof-top HVAC and Compressor Units

Noise Barrier Analysis Rite Aid at Cameron Ranch, Cameron Park, California Rooftop HVAC and Refrigeration Compressor				
Unit	Distance to Nearest Property Line (feet)	Source Noise Level, dBA*	Noise Level at Nearest Property Line, dBA No Shielding	Noise Level at Nearest Property Line, dBA With Shielding
HVAC 1	110	90	49.2	36.5
HVAC 2	93	90	50.6	39.9
HVAC 3	59	90	54.6	44.0
HVAC 4	67	84	47.5	35.4
Refrigeration Compressor	44	81.1 @ 5 feet	62.2	54.5**

* HVAC noise levels are expressed as the A-weighted sound power level.
 ** This property line noise level exceeds the El Dorado County noise level standard for evening and nighttime periods.

The HVAC Units 1, 2 and 4 conform to the El Dorado County Noise Standards identified under General Plan Policy 6.5.1.2. Based on its location, HVAC Unit #3, which barely meets the maximum night time hourly standard of 45 dBA, would be operated simultaneously with the refrigeration compressor, resulting in a maximum noise level of 54.9 dBA conforming to the maximum 55 dBA. In order to meet the El Dorado County General Plan standards, the noise analysis recommends that the Refrigeration Compressor be shielded within a three-sided wood panel enclosure with the southern side open. The following mitigation measure shall be imposed:

Mitigation Measure 4 (Noise Impact)

Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall submit to Planning Services for review and approval a Final Roof Top Exhibit detailing the type, quantity, location, specifications and applicable mitigation measures of the proposed HVAC and Refrigeration Compressor identified and evaluated in the Supplemental Environmental Noise Analysis by Brown, Buntin and Associates (dated September 29, 2006). Specifically, the Refrigeration Compressor shall be shielded (on three sides with southern side open) by a 1/2' plywood or wood siding with duct lining or semi-rigid fiberglass or mineral wood board. The enclosure shall be placed as close to HVAC Unit #3 and the compressor unit, allowing room for servicing of the equipment. All of the HVAC and Refrigeration Compressor Units shall be adequately screened or positioned to minimize aesthetic impacts.

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the Roof Top Exhibit includes the required mitigation measures identified in the Brown, Buntin, and Associates' report dated September 29, 2006

Parking Lot Noise: The nearest parking space in the parking lot is located approximately 43 feet east of the residentially zoned lot. BBA used 150 p.m. peak hour movements (based on KD Anderson Traffic Study turn movements for the p.m. peak hour for the Year 2025 Plus Project Conditions) to calculate a typical noise exposure for vehicles operating in and out of the parking lot. The calculated noise levels for the above assumptions at a distance of 43 feet are 54 dB L_{dn} for daily traffic and 57 dB L_{eq} during peak hour. As mitigated below, the construction of a 6-foot tall noise barrier along the western property line would provide a 5 dB reduction in parking lot noise, ensuring conformance to the Noise Element standards of 60 dB L_{dn} and 55 dB L_{eq}. Implementation of the mitigation would lessen impacts to significant level.

Loading Dock Noise: The truck loading dock, located in the rear of the building adjacent to the residentially zoned property to the north, may be significant noise source due to passing of trucks. Depending on the frequency and time of day, engine noise associated with slow passing truck could produce 70 dB to 75 dB at 50 feet. The loading dock for the facility is located within the 28.5' rear yard setback of the building. As identified in the mitigation below, the construction of a minimum 8-foot

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

concrete masonry wall along the length of the entire northern property line and 30 feet south of the northwest corner of the property line would break line of sight to the truck noises, reducing noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5 (Noise Impact)

Prior to submittal of the building permit, the applicant shall submit a Final Site Plan depicting the following:

- a) An 8-foot tall (above the commercial driveway elevation) concrete masonry wall constructed along the entire length of the northern interior property boundary, for a distance of about 30 feet south of the north property boundary along the western property boundary; and*
- b) A 6-foot tall (above the commercial driveway elevation) concrete masonry wall constructed along the western interior property line. This wall shall extend from the project entry to the northwest corner of the site, intersecting with the 8-foot tall wall in the vicinity of the trash enclosure.*

MONITORING: Prior to issuance of building permit, Planning Services shall verify that the Final Site Plan includes adequate noise mitigation attenuation to be consistent with applicable policies of the Noise Element and Zoning Ordinance. .

Drive-Thru Noise: During drive through operating hours, noise would also be generated at the drive-thru window from the intercom loudspeakers. These speakers typically generate levels in the range of 65-70 dB at a distance of 5 feet. The predicted maximum noise level at the nearest residential property (to the west), located approximately 45 feet from the order panel, would be 46 to 51 dB. Given that the location and orientation of the drive through window are not known, the speaker noise could be directed away from the residential site in the west, lowering the noise level by 5 to 10 dB than predicted above. Drive-thru speaker noise at the nearest property is considered below both the daytime and evening maximum noise level standards of 70 dB AND 60 dB, respectively. Moreover, noise from the speaker would be masked by the ambient traffic noise along the Green Valley Road. A condition is recommended requiring the project applicant to consult Brown, Buntin and Associates in determining the type, location and orientation of the drive-thru speaker prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

Noise from the drive through traffic does not expect to exceed the daytime or nighttime noise level standards. These noise levels are expected to be well below the ambient noise levels dominated by the traffic noise on Green Valley Road. Noise impact resulting from the drive though traffic would be less than significant.

Refuse Bin Service Noise: Refuse and Recycle Bins are proposed to be located at the northwest corner of the site, adjacent to the residentially zone parcels to the north and west. Noise is expected when the refuse collecting trucks are passing by and emptying the bins. Noise is generated from diesel engine, and from metal-to-metal contact. The overall noise levels from this operation may be considered approximately similar to the noise level generated from diesel truck passing by. Utilizing previous BBA files, a diesel truck passing at low speed is expected to generate a Sound Exposure Level (SEL) of 82 dB @ 100 feet. Emptying of the bins are expected to occur about 15 feet away from the nearest property line; the SEL expected is 90.2 dB

The emptying of the refuse bins is expected to occur during daytime hours, 2 to 3 times a week, and one time per day and no more than 2 minutes per visit. The following equation is provided:

$$L_{eq} = E \text{ SEL} / 3600, \text{ where } L_{eq} \text{ is the sum of noise energy in each hour divided by the number of seconds in one hour.}$$

Based upon the assumptions, emptying the refuse bin is expected to generate noise level of 55 dB L_{eq} complying with the daytime standard of 55 dB L_{eq} . An 8-foot property line barrier would provide a noise level reduction of approximately -7 dB, in conformance to the standard.

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

b, d, e. The project would anticipate noise levels from vibration during construction. Given limited hours of construction, this type of noise is temporary and would be offset by the dominant noise source associated with traffic along Green Valley and Starbuck Roads. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

Airport Noise Guidelines are outlined under Objective 6.5.2 of the Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element. Specifically, General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires all projects within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport would be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). The project is located approximately ¼ mile north of the Cameron Park Airport, a public airport. Based on the Cameron Park Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan CLUP, the project site is located outside of the 55 dB airport noise contour. Additionally, the CLUP only requires acoustical analysis of airport noise impacts on residential development occurring within the 55 dB and 65 dB. Given that the project is commercial in nature and is outside of the 55dB, aircraft noise impacts would be considered less than significant. Nevertheless, as required by the Airport Safety District (-AA) overlay, a recordation an avigation and noise easement on the property would be required prior to issuance of building permit. The purpose of the easement would be to grant the right of flight and the right to cause noise, light and other effects associated with the operation of aircraft in the airspace over and above the subject property.

f. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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 commercial project would provide necessary goods and services for neighboring residential areas. No housing or people would be displaced, nor would induce substantial population growth in the area. There would be no impact.

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?			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-b. The project is within and would be served by the Cameron Park Fire Department and El Dorado County Sheriff's Department. The proposed commercial facility would be equipped with its internal fire suppression system in accordance with Fire District's standards. Given the project is commercial in nature and would not increase residential count in the community of Cameron Park, the project would pose less than significant impact on these public services.

c-e. The commercial project would not contribute to increased demand on schools, parks, or other governmental services. There would be no impact.

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

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

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 would not pose 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.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

a&b. Included as Attachment 1, KD Anderson and Associates performed a Traffic Impact Analysis for the project. In analyzing potential traffic effects resulting from the amendment to land use designations, the analysis determined that there is no net change in the amount of land subject to the land use designation amendment, therefore, there would be no appreciable change to the trip generation at the corner of Green Valley and Starbuck Roads. Therefore, impacts of the land use change are considered less than significant.

The analysis specifically evaluated the potential impacts associated with the proposed retail development. Based on this analysis, the project is expected to generate approximately 778 daily trips on a weekday basis with average daily trips (ADT) 1,525. The result also determined that 46 trips would occur during the a.m. peak hour and 149 during the p.m. peak hour. After discounting the pass-by trips, the resulting a.m. peak is reduced to 23 trips and peak p.m. trips to 76.

The analysis included an evaluation of the proposed project in comparison with the following existing future projected traffic scenarios: Existing Traffic Conditions, Existing Plus Project Conditions, 2011 Traffic Conditions, 2011 Plus Project Conditions, Cumulative (2025) Project Conditions, Cumulative (2025) Plus Project Conditions. The following is a summary of each scenario and applicable recommended traffic mitigations for the project.

Existing Traffic Conditions

All study intersections within the vicinity of the project operate at Level of Service (LOS) C or better, except for the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Oxford Road. This particular intersection meets the peak hour signal warrants and is identified to be signalized under the County’s 5-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Upon signalization, the intersection would operate at LOS B in both a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Existing Plus Project Specific Conditions

The project would contribute to the traffic volumes along Starbuck Road, Green Valley Road and Cameron Park Drive. All intersections would maintain operation at LOS C or better with the assumed signalization at Cameron Park Drive and Oxford intersection. The analysis following recommended measures are required including contribution to its fair share to the cost of regional circulation improvements via existing countrywide Traffic Impact fee Mitigation (TIM)fee program, frontage and road improvements (ie. widening and lane striping) along Starbuck Road and Green Valley Road.

2011 Setting

Growth is expected to occur along GreenValley Road, Starbuck Road and Cameron Park Drive in the next five years. Signalization at Cameron Park Drive and Oxford Road would be constructed. Level of service at the study intersections are projected to be within El Dorado County standards, operating at LOS C or better. No recommendations necessary.

2011 plus Project Specific Impacts

Project would contribute to traffic volumes along the surrounding roadways. All intersections would continue to operate within the El Dorado County level of service standards at LOS C. No mitigation required.

2025 Setting

Long range improvements are expected along Cameron Park Drive to four lanes south of Oxford Road. LOS at the study intersections are projected to be within the El Dorado County standards. All study intersections would operate at LOS D or better. The analysis recommended extension of existing westbound left turn lane at the Green Valley Road and Starbuck Road/Cameron Park Drive

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

2025 plus Project Specific Impacts

The project would continue to contribute to the traffic volumes along the surrounding roadways. All intersection would continue to operate within acceptable El Dorado County LOS D or better. No recommendation needed.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the analysis and considered the proposed KD Anderson mitigations. DOT protocols only evaluate current projects up to the Year 2011 scenario; therefore, the scenarios after Year 2011 analyzed by KD Anderson are inapplicable. DOT provided project-specific and standard conditions including widening at the project frontage portion on Green Valley Road and Starbuck Road, implementing lane striping on both roads, and requiring additional R.O.W along Green Valley Road (Attachment 6). Implementation of these conditions would ensure a less than significant impact on traffic in the vicinity of the project.

c.-g. The project site is within the Cameron Park Airport Safety Zone 3. The proposed commercial development is identified as an allowed use by the Cameron Park Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The commercial building would not present an air traffic hazard. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. An Avigation and Noise easement would be recorded on the property, prior to issuance of building permit. There would be no impact.

The commercial facility and associated adjacent off-site improvements are proposed to be constructed in accordance to the applicable development standards of the Zoning Code and Design and Improvement Manual. Prior to issuance or approval of any permits, Grading, Improvement and Building Plans would be reviewed by the Development Services Department and DOT. Therefore, there would be no impact.

The facility would provide the required amount of off-site parking (58) in accordance to the parking standard in the El Dorado County Zoning Code.

The proposed development is located within the desirable transit corridor of Green Valley Road and Cameron Park Drive served by El Dorado County Transit Department. The current bus turnout, located in front of Circle K gas station southeast of the project site, is deemed substandard. The department reviewed the project and initially recommended a bus turnout be provided at its frontage along Green Valley Road. Given the constraints that a bus turnout would pose on the project, the department re-considered its comments and, in coordination with applicant, DOT and Planning Services, recommended a condition requiring the applicant post an in-lieu deposit for the construction of a bus turnout in the vicinity of the project along Green Valley Road. Therefore, there would be no impact.

The project site is adjacent to Green Valley Road, a corridor identified within the Bicycle Transportation Plan. DOT is recommending a condition for striping a 5-foot wide shoulder dedicated for a bicycle lane. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

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

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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, b, d-h. The project would be required to connect to El Dorado Irrigation District's (EID) existing utilities adjacent the project site for sewer and water services. According to EID's Facility Improvement Letter, the commercial development would be served an equivalent to two EDU's of water. Coupled with the review of an Improvement Plan, a Facility Plan Report would be required detailing the necessary improvements to serve the facility in accordance to the district and County's standards.

Rite Aid would be required to contract with the local purveyor of solidwaste subject to applicable waste disposal standards. Rite Aid would also require electrical, phone and other telecommunication services. A final utility plan would be submitted verifying the appropriate easements and construction details necessary to accommodate the utility. Electrical and plumbing plans would also be submitted detailing the type apparatus needed to serve the facility. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

c. As discussed under section VIII. Hydrology/Water Quality section, the facility would require a new on-site drainage system subject to El Dorado County Drainage Standards. Development Services-Building Division would review

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

the proposed drainage on-site while DOT would verify any connection to existing drainage system off-site. A submittal of Drainage and Improvement Plans would be required.

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

Discussion

a.-c. As discussed in the Biological Resources section above, the project would impact oak tree canopy, subject to standards under General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4A. Appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated reducing impacts to the canopy of Oak Woodland to less than significant. With the impacts to the oak trees, there is the potential to affect migratory birds that may inhabit the site. Mitigation measure has also been incorporated reducing the impact to less than significant impact.

As discussed above, the proposed retail facility has been reviewed for project specific and potential cumulative impacts. With incorporation of specific mitigation measures, the project is determined to have less than significant impacts to Noise and Biological Resources. Prior to any construction, the project would be required to submit project plans, pertinent documentation, and fees for review and consideration by various regulatory County Departments and agencies. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact.

Implementation of the project would have inherent temporary effects during construction such as noise, dust, construction traffic and aesthetic. Standard construction measures imposed by the County and Best Management Practices within the industry would be enforced. Project operation effects such as noise and traffic have been evaluated in this document and are subject to specific measures reducing the impacts to less than significant.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Traffic Analysis
2. Biological Resources Evaluation/Tree Survey Plan
3. Air Quality Analysis
4. Noise Analysis
5. Preliminary Drainage Report
6. Agency Comments
7. Reasonable Use Analysis

EXHIBITS:

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. General Plan Map
- C. Zoning Map
- D. Assessor's Parcel Map
- E. Recorded Boundary Line Adjustment Map
- F. Site Plan
- G. Preliminary Grading Plan
- H. Preliminary Drainage Plan
- I. Preliminary Landscaping Plan
- J. Photometric Plan
- K. Elevation/Floor Plan
- L. Sign Plan
- M. Rooftop Layout