



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: PD 06-0026/P 87-0118R Walgreens Plaza Goldorado

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

Contact Person: Audrey Anderson

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address:

Wayne and Duane Swart
2278 El Segundo
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Michael and Kristen Wadden
7350 Steeple Chase Dr.
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Smith and Gabbert, Inc
3420 Palmer Drive
Cameron Park, CA 95682

Richard and Shirley Marshall
Trustees of the Marshall Trust
2056 Brook Mar Drive
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Interra-Vision Development, LLC, 2377 Gold Meadow Way, Suite 100, Gold River, CA 95670

Project Agent's Name and Address: Robert A. Laurie, Attorney at Law, 3161 Cameron Park Drive, Suite 215, Cameron Park, CA 95682

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

Engineer: Stanley Iverson, Tait and Associates, Inc., 11280 Trade Center Drive, Rancho Cordova, CA 95742

Architect: Rachel Huang So, Rauschenbach Marvelli Becker (RMB), 2277 Watt Ave., 2nd Floor, Sacramento, CA 95825

Project Location: Northeast corner of the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Palmer Drive in the Cameron Park area; Supervisorial District 1

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 083-453-06, -07, -08, -15, -16

Zoning: Commercial – Design Community (C-DC)

Section: 3 **T:** 9 North **R:** 9 East

General Plan Designation: Commercial (C)

Description of Project:

The project consists of the following requests:

- 1) Planned Development Permit for the construction and operation of a 14,820 square foot commercial retail/pharmacy (Walgreens) and a 3,300 square foot retail building.
- 2) Parcel Map amendment (approved under P87-0118) consisting of merging of lots Assessor's Parcel Numbers 083-453- 06 (Lot 1), -07 (Lot 2), -15 (Lot 10), and -16 (Lot 11) resulting in one commercial lot; and
- 3) Design Waiver Request for the following:
 - a) Reduction of standard sidewalk width of eight-foot wide to five-foot wide along the project frontage (Cameron Park Drive)

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	C-DC-PD	C	vacant undeveloped
North:	C	C	commercial/office buildings
East:	C	C	shopping center
South:	R-1	HDR	single family residences
West:	C	C	vacant, parking areas

Briefly describe the environmental setting: The project site is located on the north side of the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Palmer Drive, just north of Highway 50. The site is relatively flat, with elevations ranging from 1,320 and 1,360 feet above sea level.

Most of the project site is covered with foothill woodland, portions of which have recently been brushed. An unnamed paved road, which provides access to nearby businesses, and associated parking spaces, occurs in the central portion of the site. Areas located south of the road and parking area are covered with moderately dense oak woodland; the eastern and northern portions of the site are covered with open grassy areas with scattered oaks.

Two soil units have been mapped on the project site, Rescue very stony sandy loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes and Rescue sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent. Rescue soils are well-drained, but have moderately slow to slow permeability because of the clay layer. The soils found on the project site do not appear to match the soils descriptions, possibly due to past deposition of fill onto the site.

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

Regional Water Quality Control Board: Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of Clean Water Act
 Cameron Park Community Service District: In-lieu fees and park impact fees
 El Dorado County Department of Transportation: encroachment permits, grading plans
 El Dorado County Building Department: building permits

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. (NEED TO CHECK THOSE THAT YOU MITIGATED)

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	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	X	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** would be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there would 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** would 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: August 13, 2007

Printed Name: Audrey Anderson For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: August 13, 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 would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less-than-significant with mitigation, or less-than-significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less-than-significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less-than-significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less-than-significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less-than-significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development;
 - Substantially change the natural landscape; or
 - Obstruct an identified public scenic vista.
- a) The project is approximately two miles east from a scenic vista, Marble Valley, as identified in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR (p. 5.3-3 and Exhibit 5.3-1). The scenic vista is visible primarily from the south, where topography and elevations allow for clear visual access. Since the project is east of the scenic viewpoint, and not in the direction of the south-facing scenic view, the project would not adversely affect or impair views of Marble Valley. The project would have no impact on scenic vistas.
 - b) The nearest state scenic highway, as designated and listed by Caltrans, is U.S. Highway 50 beginning from the eastern limits of the Government Center interchange (Forni Road/Placerville Drive) to South Lake Tahoe. The scenic highway begins approximately nine miles east of the project site. The project would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.
 - c) This project site is surrounded by existing commercial uses along the eastern side of Cameron Park Drive and Palmer Drive and residences on the west side of the road. Implementation of the commercial project would require on-site improvements such as removal of oak trees, site grading in preparation for necessary utilities, pad preparation for the proposed building and off-site improvements including curb, gutter and sidewalk and road tapers. Prior to any construction, these improvements are subject to preparation and verification of Improvement and Site Grading Plans, in accordance with the El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standard Manual (DISM). The proposed development has been designed in conformance with the architectural design desired by the community of Cameron Park. The project would have less than significant impact to the visual character of the area.
 - d) The project would result in the development of two commercial buildings. New sources of light and glare would result from sources such as parking space lighting, automobile headlights, and a neon sign. Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance sets forth standards for outdoor lighting. These include using hoods or screens on all outdoor lighting to direct light downward and away from adjacent properties, top- and side-shielding of

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

parking lot and other security lighting, and prohibiting lights shining on a road in a manner which may be considered a traffic hazard. Section 17.16.070 of the Zoning Ordinance prohibits blinking lights and requires control of lighting so that visibility of vehicular traffic is not impaired and adjacent residential zones are shielded from objectionable glare. The project must comply with these Zoning Ordinance requirements prior to final approval. The impacts would be less than significant.

Findings: The proposed development is commercial in nature and would be consistent with the underlying land use designation for the property and surrounding uses. The project would have less than significant impacts to aesthetic resources on site.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if implementation of the project would:

- Convert important agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impair the productivity of such agricultural land, or convert land 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;
 - Substantially reduce the amount of agricultural land in the County; or
 - Subject agricultural uses to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a) Exhibit 5.2-1 of the County General Plan EIR (El Dorado County, 2003) depicts important farmland, which includes Farmland as defined in this Initial Study (Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance). The exhibit is based on the Important Farmland Map for El Dorado County, prepared by the California Resources Agency, Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The project site is in an area designated in Exhibit 5.2-1 as Urban and Built-Up Land. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. There would be no impact on Farmland.
- b) No agricultural operations currently exist on the project site. The project site is zoned for commercial use, and adjacent lands are zoned for commercial and residential uses. There are no parcels zoned for agricultural uses in the immediate vicinity. The project site and adjacent lands are not under any current Williamson Act contracts. The nearest Williamson Act contract parcel is approximately three miles east. There would be no impact related to agricultural zoning or Williamson Act lands.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- c) The area surrounding the project site has been designated as Urban and Built-Up Land or Other Land (see Exhibit 5.2-1 of the County General Plan EIR). There is no designated Farmland in the vicinity. Commercial and residential development is located in the area, with existing streets and other infrastructure the project would utilize. Therefore, the project would not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. There would be no impact.

Findings: The proposed project would result in no loss of Farmland, or conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts. The project would not facilitate the loss of agricultural lands. The proposed project would have no impact on agricultural resources.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), precursors to ozone, would result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82 pounds per day (see Table 5.1 of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District Guide to Air Quality Assessment, dated February 2002);
 - Emissions of particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) would result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82 pounds per day (see p. 6-2 of the Air Pollution Control District Guide), except for industrial sources covered by Table 6.1 of the Air Pollution Control District Guide; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants that cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) In 1994, the Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan was adopted. This is also called the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Clean Air Plan was designed to bring the Sacramento Region, which includes all of El Dorado County except for the Lake Tahoe Basin, into compliance with the federal one-hour ozone standard. The SIP includes adopted measures and commitments to adopt measures to reduce ozone emissions, along with contingency measures and a demonstration of emission reductions sufficient for attainment of air quality standards. In 2006, the

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District initiated a Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan Update, which would be designed to bring the region into compliance with the federal eight-hour ozone standard promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1997.

As discussed in c) below, the project would be considered in compliance with the Clean Air Plan if the County requires the project to implement any applicable emission reduction measures contained in and/or derived from the Clean Air Plan. A list of emission reduction measures, applicable to a variety of land uses, is available in Appendix E of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) CEQA Guide. As of 2006, the County is in nonattainment status of state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM₁₀. Emissions of these pollutants generated by the project would be potentially significant.

Based on the AQMD CEQA manual, the proposed retail development, measuring total of 18, 120 square feet, is below the screening level threshold of 62,000 square feet in determining long term air quality impacts. Therefore, the project would pose less than significant impact.

- b) As of 2006, El Dorado County is in attainment status of all federal and state ambient air quality standards, except state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM₁₀. Air pollutant emission sources from the project upon completion would be from vehicle trip emissions, landscape equipment, and consumer products. Table 5.2 of the AQMD CEQA Guide provides size or activity cutoff points for various types of land uses the AQMD has determined would result in a project exceeding the emission thresholds of 82 lbs./day for ROG and NO_x. For a shopping center, the cutoff point is 62,000 square feet. The project as proposed would construct 18,120 square feet of commercial buildings, which is below the cutoff point. As noted above, the cutoff points also would apply to emissions of PM₁₀, CO and SO₂. Operational air quality impacts would be considered minor, and would not significantly contribute to existing ozone and PM₁₀ air quality violations.

According to an air quality study conducted by Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting, mobile-source CO is the localized pollutant of primary concern associated with the long-term operation of the proposed project. Localized CO concentrations are typically highest in the vicinity of congested roadway intersections. Based on a review of the traffic analysis prepared for the project, the Ambient study concluded that predicted localized mobile-source CO concentrations at nearby intersections would be unlikely to exceed applicable ambient air quality standards. Also, the Ambient study stated that the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the installation of any major sources of odorous or toxic air contaminants resulting in localized concentrations at nearby receptors in excess of applicable standards. Commercial activities that use toxic air contaminants, such as dry cleaning establishments, would be required to obtain permits from the AQMD, pursuant to its rules and regulations. Permits may be granted to such sources if they are constructed and operated in accordance with applicable regulations, including Rule 523 (New Source Review) and Rule 526 (Toxic New Source Review). In accordance with permitting requirements, the AQMD would evaluate sources to determine potential health-related impacts and to identify appropriate control measure to be implemented to protect nearby receptors.

Construction activities associated with the project would include grading and site improvements, building pad construction, utilities, entryways and associated on-site activities. Construction-related activities could generate PM₁₀ dust emissions that could exceed state and/or federal ambient air quality standards. This is a temporary but potentially significant effect. The applicant must comply with AQMD Rule 223-1, Fugitive Dust-Construction Activities. Requirements under Rule 223-1 include the following:

- Visible emissions shall not exceed 20 percent opacity at point-of-origin and shall not extend more than 50 feet from point-of-origin, or cross the project boundary line, whichever is less.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- Vehicle speeds shall be limited to prevent visible emissions past the project boundary line, or 50 feet from the point of origin, whichever is less.
- The dust generating process must be suspended when wind causes visible emissions past the project boundary line, or 50 feet from the point of origin, whichever is less.
- Projects that require a County grading permit must submit a Fugitive Dust Plan and fee to the AQMD for approval. The Fugitive Dust Plan identifies potential dust-generating activities associated with the project and indicates measures to be implemented to control dust emissions. Notification must be made to the AQMD 10 days prior to the start of earthmoving activities.
- Applicable Best Management Practices shall be utilized throughout the project to comply with the requirements of Rule 223-1.
- Trackout from project site must be prevented and removed when exceeding 50 feet from the nearest unpaved surface exit point of the site.
- All trackout must be cleaned at the end of each workday by manually sweeping, with a rotary brush or broom with sufficient wetting, a PM₁₀-efficient street sweeper, or flushing with water if possible without causing adverse impacts on storm water drainage or potential violations of any National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program.
- Larger sites (>150 vehicle trips/day or >20 vehicle trips/day for ≥3-axle vehicles) must also install a trackout control device.
- Storage piles must have a means of dust control.

Compliance with the AQMD Rule 223-1 requirements would reduce dust emissions from construction activities to a level that is less than significant.

The use of construction equipment that emits diesel exhaust would result in the generation of ROG, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, which could adversely affect air quality. Compliance with existing AQMD rules and regulations would reduce the amount of emissions generated by project construction and operations, particularly of ozone precursors and PM₁₀. Project impacts related to local and regional air quality would be less than significant.

- c) As noted in b) above, the County currently is in nonattainment status for state and federal standards for ozone and state standards for PM₁₀. The project is likely to generate emissions of ozone precursors and PM₁₀, through both construction activities and project operations. As noted in b) above, project operations are expected to generate ROG and NO_x emissions that are below significance thresholds established by AQMD, based on the anticipated amount of square footage of commercial development. Nevertheless, the project would contribute ozone emissions in an area classified in “serious nonattainment” of federal ozone standards.

The El Dorado AQMD CEQA Guide provides guidance for assessing the cumulative impacts of a project on air quality. For ROG and NO_x, the AQMD basically determines their cumulative significance on whether the project is consistent with an approved plan or mitigation program of AQMD-wide or regional application. For western El Dorado County, the Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan is the applicable plan. Development projects are considered consistent with the Clean Air Plan if:

- The project does not require a change in the existing land use designation and projected emissions of ROG and NO_x from the proposed project are equal to or less than the emissions anticipated for the site if developed under the existing land use designation;
- The project does not exceed the “project alone” significance criteria;
- The lead agency for the project (i.e., the County) requires the project to implement any applicable emission reduction measures contained in and/or derived from the Clean Air Plan; and
- The project complies with all applicable AQMD rules and regulations.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

The project would be required to comply with all AQMD rules and regulations. The project also does not require a change in the existing land use designation, which is Commercial, as the project proposes commercial/retail development. As discussed in b) above, the project by itself would not exceed thresholds of significance for ozone precursors, PM₁₀, CO and SO₂.

As discussed in b) above, construction activities associated with the project would be expected to generate PM₁₀ emissions. These emissions would be temporary and would cease when construction work is completed. In addition, AQMD rules would control PM₁₀ emissions resulting from construction activities. Project operations are expected to generate very little amounts of PM₁₀. Therefore, the project would not contribute a cumulatively considerable amount of PM₁₀. Cumulative impacts on PM₁₀ emissions are considered less than significant.

- d) No schools, hospitals, parks, or other sensitive land uses are located within the immediate vicinity. Some residences are located to the south of the project site, but they are separated from the site by Cameron Park Drive and intervening landscape. The most significant pollutant generated by the project would be PM₁₀ emissions during construction, and such emissions would cease after construction work ends. Also, as described in b) above, AQMD Rule 223-1 requires measures to control dust emissions during construction. Thus, the project would not expose existing residents in the area to substantial pollutant concentrations. The impact would be less than significant.
- e) Odors generated by construction activities such as exhaust fumes from construction equipment, and the use of landscape maintenance equipment after project completion, can be considered objectionable by some residents in the area. These odors would be sporadic and temporary, and occur intermittently throughout the workday. Exhaust odors would dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity. Because of the temporary and sporadic nature of odor generation, the potential impact on residents or visitors to the area is limited and unlikely to be substantial. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: The proposed project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The project would result in increased emissions due to construction activities and project operation. However, implementation standard AQMD regulations subject to the development would result to less-than-significant level of impacts to air quality.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X	
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X	
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory		X	

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X	
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X

Discussion:

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

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
 - Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
 - Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;
 - Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
 - Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species; or
 - Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.
- a) North Fork Associates conducted a Biological Resource Assessment of the project site, which included field trips to determine the existence of special-status plant and wildlife species. The Assessment defined “special-status” species as those listed as endangered or threatened under both federal and state Endangered Species Acts, designated a Species of Special Concern by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and listed on California Native Plant Society (CNPS) plant inventory lists.

According to the Biological Resource Assessment, the project site has suitable habitat for eleven special-status plant species (North Fork Associates, 2006a, Table 2):

- Big-scale balsam root (CNPS list)
- Bisbee Peak rush-rose (CNPS list)
- Brandegee’s clarkia (CNPS list)
- El Dorado bedstraw (federal endangered, state rare, CNPS list)
- El Dorado County mules-ears (CNPS list)
- Layne’s ragwort (federal threatened, state rare, CNPS list)
- Oval-leaved viburnum (CNPS list)
- Pine Hill ceanothus (federal endangered, state rare, CNPS list)
- Pine Hill flannelbush (federal endangered, state rare, CNPS list)

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- Red Hills soaproot (CNPS list)
- Stebbin's false bindweed (federal endangered, state endangered, CNPS list)

Most of these plant species are commonly associated with gabbro soils which the Assessment determined was not expressed well on the site. All 11 special-status plant species were considered to have a low probability of occurrence. Field surveys conducted in May and June 2006, to coincide with the flowering season for all 11 plant species, found none of these species on the project site (North Fork Associates, 2006a, p. 10). Therefore, it is considered unlikely that any special-status plant species exist on the project site.

The Biological Resource Assessment determined that the project site contains suitable foraging habitat for one special-status wildlife species. Cooper's hawk, a California Species of Special Concern, was not observed on the project site during field surveys. While Cooper's hawk has been known to nest in live oaks in the vicinity of water, it prefers riparian woodland habitats, of which the project site has none. Therefore, the probability of Cooper's hawk nesting on the project site is considered low (North Fork Associates, 2006a, p. 13). However, there is potential nesting habitat on the project site for raptor species such as red-shouldered hawk, red-tailed hawk, and the great horned owl. Taller trees of black oak and foothill pine could provide nesting habitat for these species. Construction activities that occur during the typical breeding season (approximately March 1 through August 31) could disturb the breeding and nesting of these species, thereby adversely affecting their numbers. The take of any raptor species is prohibited under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5. In addition, the southwestern corner of the project site contains a large snag that potentially could provide nesting habitat for owls, bluebirds and woodpeckers. During a wildlife site survey, several woodpeckers were observed using cavities within the snag. Construction activities involving the removal of the snag could result in the loss of active bird nests. These are considered potentially significant impacts.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-1

If construction activities are scheduled to occur within the typical breeding season for raptors (March 1 through August 31), on-site pre-construction surveys for raptors and their nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of the proposed development activities. The survey results shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and Planning Services prior to issuance of a grading permit. If active raptor nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the site, consultation must be initiated with CDFG to determine appropriate avoidance measures. The applicant shall follow the appropriate avoidance measures issued by CDFG, and no construction activities shall occur on the project site until the avoidance measures are issued and implemented. If no active nests are found, then no further action is required, and construction activities may proceed upon approval by Planning Services.

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the above measure has been incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a grading permit. 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.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-2

Removal of the snag shall occur outside the typical breeding season/nesting period for cavity nesting bird species (approximately April through July). If snag removal must occur during the typical breeding/nesting season for cavity nesting bird species, an on-site pre-construction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of the proposed development activities. The survey results shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and Planning

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Services prior to issuance of a grading permit. If active nests are found, consultation must be initiated with CDFG to determine appropriate avoidance measures. The applicant shall follow the appropriate avoidance measures issued by CDFG, and no construction activities shall occur on the project site until the avoidance measures are issued and implemented. If no active nests are found, then no further action is required, and snag removal may proceed upon approval by Planning Services.

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the required note has been incorporated on the plans prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Development Services 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 the mitigation measures mentioned above would avoid direct impacts on nesting birds, including raptor species protected by the Fish and Game Code. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

- b) The Biological Resource Assessment identified two habitat types on the project site: foothill woodland and annual grassland. The foothill woodland habitat contains oak woodland that receives special protection under General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. The Aesthetics section discusses potential impacts on oak woodland, requirements of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, and mitigation measures for identified impacts. The impacts would be less than significant with these mitigation measures. Annual grassland is not considered a sensitive natural community, and no other sensitive natural communities have been identified on the site, as identified in Exhibit 5.12-7 of the County General Plan.
- c) North Fork Associates conducted a Wetland Delineation for the project site, including a site visit in January 2006, during the rainy season. The Wetland Delineation identified a seasonal wetland approximately 0.02 acres in size at the center of the project site. This seasonal wetland was considered a potential jurisdictional water of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, as it is adjacent to Deer Creek, a tributary of the Cosumnes River, which drains into the Mokelumne River, a navigable water of the United States. In a letter to the project applicant dated August 24, 2006, the Corps of Engineers approved the jurisdictional determination of the wetland.

The project as proposed would fill this wetland, which is a potentially significant impact. A fill of jurisdictional wetlands would require a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It also would require a water quality certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. The Section 404 permit and water quality certification typically have conditions attached that are designed to mitigate the loss of filled wetlands. In addition, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-3

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall obtain a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and a water quality certification from the Central Valley RWQCB. The project applicant shall incorporate all conditions attached to the permit and certification into the project.

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the required Section 404 permit has been obtained prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Implementation of the mitigation measure would ensure timely compensation for the loss of the seasonal wetland due to project construction. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

- d) The Biological Resource Assessment did not identify the project site as being part of a migration corridor for wildlife. However, the Assessment indicated the existence of potential nesting habitat for bird species, as discussed

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

in a) above. Construction activities could affect these potential nesting sites. Compliance with the mitigation measures described in a) above would avoid or minimize impacts on these sites. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

- e) The proposed project is expected to have an impact on existing oak woodland. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 seeks to minimize the impact of development projects on oak woodlands. Specifically, the project includes substantial grading and the removal of oak trees, as well as construction of commercial buildings on the site. The oak woodland is the most notable visual feature on the project site. The visual character of the site would change from undeveloped land to commercial development, consistent with the visual character of areas to the north and east. The scale and type of development proposed is consistent with existing commercial/office development north and east of the site.

The project would be required to comply with County General Plan policies, zoning codes, and ordinances that regulate visual character, including policies to protect biological resources, height limitations to protect views, and other miscellaneous policies. Most significant of these is General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. This policy requires all new development projects (not including agricultural cultivation and actions pursuant to a Fire Safe Plan necessary to protect existing structures) that would result in soil disturbance of parcels over one acre that have at least 1 percent total canopy cover by woodlands habitats as defined in the General Plan to mitigate impacts by one of two options:

- Adherence to tree canopy retention and replacement standards (Option A); or
- Contribution to the County's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan conservation fund (Option B). Option B is currently not available, as an Oak Woodland Management Plan has not yet been adopted by the County.

As defined by the Interim Interpretive Guidelines for El Dorado County General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 (Option A), adopted November 9, 2006, woodlands habitats subject to this policy include blue oak and blue oak-foothill pine woodlands. The southern and western portions of the project site contain predominantly blue oak woodland. The tree canopy retention standards established by Policy 7.4.4.4 require retention of a defined percentage of existing canopy cover, based on the percent of existing canopy cover on a site. A Tree Resources Assessment conducted for the project site determined that existing woodland canopy covers 48.1 percent of the site (North Fork Associates, revised 2007, p. 6). Under the tree retention standards, 80 percent of this existing canopy must be retained. The Tree Resources Assessment indicates that the project would reduce the canopy on the site to approximately 0.24 acres, or 8.6 percent of the site (North Fork Associates, revised 2007, Appendix D).

The project applicant has proposed a landscape plan that would retain or replant 84 oak trees on the project site. The plan includes the planting of (32) 15-gallon valley oaks, (9) 15-gallon California black oaks, (18) 15-gallon interior live oaks, and (6) 15-gallon crape myrtle trees. The total amount to be planted is 65 gallons, including the preservation of 19 existing oak trees. The applicant also proposes an additional 0.22 acres of off-site mitigation on the adjacent Parcel 12 (APN 083-453-17). Policy 7.4.4.4 permits off-site mitigation, at the discretion of the Development Services Director.

The retention of 19 (0.24-acre–18.2 percent) and replanting 65 (0.70-acre – 53 percent) oak trees on the project would result to of 0.94-acre or 71.2 percent of the current canopy. Coupled with the 0.22 acres (16.7 percent) of off-site mitigation on adjacent Parcel 12, the canopy retention percentage would be 1.16-acres or 87.9 percent, exceeding the required retention standards

The Interim Interpretive Guidelines contain a “reasonable use” provision. Under this provision, the Planning Commission may grant existing legal lots relief from Policy 7.4.4.4 of the oak canopy cover retention requirements,

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

if strict compliance with these requirements would preclude reasonable use of the property or cause substantial inconsistencies with other General Plan policies. Factors unique to the property that may lead to a reasonable use finding include topographic constraints, configuration of the remaining area useable for development, access requirements, lot, and/or other physical or environmental limitations, or conflict with the requirements of an approved Fire Safe Plan. Relief from the retention requirements may be granted if the following applicable findings are made:

- The applicant demonstrates the project is designed to maximize use of parcel area unconstrained by oak trees, unless precluded by other significant constraints such as steep slopes, streams, creeks, wetlands or other sensitive environmental resources.
- The proposed project is limited to development and site disturbance that is typical and prevalent for the general area surrounding the project site.
- Soil disturbance and tree removal is minimized through the incorporation of some or all of the following measures into the project design:
 - Stepped foundations are used on sloping areas rather than graded pads.
 - Depth of excavation and/or fill outside of the building footprint is limited to no more than five feet measured vertically from the natural ground surface, except for grading necessary to install retaining walls designed to reduce the total area of tree canopy that will be removed and/or damaged.
 - Structures and the configuration of the area of disturbance are designed to parallel the natural topographic contours to the greatest extent feasible.
 - Design techniques such as clustering of buildings are proposed to take advantage of the portions of the property which are least constrained by oaks.
 - The project is designed to maximize consistency with all applicable policies of the El Dorado County General Plan. *It is recognized that more than one policy may have to be considered in the determination of reasonable use of a particular parcel.*

The project applicant has requested that a finding of reasonable use be made by the Planning Commission, on the grounds that strict application of the oak canopy cover retention requirements would make the project infeasible. On July 26, 2007, the El Dorado County Planning Commission considered the Reasonable Use Determination of the required tree canopy retention and replacement standards for the project. With a 4-0 vote, the Planning Commission approved the request granting relief from the retention requirements and the proposed replacement measures, and adopted findings for reasonable use of the property.

The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-4

Any oak tree removed from the site shall be replaced as specified in the Interim Interpretive Guidelines for El Dorado County as modified by the Reasonable Use Determination approved by the El Dorado County Planning Commission on July 26, 2007. The arborist contract, planting and maintenance plan, and all compliance documents necessary to meet the Oak Woodlands Interim Interpretive Guidelines shall be submitted to Planning Services for its review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit.

MONITORING: Planning Services shall verify that the Final Landscape Plan contain the details of the approved canopy replacement, planting, monitoring specifications identified in the Arborist Report. In

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-5

The project applicant shall place construction fencing around onsite oak trees that will be retained to protect them from disturbance during construction. Protective fencing shall be erected at least one (1) foot beyond the drip line surrounding each oak tree unless otherwise specified by a certified project arborist. This fenced area shall not be encroached for any reason, without authorization by the certified project arborist. No materials, equipment, or vehicles shall be stored or parked within the projected tree zone. No grading, cuts, fills or trenching of any kind shall be allowed within the drip line of the trees without direct supervision of the project arborist.

MONITORING: Planning Services shall review the required protection measures on all construction/grading/improvement plans and verify implementation of the measures on-site.

Implementation of the mitigation measures would compensate for the loss of oak tree canopy that may occur as a result of the project, even if the reasonable use request is approved, and ensure protection of oak trees proposed for onsite retention. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

- f) The project site is not currently covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. Exhibit 5.12-7 of the County General Plan indicates the project sit may be within the core area of the recovery plan for the California red-legged frog, released by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 2002. However, the Biological Resource Assessment for the project site identified no habitat for the red-legged frog (North Fork Associates, 2006, Appendix A). The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: Potentially significant impacts to biological resources include potential impacts to nesting habitat for raptors and other bird species. Impacts to these species are reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2**. A seasonal wetland subject to Section 404 jurisdiction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers may be filled as a result of the project. Compliance with conditions set forth in the required Section 404 permit and water quality certification, along with incorporation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-3**, would ensure compensation for the loss of the wetland. Construction activities associated with the project would remove existing oak trees, requiring mitigation in accordance with County policies and guidelines. Specifically, implementation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5** would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. For the Biological Resources category, established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project with mitigation.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
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	

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion:

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

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property or historic or cultural significant to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study;
 - Affect a landmark of cultural/historical importance;
 - Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.
- a) The project site is vacant, with no buildings or features other than a paved road installed recently. Table 5.13-1 of the County General Plan EIR shows properties in the unincorporated area of El Dorado County on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. Table 5.13-2 of the General Plan EIR lists California Historic Landmarks in unincorporated El Dorado County. Neither table shows any sites or landmarks in the Cameron Park area.
- b) There is no record of significant archeological resources on the project site. However, there is a possibility that subsurface deposits of artifacts could be inadvertently uncovered during grading and other construction activities associated with the project. These subsurface deposits may be considered historically significant. The County General Plan EIR states that any level of ground disturbance within the County, regardless of intensity, has the potential to affect cultural resources, since prehistoric resources can occur anywhere on the landscape regardless of topography (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.13-13). This is a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURE CUL-1

During preliminary site grading, a cultural resources specialist shall be present on site in the event that subsurface artifacts are uncovered. Work in the area of the discovery shall be halted until artifacts can be evaluated in accordance with state and federal regulations regarding cultural resources. If a deposit is found to be significant, data shall be collected and consultation shall be initiated with appropriate agencies. The cultural resource specialist, in coordination with appropriate agencies, shall provide recommendations on the disposition of the resource that retains its cultural value. Recommendations may include, but are not limited to, excavation of the resource or covering of the resource by pavement. These recommendations shall be implemented by the contractor working at the project site. A contract demonstrating that a cultural resources specialist has been retained for site grading activity shall be submitted to Planning Services for review prior to issuance of a grading permit.

MONITORING: During grading, building services representative shall ensure that a cultural resource specialist is on site.

With the incorporation of the mitigation measure, subsurface cultural resources uncovered during project grading and construction activities would be protected until their significance is evaluated and recommendations are made as to their disposition. Impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- c) No paleontological resources or unique geological features were identified on the project site. The County General Plan EIR states that paleontological resources are unlikely to be encountered in El Dorado County. Paleontological remains are found in sedimentary rock formations, which are virtually nonexistent in the County (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5-13.1). The impacts would be less than significant.
- d) There are no known burial sites within the project site. If human remains are unearthed during construction, the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall apply. Under these sections, no further disturbance of the remains shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are identified as Native American, the County Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American, and the descendant may make recommendations for means of treating and disposing of the remains and any grave goods with appropriate dignity. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: The project could have potentially significant impacts on subsurface cultural resources that may exist on the project site. The incorporation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce the impacts on such resources to a less-than-significant level. With mitigation, established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the Cultural Resources category.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion:

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
 - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) i) According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, there are no Alquist-Priolo fault zones within El Dorado County. The nearest such faults are located in Alpine and Butte Counties. There would be no impact related to Alquist-Priolo zones.
- ii) The County General Plan EIR states there are no active faults in El Dorado County. The nearest fault to the project site is the East Bear Mountain Fault, which is located approximately three miles east. The East Bear Mountain Fault is classified as a pre-Quaternary fault, a type of fault considered inactive (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.9-5 and Exhibit 5.9-2). The potential intensity of seismic events varies across the County, generally increasing from west to east, with the highest potential ground shaking intensity located in the Lake Tahoe Basin (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.9-5). The project site is located within Seismic Risk Zone 3, which is a zone of increased risk for strong seismic shaking. Existing seismic safety regulations within the adopted County building code, which is based on the California Building Code, would ensure that structures and improvements on the site are safe from impacts related to seismic shaking. The impact would be less than significant.
- iii) Seismic-related ground failure includes lateral spreading and seismically-induced landslides and avalanches. Lateral spreading occurs mainly in areas with soft, saturated clay soils and beneath fills. The project site does not contain such soils. Seismically-induced landslides and avalanches occur mainly in areas with high potential for seismic activity. El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.9-2). Liquefaction most likely occurs in areas with water-saturated silts, sands and gravels having low to medium density. The only area on the project site that contains such soils is the seasonal wetland. This wetland is dry outside the rainy season, and the project would most likely fill this wetland. Therefore, the liquefaction hazard is considered low. The impacts would be less than significant.
- iv) The project site is relatively flat, and contains no slopes that are greater than 20 percent. The most heavily sloped lands are located in the southeastern corner and the west central portion of the site, near the traditional banks of the intermittent stream that is now piped under the project site. The potential for landslides on the site is also limited by the planned grading associated with the project, along with a retaining wall along the southern and eastern boundaries. The impact would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- b) The proposed project can result in substantial soil erosion and loss of topsoil through construction, earthmoving and grading activities. Such activities loosen the soil and expose it to wind and precipitation, which can carry away sediments. Erosion more commonly occurs during the rainy season, from approximately October 15 to May 1.

The County Department of Transportation and the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District have developed a list of storm water management practices that all construction sites within western El Dorado County are required to implement. These include management of disturbed soil areas by implementing soil stabilization measures (e.g., mulch, hydroseeding, erosion control blanket), sediment barriers and sediment basins. They also include stockpile management measures, requirements to preserve natural features to the extent feasible, and scheduling of construction activities to avoid the rainy season. These storm water management practices would minimize the amount of soil erosion that may occur due to rainy weather. In addition, compliance with AQMD Rule 223-1, described in the Air Quality section, would reduce the amount of wind erosion. Also, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant would be required to apply for a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit for the disturbance of over one acre of land during construction (see Hydrology and Water Quality section). The overall impact would be less than significant.

- c) Project impacts related to lateral spreading, liquefaction and landslides are discussed in a) above. Subsidence occurs primarily in areas with substantial withdrawal of underground liquid and gaseous resources, such as water and natural gas. The project would be connected to the local water delivery system, and would not use water wells. Therefore, it would not withdraw any water from local aquifers. No wells of natural gas or other underground liquid resources would occur, so no subsidence would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) According to the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, prepared by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service (now the Natural Resources Conservation Service), the project site contains two soil types: Rescue sandy loam and Rescue very stony sandy loam. Both soil types have a low shrink-swell soil potential down to 10 inches below ground surface. However, at depths greater than 10 inches below surface, the shrink-swell potential is moderate, due to the greater presence of clay (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1974). Expansive soils in concentrated amounts could cause distress to concrete slab-on-grade floors and foundations, affecting the structural stability of homes on the site. Therefore, the presence of a moderate shrink-swell potential is a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURE GEO-1

Areas with high concentrations of expansive soils shall be identified on final soils reports filed with the County building department. Areas with expansive soils where building construction is proposed must be sufficiently over-excavated and blended or replaced. Verification of compliance with this mitigation measure shall occur during review of grading permit applications.

MONITORING: Development Services-Building Department shall review and verify soils report for areas with expansive soils during processing of grading and building permit review process.

Incorporation of the mitigation measure would reduce the potential shrink-swell hazard on the project site. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

- e) The project would be connected to the wastewater system of the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). The project does not involve the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. There would be no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Findings: It has been determined that risks related to geologic features would be considered less than significant. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would reduce impacts due to expansive soils to a less than significant level. For the Geology and Soils category, established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project with mitigation.

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;
- Places people and buildings within the safety zones of a public or public use airport as delineated by an airport land use plan, or within the approximate approach-departure area of a public airport or private airstrip;

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) Construction activities associated with the project may involve the transportation, use, and disposal of construction materials, paints and fuels that may be considered hazardous. The use of these hazardous materials would only occur during construction. Some spillages of paints and fuels may occur, but they would be minor and not pose a significant hazard to workers and adjacent land uses.

The project proposes commercial uses that would be retail in character. Retail activities generally use a smaller amount of hazardous materials than other types of commercial activities. State law requires submittal of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan by activities that transport, store or handle 55 gallons, 500 pounds or 200 cubic feet of hazardous materials at any one time. The Business Plan identifies the hazardous materials used by the activity and outlines emergency procedures the activity will undertake in the event of a hazardous material release. Retail stores would be required to submit a Business Plan to the County Department of Environmental Health if the criteria for submittal are met. In addition, any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials, during both project construction and project operations. With existing regulations, the impact is less than significant.

- b) Hazardous materials may be used during project construction and operations, as discussed in a) above. Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials, including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (CalOHS) requirements for worker safety.

El Dorado County is an area where naturally occurring asbestos may potentially occur. Naturally occurring asbestos is most commonly found in ultramafic rocks (rocks with a high concentration of magnesium and iron) and in serpentinite (commonly called serpentine). Earthwork that disturbs areas containing these rocks may expose people to asbestos through the inhalation of dust containing asbestos fibers. These fibers can cause lung damage; therefore, dust from naturally occurring asbestos is considered a hazardous substance. A California Geological Survey report from 2000 identified sites in western El Dorado County where naturally occurring asbestos is likely to exist. According to the report, the project site is not in an area likely to have naturally occurring asbestos. El Dorado AQMD Rule 223-1 states if naturally occurring asbestos, serpentine or ultramafic rock is discovered after commencement of project, the discovery must be reported to the AQMD no later than the next business day and the project must comply with applicable provisions of AQMD Rule 223-2 and the State of California Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations (California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93105). Among its provisions, Rule 223-2 requires an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan that must contain a description of actual and potential sources of dust emissions and Best Management Practices and other dust control measures, along with monitoring and reporting requirements. In accordance with State requirements, the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan must be submitted to the AQMD within 14 days of the discovery of naturally occurring asbestos, serpentine or ultramafic rock. Compliance with these regulations would limit any dust emissions from naturally occurring asbestos sites, thereby reducing any potential health hazards. The overall impact would be less than significant.

- c) The project would not emit any hazardous materials within 0.25 miles of schools. The nearest schools are Camerado Springs Middle School, approximately one mile to the west, and Ponderosa High School, approximately

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

one mile east. As noted in a) above, the project when completed is unlikely to release any significant amount of hazardous materials. There is no impact.

- d) The project site is not on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, commonly called the “Cortese list.” There are no Cortese list sites in El Dorado County. A check of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s EnviroStor mapping program indicated only one hazardous material site in the County – Promontory Elementary School in El Dorado Hills. The Central Valley RWQCB maintains a list of leaking underground storage tank sites. The nearest site is the ARCO gas station on 3969 Cameron Park Drive, east of the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Palmer Drive. The most recent quarterly report, from April 2007, indicates the ARCO site is undergoing post-remediation monitoring. This indicates that cleanup actions have occurred on this site. There is no impact.
- e) The nearest public airport is the Cameron Airpark, located less than two miles to the north of the project site. In 1986, the Foothill Airport Land Use Commission adopted the Cameron Airpark Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). The CLUP establishes policies related to height restrictions, noise, and compatibility of land uses with airport operations. Compatibility of land uses with airport operations are determined based on the location of the land use within three safety zones: clear, approach/departure, and overflight. Each zone places restrictions on the types of land uses allowed. There are no restrictions placed by the CLUP on land uses outside these three zones. The project site is not located in any of the three safety zones established by the Cameron Airpark CLUP. Therefore, the project would experience no safety hazards associated with Cameron Airpark operations. There would be no impact.
- f) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There is no impact.
- g) The project is not expected to interfere or negatively affect any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Plans for the proposed project indicate that it would not block or significantly decrease access to Cameron Park Drive and Palmer Drive, which are the most likely evacuation routes. The impact is less than significant.
- h) The project is located in an area with a fire hazard classified as “High”, according to Figure HS-1 of the County General Plan. Since land to the west of the project site is vacant, the project could expose people or structures to risk of wildland fires originating on that vacant land. However, buffering between the vacant land and the proposed development on the project site would be provided by paved roadway and parking area. A fire hydrant currently is available on the site, which would give firefighters access to water to fight fires in the vicinity. The project site must comply with fire safety requirements of the Cameron Park Fire Department, and with the County-adopted Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code. In a comment letter from EID, the Cameron Park Fire Department determined the fire flow for the project is 1,625 gallons per minute for three-hour duration while maintaining residual pressure of 20 pounds per square inch. A water line extension from one of several 6-inch water lines stubbed out to the project site would provide the required fire flow. The project proposes connection to the EID water system. The impacts would be less than significant.

Findings: The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials. The project site is located in an area where risk of wildland fires is high. Compliance with Cameron Park Fire Department and County regulations would reduce this impact to less than significant. For this Hazards and Hazardous Materials category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed project.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA);
- 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;

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- 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) The project proposes to construct commercial/retail buildings. Commercial/retail uses would not directly discharge any wastewater or other effluent into streams. Wastewater generated by future land uses would be collected by EID's wastewater system and treated at the Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. The treatment plant had been operating under Cease and Desist Order No. R5-2002-0210 issued by the Central Valley RWQCB, due to noncompliance with treated discharge standards for pH, turbidity and temperature. Site-specific objectives for these three parameters were adopted, and the treatment plant has complied with these objectives. On January 25, 2007, the Central Valley RWQCB rescinded the Cease and Desist Order by adopting Resolution No. R5-2007-0008. Wastewater from the project site would be treated and discharged in accordance with RWQCB waste discharge requirements. The impact is less than significant.
 - b) The project would not withdraw any groundwater from the site, as it proposes to connect to EID's water supply system and not use wells. Site grading, paving, and construction of buildings would reduce the area available for groundwater recharge, as structures and soil compactions may make the ground less permeable to water. However, the proposed landscaping and tree mitigation areas would allow precipitation to percolate into the ground, thereby allowing recharge of aquifers beneath the site. Since the project would not withdraw any groundwater directly, and since EID uses surface water, the reduced recharge area would not lead to a net deficit in aquifer volumes or a lowering of the groundwater table. The impact is less than significant.
 - c) The project would have an impact on normal drainage patterns, through site grading and the creation of additional impervious surfaces. Substantial erosion or siltation can occur without use of appropriate revegetation and erosion control measures. As discussed in the Geology and Soils section, the County Department of Transportation and the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District have developed a list of storm water management practices applicable to all construction sites within western El Dorado County. These practices include management of disturbed soil areas by implementing soil stabilization measures, which would reduce potential soil erosion.

In addition, prior to construction of a project one acre or greater in size, the RWQCB requires a project applicant to file for a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit. The General Construction Permit process requires the project applicant to 1) notify the State, 2) prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and 3) to monitor the effectiveness of the plan. The SWPPP identifies pollutants generated by construction activities, including sediment, earthen material, chemicals, and building materials. It also describes the Best Management Practices that would be employed to reduce or eliminate contamination of surface waters by the identified pollutants. The State Water Resources Control Board, which oversees the RWQCB, currently is in the process of reissuing the statewide General Construction Permit with some modifications. The modifications would more appropriately allocate responsibilities and requirements to projects based on their relative risk to water quality, obtain better measures of performance from projects, and establish a standard that address impacts related to hydromodification (alteration of stream channel due to changes in sediment load). Since project construction would likely disturb at least one acre, the project would be required to obtain the NPDES General Construction Permit and comply with its conditions. The impact would be less than significant.

- d) The project would generate an increase in surface runoff, through site grading and the creation of impervious surfaces. The project site is part of the Plaza Goldorado subdivision, approximately 8.09 acres in size. According to the County's Design and Improvement Standards Manual, drainage facilities for areas less than 100 acres shall be designed for an average recurrence interval of a 10-year flood (El Dorado County, 1986, p. 29). The 10-year flood

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

is a flood that would occur on average once every 10 years. Compliance with the provisions of the Design and Improvement Standards Manual would reduce potential flooding impacts associated with increased runoff. The impacts are less than significant.

- e) As noted in d) above, the proposed project would generate an increase in surface runoff, which would enter existing stormwater drainage facilities. Compliance with the provisions of the County's Design and Improvement Standards Manual would ensure existing drainage facilities can accommodate the additional runoff.

Runoff from commercial areas contributes to water quality degradation. Urban storm water runoff contains pesticides, oil, grease, heavy metals, motor vehicle fluids, other organics, and nutrients. Because these pollutants accumulate during the dry summer months, the first major autumn storm can flush a highly concentrated load to receiving waters and catch basins. However, after the "first flush," contaminant concentrations in runoff would be greatly reduced. Impacts would be less than significant. Also, in 2004, the County adopted the *Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County*. The *Storm Water Management Plan* contains a chapter on Post Construction Runoff Control, which contains provisions designed to reduce the water quality impacts of runoff after completion of construction work. Compliance with these provisions would reduce potential water quality impacts of runoff to a level that is less than significant.

- f) All impacts to water quality are discussed within the sections above, as well as the Geology and Soils section contained earlier in this Initial Study. No additional impacts have been identified. There would be no impact.
- g) FEMA prepared Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel No. 0600400725C, revised December 4, 1986. This map covers the project site, and indicates areas that part of the 100-year floodplain. The 100-year floodplain is the area anticipated to be flooded in the event of a storm that occurs on average once every 100 years, and is the basis for flood planning. According to the FEMA map, the project is not located within a 100-year flood zone. There would be no impact.
- h) As discussed in g) above, the project is not located within a 100-year flood zone. There would be no impact.
- i) As discussed in g) above, the project is not located within a 100-year flood zone. The nearest dam is the Cameron Park Lake Dam; however, the project site is not within the dam failure inundation zone as indicated in Appendix A of the County General Plan. The project site is not within an area protected by a levee. There would be no impact.
- j) The project is not in any area at risk for seiche or tsunami because it is not next to or near any body of water. The project is not located in an area prone to inundation by mudflows. There would be no impact.

Findings: No significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. Implementation of County regulations and standards, along with compliance with RWQCB permit conditions, would limit potential impacts related to erosion and drainage to levels that are less than significant. For the Hydrology and Water Quality section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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:

- Physically divide an established residential community;
 - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community, or with conservation plans of federal or state agencies.
- a) The proposed project is a commercial/retail development on vacant land, adjacent to commercial and office development. Therefore, it would not physically divide an established residential community. There would be no impact.
- b) The project would be consistent with the existing General Plan designation on the site, which is Commercial. There is no General Plan Important Biological Overlay (IBC) zone covering the site, nor are there any additional designations which require treatment for known environmental impacts. The project must comply with all existing General Plan policies and County regulations adopted for the purposes of mitigating an environmental impact. The one potentially significant conflict would be with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and its Interim Guidelines, which seek to conserve woodlands. The Aesthetics section discusses the potential impacts and identifies mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. No other potential conflicts were identified.
- c) As discussed in the Biological Resources section, there is currently no adopted HCP or NCCP that covers El Dorado County. There would be no impact.

Findings: The project may potentially conflict with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4., which seeks to protect woodlands. Mitigation described in the Aesthetics section would reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant. For the Land Use Planning section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance with mitigation.

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-2a or -2b, or
 - Result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- a) There are no known mineral resources of value on the project site, according to Exhibit 5.9-6 of the County General Plan. Exhibit 5.9-6 is based on mineral land classification reports prepared by the California Geological Survey. These reports designate Mineral Resource Zones that identify the location of significant mineral resources. There would be no impact.
- b) The County General Plan has not designated any mineral resource areas other than the Mineral Resource Zones designated by the state. There are no designated mineral resource recovery sites of local importance. There would be no impact.

Findings: No impacts to any known mineral resources would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. In the Mineral Resources section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

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	

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise-sensitive land uses in excess of 60 decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (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 3 dBA, or more; or
 - Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- a) The most significant source of noise to which future development on the project site would be exposed would be traffic noise from nearby roadways. Exhibit 5.10-8 of the County General Plan EIR delineates traffic noise contours for two roadways near the project site: U.S. Highway 50 and Cameron Park Drive. According to Exhibit 5.10-8, the project is within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour of Cameron Park Drive for the base year (2001). Virtually the entire project site would be within the 60 dBA contour by the year 2025. Therefore, the proposed buildings would be exposed to noise levels of 60 dBA or greater. However, Table 5.10-4 of the County General Plan EIR, based on the State’s General Plan Guidelines, indicates the exposure of business commercial land uses to noise levels of up to 70 dBA is normally acceptable, while noise levels above 75 dBA are normally unacceptable. Under the worst of potential noise conditions – traffic from the 1996 General Plan Alternative (Buildout) project buildings may be exposed to noise levels of 70 dBA from traffic on the segment of Cameron Park Drive between Palmer Drive and Oxford Road (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.10-87). However, it is not likely that the building would be consistently exposed to noise levels exceeding 75 dB. Moreover, building practices and local building codes applicable to commercial buildings would reduce the interior noise levels of the buildings. This impact would be less than significant. Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan are not applicable to this project, as commercial/retail land uses are not designated noise-sensitive land uses.
 - b) The project may generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction. However, those impacts are temporary and would be confined to standard construction hour limitations, as described in d) below. Moreover, the nearest sensitive land use to groundborne vibrations or noise are the residences south of the project site, which are approximately 100 feet away or more. It is unlikely that residences would experience groundborne vibration or noise impacts at that distance. The impacts would be less than significant.
 - c) The project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, due mainly to vehicle traffic generated by the proposed commercial/retail development. However, this development would occur in an area of substantial commercial development, adjacent to a busy roadway. The noise levels the project would generate

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

would not be greater than those generated by the shopping center to the east and by traffic on Cameron Park Drive. The contribution of the project to noise levels would be relatively minor, and not likely to exceed the 3 dBA increase threshold. The impacts would be less than significant.

- d) The project may generate temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity during construction periods. This noise increase would be temporary and would cease after completion of construction. Also, the distance to the nearest residence, the land use most likely to be disturbed by construction noise, is approximately 100 feet. Construction noise would be attenuated by this distance. Nevertheless, noise levels on the project site during construction may be sufficiently elevated to be noticeable by nearby residents. This is a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURE NOI-1

Construction activities shall be conducted in accordance with the County noise regulation or limited to the following hours and days: 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on any weekday; 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends and federally recognized holidays.

MONITORING: Prior to issuance of construction/grading permits, Planning Services shall verify that this measure is incorporated as a note on the plans.

Compliance with the mitigation measure would result in no construction noise during hours when residents are more likely to be disturbed by noise, particularly nighttime hours. With mitigation, the impacts would be less than significant.

- e) The project is within two miles of the Cameron Airpark. Figure 6 of the Cameron Airpark Airport CLUP (see Hazards and Hazardous Materials section) shows the 55 dB CNEL, 60 dB CNEL and 65 dB CNEL noise contours around Cameron Airpark. General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 states all projects within the 55 dB CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies of the applicable CLUP. The project site is outside the 55 dB CNEL area, as delineated in the Cameron Airpark CLUP. Therefore, based on General Plan policy, people working on the project site would not be exposed to excessive noise levels generated by Cameron Airpark operations. There would be no impact.
- f) As noted in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section, the project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip, and therefore would not be exposed to noise from airstrip operations. There would no impact.

Findings: For the Noise category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would occur from the proposed development, with the incorporation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-1**.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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) The project may induce some population growth in the area directly by proposing commercial development that would generate employment. However, potential employees would most likely come from the community of Cameron Park and nearby communities. Few employees are likely to come from areas farther away. The project is consistent with the land use designation under the County General Plan, which anticipates population growth in the County based on these designations. Therefore, anticipated population growth would not be altered by this project. The project would utilize existing infrastructure, and therefore would not require new infrastructure that may indirectly induce population growth. Impacts related to population growth would be less than significant.
- b) The project site is vacant; therefore, the project would not displace any existing housing. There would be no impact.
- c) As discussed in b) above, the project site is vacant, with no residences. Therefore, the project would not displace any people. There would be no impact.

Findings: The project would not displace any housing or people. The project would not directly or indirectly induce significant population growth. For the Population and Housing section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion:

A 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 related to public services.

- a) The project site would be served by the Cameron Park Fire Department, part of the Cameron Park Community Service District (CSD). The Cameron Park CSD has a cooperative agreement with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection for fire prevention and suppression and emergency medical services for the community of Cameron Park. The Fire Department maintains a fire station at Country Club Drive, within one mile of the project site. The proposed project is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for fire services. The property has been designated for commercial uses, and the project is consistent with the General Plan and the analysis of impacts to fire services contained in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR indicated that Fire Department would likely need to expand an existing facility to accommodate demand generated by additional population growth. Mitigation set forth in the General Plan EIR includes review of projects for land use compatibility and siting and design considerations. Since the project is not expected to induce significant population growth (see Population and Housing section), it is not expected an expanded Fire Department facility would be required.

In a comment letter to the project engineer dated December 9, 2005, the Cameron Park Fire Department stated one additional fire hydrant would be required to meet the required fire flow of 1,625 gallons per minute with 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for a three-hour duration. Preliminary site plans indicate two existing fire hydrants – one onsite and one on the parcel adjacent to and west of the project site. The preliminary plans do not indicate the installation of a fire hydrant in accordance with Fire Department standards. However, subsequent approval and issuance of building permit shall be subject to the Fire Department's review.

- b) Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department. Because of the size and scope of the proposed project, it is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for police services. The property has been designated for commercial uses, and the project is consistent with the General Plan and the analysis of impacts to police services contained in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR set forth mitigation that would limit the range of appropriate land uses on with law enforcement facilities could be developed, and would subject proposed facilities to review of land use compatibility and siting and design considerations. These mitigation measures would reduce potential environmental impacts of any future Sheriff's Department facilities. Since the project is not expected to induce significant population growth (see Population and Housing section), it is not expected new or expanded Sheriff's Department facilities would be required. The impact would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- c) School services in the Cameron Park area are provided by the Buckeye Union Elementary School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The proposed project is a commercial, which by itself would not generate an increase in student population requiring additional facilities. As discussed in the Population and Housing section, the project may attract new employees, but most would come from the surrounding area. The project is not expected to attract a significant number of new residents. Future development would be required to pay impact fees for new facilities adopted by both districts, which would mitigate any potential impacts of the project. The impact would be less than significant.
- d) Parks services would be provided by the Cameron Park CSD. As discussed in the Population and Housing section, the proposed project would not induce significant population growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore the project is not expected to increase or expand demand for parks. There would be no impact.
- e) There are no other governmental services anticipated to be adversely impacted by the proposed project. As previously noted, the project is not expected to induce significant population growth, which would stimulate demand for public services that could be met with new or expanded facilities. There would be no impact.

Findings: The proposed project would not result in any substantial increase in demand for public services, due to the lack of population growth the project would induce. Therefore, no new or expanded public service facilities would be required.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Recreation 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) As noted in the Public Services section, the project is not expected to increase demand for park service, since it is not expected to induce significant population growth. There would be no impact.
 - b) The project does not include recreational facilities. As noted in a) above, the project would not generate an increase demand for park services. Therefore, the project would not require construction or expansion of additional facilities. There would be no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Findings: No significant impacts related to parks or recreational facilities would result from the project. For this Recreation section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X
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 Transportation/Traffic would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
 - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
 - Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.
- a) The project site is located adjacent to Cameron Park Drive and Palmer Drive. Cameron Park Drive is a two-lane roadway that accommodates approximately 24,500 vehicles per day in the vicinity of the project site. Palmer Drive is a two-lane roadway that serves commercial and office development east of Cameron Park Drive. This roadway carries approximately 10,000 vehicles per day (Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2006, pp. 1, 4). In addition, Goldorado Plaza Circle provides access onto the project site from Palmer Drive.

As required by County policy, a traffic study was prepared to analyze the potential traffic impacts resulting from the project. The *Draft Traffic Impact and Operational Analysis*, dated August 14, 2006, provides analysis and

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

conclusions regarding traffic impacts of the project. Specifically, the project analyzes traffic impacts associated with the project on the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Palmer, the transportation facility most affected by the proposed project. This intersection has a traffic signal. According to the traffic analysis, the intersection currently operates at a level of service (LOS) of B during the morning (AM) peak hour and at D during the evening (PM) peak hour. LOS is a qualitative measure used to describe operating conditions of roadways and intersections, with A being the best and F the worst. The traffic analysis states the County would implement a project to widen Cameron Park Drive during the current Capital Improvement Program, which covers fiscal year 2005/2006 to fiscal year 2009/2010. The project, scheduled to begin in late 2006, would add one northbound lane and one southbound lane along the segment of Cameron Park Drive fronting the project site (Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2006, p. 11).

According to the traffic analysis, the project is expected to generate 1,419 total daily trips, with 55 AM and 129 PM peak hour trips. With the proposed improvement to Cameron Park Drive, the additional vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would result in a LOS at the Cameron Park Drive/Palmer Drive intersection of B during the AM peak hour, and C during the PM peak hour (Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2006, p. 11). Based on General Plan Policy TC-Xd, approved by County voters as part of Measure Y in 1998, the LOS for County-maintained roads shall not be worse than E in a Community Region (El Dorado County, 2004, p. 70). The project site is within the Cameron Park Community Region. Therefore, LOS at the intersection with implementation of the project would be in compliance with Policy TC-Xd, as the intersection LOS would be no worse than C.

The traffic analysis also evaluated traffic conditions with and without the project for the year 2011, five years from the year of the analysis (2006). This analysis is required by the County Department of Transportation's Final Draft Traffic Impact Study Guidelines. The traffic forecast for 2011 assumed buildout of the entire Plaza Goldorado subdivision (project site and adjacent parcels to the north and east) and Cameron Park Drive capacity improvements. Under 2011 conditions without the project, the LOS at the Cameron Park Drive/Palmer Drive intersection would be B during the AM peak hour and C during the PM peak hour. With the project, LOS at the intersection would be the same. The intersection LOS would not worsen, and would be in compliance with General Plan Policy TC-Xd. The impacts would be less than significant.

- b) The County does not have a designated congestion management agency. As discussed in a) above, the project would contribute to an increase in traffic in the vicinity of the Cameron Park Drive/Palmer Drive intersection. However, the LOS at the intersection would be no lower than C, due to scheduled improvements to Cameron Park Drive. The LOS at the intersection would exceed the minimally acceptable LOS of E in the Cameron Park Community Region. The impact would be less than significant.
- c) As previously noted, the project is within two miles of Cameron Airpark. However, the project is approximately 1.5 miles away from the southern end of the runway. The Cameron Airpark CLUP indicates the project site is within the 'Conical Surface' of Cameron Airpark. The Conical Surface is an imaginary surface defined in Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 as extending from 5,000 to 9,000 feet from the end of an airport's primary surface, and at least 150 feet above the airport's elevation sloping upward at a ratio of 20:1. Any structures that penetrate the Conical Surface would be considered a hazard to air navigation. The anticipated height of the proposed structures would be no higher than 35 feet; therefore, it would not penetrate the Conical Surface. The project would not generate an increase in air traffic at Cameron Airpark, as it is a commercial/retail project that would serve only the local area. The project would not change air traffic patterns that results in safety risks. There would be no impact.
- d) The intersection of Palmer Drive and Plaza Goldorado Circle is located approximately 330 feet from the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Palmer Drive. Given the proximity of these two intersections, there is a possibility that traffic from the project site, added to existing traffic in the area, may lead to excessive queuing and/or intersection

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

blockage along Palmer Drive. Such conditions may lead to safety hazards. The traffic analysis for the project evaluated this potential condition. It concluded there would be no anticipated operational problems at the two intersections, as there would be sufficient storage capacity to avoid excessive queuing (Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2006, p. 18). Moreover, a proposed right-turn in, right-turn out access point off Cameron Park Drive would improve circulation around the project site by reducing queuing on that roadway (Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2006, p. 17). Therefore, roadway design features around the project site would not substantially increase traffic hazards. Proposed land uses would be compatible with adjacent existing and proposed land uses, which are primarily commercial and office. The impacts would be less than significant.

- e) The project as proposed would provide two access points – one off Palmer Drive and one off Cameron Park Drive. These access points would provide adequate emergency access. The impact would be less than significant.
- f) The project conforms with the County’s off-street parking requirements, set forth in Chapter 17.18 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. As a retail use not in a shopping center, the project would be required to provide one parking space for every 300 square feet of gross floor area. Based on this requirement, the project must provide a minimum of 61 off-street parking spaces. The project proposes 75 stalls (71 standard and 4 handicap) and 2 loading zones within 24 feet by 60 feet area. The project would have sufficient parking capacity for future customers. The impact is less than significant.
- g) The project does not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs regarding alternative transportation. The Bicycle Transportation Plan requires a Class II bicycle lane route along Cameron Park Drive. The project would not impede installation of the bicycle lane. El Dorado Transit operates a bus line that passes by the project site, with a bus stop available at the Goldorado Center near the project site. The project would not affect this bus line and stop, except for possibly increasing demand for bus service. The impact would be less than significant.

Findings: Environmental impacts of the project related to transportation would be less than significant level. Motor vehicle traffic generated by the project is anticipated to be accommodated by existing traffic facilities, with improvements along Cameron Park Drive. Other transportation-related impacts are considered to be less than significant. For the Transportation/Traffic category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		X
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		X

Discussion:

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
 - Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
 - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
 - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a) Wastewater treatment would be provided for the site by EID. The Regional Water Quality Control Board sets treatment requirements for the collection, processing, and disposal of waste, with which EID must comply. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, the RWQCB has recently rescinded a Cease and Desist Order for the Deer Creek WWTP after determining the plant is in compliance with discharge requirements. The project would not lead to the WWTP exceeding treatment requirements. The impacts would be less than significant.
- b) As previously noted, wastewater service would be provided by EID, through its Deer Creek WWTP. The WWTP has a treatment capacity of 3.6 million gallons per day (mgd) average dry weather flow. A Cease and Desist Order had limited treatment capacity to 2.5 mgd, but that order was rescinded by RWQCB in January 2007. Under existing conditions at the time the General Plan EIR was prepared (2003), the Deer Creek WWTP treated approximately 2.4 mgd (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.5-75). The WWTP has adequate capacity to accept wastewater from the proposed project. The project is commercial/retail in character. Such land uses tend to generate less wastewater than uses such as residential and industrial. In a comment letter, EID noted an 8-inch sewer line traverses the project site. This sewer line has adequate capacity at this time, and several service stubs exist along the line. Therefore, no new sewer lines need to be constructed, other than connecting lines from the buildings to the existing sewer line.

EID also would provide water supply service to the project site. As of the date of General Plan EIR preparation, existing water demand for EID was estimated to range from 37,095 to 37,806 acre-feet per year. EID had a system firm yield of 43,280 acre-feet per year. "Firm yield" was defined as the amount of water available for EID to use from a source in 95 out of 100 years with existing facilities, while incurring shortages of no more than 20 percent annually in 5 out of 100 years (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.5-75). In addition, a comment letter from EID noted the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region, of which the project site is a part, had 2,285 equivalent dwelling units

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

(EDUs) of water supply available as of January 1, 2006. The project would require 4 EDUs of water supply. There would be adequate water supply from EID to serve the project. According to a comment letter from EID, an 8-inch water line exists on the Plaza Goldorado site, and multiple 6-inch water lines have been stubbed out. Therefore, no new water lines need to be constructed, other than connecting lines from the buildings to any existing stubs. The impact would be less than significant.

- c) The proposed project would not require construction of new or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities, of which could cause significant environmental effects. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, the project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County’s Design and Improvement Standards Manual related to storm drainage. Compliance with these provisions would ensure existing drainage facilities can accommodate the additional runoff. No additional offsite facilities are required to serve the project. The impacts are less than significant.
- d) As discussed in b) above, the proposed project would be served by EID, which has indicated the ability to adequately serve the project. The proposed commercial project is not expected to need new or expanded entitlements, as EID is able to serve the project from existing resources. The impacts are less than significant.
- e) As noted in b) above, the Deer Creek WWTP has adequate capacity to accommodate the wastewater generated by the proposed project. The impacts would be less than significant.
- f) El Dorado County currently disposes its solid waste at the Lockwood Landfill in Nevada. As of 2003, the Lockwood Landfill has a total permitted capacity of 43 million tons over a 550-acre site. The remaining capacity at the landfill was approximately 33.8 million tons. The Lockwood Landfill receives approximately 1.4 million tons of solid waste per year, with a daily average of 5,700 tons. The estimated life of the currently permitted landfill is to the year 2025. The operator of the landfill, Waste Management, Inc., expects to apply for a permit for landfill use of an additional 1,000 acres at the Lockwood site, which would extend the life of the landfill by 200 years (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.6-20). This facility would have sufficient capacity to serve the additional solid waste disposal needs of the project. The impacts are less than significant.
- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the project site would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Solid waste collection and disposal within California is subject to the provisions of the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This legislation mandates a 50 percent diversion from the solid waste stream going to landfills by 2000. According to the most recent information available from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (2005), unincorporated El Dorado County currently meets the 50 percent diversion rate. The solid waste collection service provided to the project site includes a recycling program, which would ensure continued compliance with state diversion requirements. The impacts would be less than significant.

Findings: No significant impacts would result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the Utilities and Service Systems section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects would result from the project.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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

Discussion:

- a) As discussed in the Biological Resources section, the proposed project would have no impacts on special-status species, but could have impacts on other bird species. In part, this is due to the proposed removal of existing trees on the project site. An oak woodland area in the western and southern portions of the site would be greatly affected (see also the Aesthetics section). **Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5** would reduce potential impacts on oak woodlands and existing nesting habitat on the project site. Also, an existing seasonal wetland would be filled during project construction. **Mitigation Measure BIO-3** would compensate for impacts on the wetland. **Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2** would reduce potential impacts to raptors and birds' habitat on the project site.

Construction associated with the project potentially could affect unknown cultural resources, as described in the Cultural Resources section. **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce these potential impacts to a level that is less than significant.

- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as "two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." Based on the analysis in this initial study, it has been determined that the project potentially could result in cumulative impacts related to traffic, with associated impacts on noise.

The County Department of Transportation's Traffic Impact Study Protocols and Procedures provide guidance in evaluating cumulative traffic impacts. According to the Protocols:

"Each traffic impact study must provide a review of a proposed project's consistency with the land use designations and zoning densities of the 2004 County General Plan to determine if the project is consistent with such designation(s) as applicable within the proposed project area...If a proposed project is of a magnitude that is clearly within the amount of development which was anticipated in the traffic study conducted for the General Plan, then the General Plan's traffic analysis will serve as the basis for the cumulative traffic analysis of the project." (El Dorado County Department of Transportation, 2005, p.3)

The *Draft Traffic Impact and Operational Analysis* for the project states the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the site, which is Commercial. The proposed project also is located within

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Traffic Analysis Zone 163 of the traffic study for the General Plan. The project is located within an existing Planned Development Zone District and is consistent with the previously approved densities. Therefore, the size of the project is within the amount of development anticipated in the traffic study conducted for the General Plan (Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2006, p. 9).

The General Plan EIR contains an analysis of impacts of General Plan implementation on traffic, and identified mitigation measures for significant impacts. Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) is the one mitigation measure applicable to this project. Under this mitigation measure, the County shall monitor peak-hour traffic volumes and LOS beyond 2025 and, if necessary, shall implement growth control mechanisms in any part of the County where the LOS thresholds defined in General Plan policies cannot be maintained. These growth control measures may include, but are not limited to, acquisition of development rights, incentives or disincentives not to travel during peak hours on affected roadways, and changes in allowed development intensities. Given the likely impacts of the proposed project on LOS in the vicinity, as described in the Transportation/Traffic section, it is unlikely the project would lead to the implementation of this mitigation measure. However, if future development in the project vicinity warrants such a measure, it would likely reduce potential LOS impacts on roads in the area to a level that is less than significant.

Changes in traffic conditions typically lead to changes in noise. An increase in traffic volume typically increase noise levels along affected roadways. The additional traffic generated by the project, along with anticipated future development in the area in accordance with the General Plan, may have a cumulatively considerable impact on noise levels along Cameron Park Drive. However, as discussed above, the project is consistent with the development conditions used in the traffic impact study for the General Plan. Since the General Plan traffic analysis is considered applicable to the cumulative traffic analysis for the project, the noise analysis in the General Plan EIR also is applicable to the project, since it is based on the General Plan traffic study. Therefore, the noise contours along Cameron Park Drive would be the same as those outlined in Exhibit 5.10-8 of the General Plan EIR. Impacts of traffic noise based on these contours were discussed in the Noise section of this document, and were determined to be less than significant.

The Air Quality section discusses the potential cumulative effects of the project on air quality. One issue related to cumulative air quality impacts is greenhouse gas emissions and their effects on climate change. Climate change has become an issue of concern in California, as expressed through State legislation such as AB 32 and through Executive Order S-3-05, which sets greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. The primary source of greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed project would be motor vehicle traffic. No air district in California, including the El Dorado County AQMD, has identified a significance threshold for greenhouse gas emissions or a methodology for analyzing air quality impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. The state has identified 1990 emission levels as a goal through adoption of AB 32. To meet this goal, California would need to generate lower levels of greenhouse gas emissions than current levels. However, no standards have yet been adopted quantifying 1990 emission targets.

Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project were estimated using carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions as a proxy for all greenhouse gas emissions. This is consistent with the current reporting protocol of the California Climate Action Registry. Although CO₂ is not the only greenhouse gas, it is the most commonly produced in terms of both number of sources and volume generated, and it is among the easiest to measure. Other greenhouse gases, such as methane and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are not expected to be emitted in any significant amounts by the project. According to information in the traffic study for the project (see Transportation/Traffic section), the project would result in 1,419 vehicle trips per day. The URBEMIS 2002 air quality model, a computer program commonly used to assess air pollutant emissions generated by development projects, assumes commercial-based customer trips range from 6.6 miles to 7.35 miles. For a conservative estimate, and taking into consideration the more rural

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less-than-significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

character of the Cameron Park area, a trip rate of 10 miles per trip is assumed. Therefore, the project at buildout would generate an average of 14,190 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per day, or approximately 5.2 million VMT annually. Assuming an emissions factor for future CO₂ emissions from vehicles of approximately 366 grams of CO₂ per mile (California Air Resources Board 2002), approximately 2,098 tons of CO₂ per year would be generated as a result of project vehicle trips. This CO₂ emissions estimate assumes certain reductions in vehicle emissions due to future vehicle models operating more efficiently, but it does not take into account additional vehicle emission reductions that might take place in response to AB 1493, if mobile source emission reductions are ultimately implemented through this legislation.

CO₂ emissions in California totaled approximately 391 million tons in 2004 (California Energy Commission 2006a). Total CO₂ emissions from the project, as estimated above, would be approximately 0.00053 percent of this statewide total. Given the relatively small size of the project (18,120 square feet), and the fact that the project is contributing approximately 0.00053 percent of the statewide total of CO₂ emissions, the project's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions is not considered cumulatively considerable. The AQMD Rules to control air pollutant emissions described in the Air Quality section would further minimize the project's cumulative contribution to greenhouse gas emissions, as they would minimize activities requiring the combustion of fossil fuels that result in greenhouse gas emissions, such as motor vehicle travel and energy generation from power plants.

- c) The Hazards and Hazardous Materials section evaluated potential hazards that could affect human health, primarily wildfire and hazardous materials, and concluded these hazards would not be significant. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, the project site is not within a 100-year flood zone. The Transportation/Traffic section evaluated potential hazards related to traffic and determined that none existed. As discussed in the Air Quality section, the project would not generate emissions that exceed established thresholds of significance for projects. These thresholds are based on ambient air quality standards developed in part to protect human health. Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project would not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The impacts would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

El Dorado County General Plan (adopted July 2004)
Volume I - Goals, Objectives, and Policies
Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinances (Title 16 - County Code)

Cameron Airpark Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan
Foothill Airport Land Use Commission (Adopted June 4, 1986)

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service (April 1974)

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.)

Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (Section 15000, et seq.)

Air Quality Analysis for the Protzel Property Residential Development Proposed for Cameron Rimpo and Associates (November 25, 2005)

Traffic Impact Analysis – The Protzel Property
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (August 14, 2006)

Biological Resources Assessment for the ±32.6-Acre Walgreens at Cameron Park Project Site
North Fork Associates (August 28, 2006 – 2006a)

Wetland Delineation for the ±32.6-Acre Walgreens at Cameron Park Project Site
North Fork Associates (July 10, 2006 – 2006b)

Tree Resources Assessment for the ±32.6-Acre Walgreens at Cameron Park Project Site
North Fork Associates (August 18, 2006, revised April 3, 2007)

California Air Resources Board. 2002. Proposed Methodology to Model Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Estimate Fuel Economy. Available:
<<http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/downloads/pubs/co2final.pdf>>. Accessed in April 2007.

California Climate Action Registry. 2006 (June). *California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol: Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Version 2.1. Los Angeles, CA. Available:
<http://www.climateregistry.org/docs/PROTOCOLS/GRP%20V2.1.pdf>.
Accessed in April 2007.