



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECK LIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: S07-0017 Pleasant Valley Harvest

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

Contact Person: Tom Dougherty

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: John and Cindy Mosbacher, 1495 Brendan Way, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Location: East side of Buck's Bar Road approximately 2.1 miles south of the intersection with Pleasant Valley Road in the Pleasant Valley area, Supervisorial District II.

Assessor's Parcel Number: 046-270-24 (50.59 acres)

Zoning: Estate Residential 10-acre (RE-10) and Planned Agricultural 30-acre (PA-30)

Section: 1 **T:** 9N **R:** 11E

General Plan Designation: Agricultural Lands - Agricultural District (AL - A)

Environmental Setting: The 50.59-acre site is located approximately between the 2,150-foot to 2,500-foot elevations above sea level and gently slopes from the northeast corner to the southwest portion of the parcel. Two intermittent streams join as one which is shown on the Camino U.S.G.S. Quadrangle to begin within the parcel, drains from northeast to southwest and drains through a culvert under Bucks Bar Road. This riparian area contains the majority of the native oaks and pines. To the side of the intermittent stream is a man-made pond currently covered in cattails. El Dorado Irrigation District's Crawford Ditch loops through the northern portion of the parcel from east to west. There are approximately 7 acres of cleared arable land planted with 52 varieties of fruit trees and berries within the central portion of the parcel. There is one existing barn in the northwest corner and an approximately 800 square-foot single-family dwelling in the southeast corner with a separate short driveway off of Bucks Bar Road and an existing well. There is an existing driveway entering from Bucks Bar Road running past the barn and exiting through a gate on the roadway to the east. This driveway has been improved from the existing barn eastward to the emergency exit and outdoor picnic area with culverts where it crosses the intermittent stream and gravel to a width of approximately 20 feet and to United States Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Best Management Practices (BMP) Specifications No. 391.

Description of Project: The applicant is proposing to construct a three-level, 11,338 square-foot mixed use "Ranch Marketing Building with market and storage space for product sales, a bake shop, indoor and outdoor special events areas with lodging and multi-use space for private social events, family reunions, corporate and charitable events, small concerts, and weddings with the total capacity for special events not to exceed 250 persons and theatrical performances not to exceed 300 persons. Also proposed is one on-site wall sign mounted on a structure straddling the interior entranceway drive designed to look like the old Buck's Bar Covered bridge and two additional on-site monument signs at the main entrance at Bucks Bar Road, one monument sign within the parcel at the "Ranch Marketing" building, one outdoor toilet room for guests and customers, a primary single-family dwelling for the owner, an observation tower, a graveled main parking lot, and graveled overflow parking lots with a total of 147 spaces proposed for cars, over-sized vehicles, and buses. Outdoor pole lighting with full cut-off shielding is proposed to illuminate the main parking lot, and wall-mounted lights for the lawn, toilet room and agricultural sale areas. An aquaculture fish pond will be created. Other improvements include three picnic areas, walking paths and a covered pedestrian bridge crossing the intermittent stream. The existing 800 square-foot single-family residence would become a second residential unit when the primary single-family dwelling is constructed.

The Ranch Marketing Building is proposed to have a 4,800 square-foot main floor with a bake shop, dining facility, accessible restrooms, dressing rooms, offices, storage, and a multi-purpose main hall with a maximum capacity of 250 people for events. The lowest level is also 4,800 square-feet and will include the market area

for selling of ranch marketing products and an area for general storage and cold storage of fruit and berries grown on site. The gift display area of 1,000 square feet for sale of agricultural related merchandise and gift items.

The top level will include a 1,200 square-foot living area proposed to be used as a lodging area accommodating up to 15 guests. The applicant proposes to live in the lodging area with two bedrooms and a private kitchen until the primary dwelling is constructed. At that time the kitchen in the upper level will be removed and it will become the third bedroom leaving the commercial kitchen below as the only kitchen. The lodging use will not commence and no guests would be permitted within the ranch marketing lodge area until the primary dwelling is cleared for final occupancy. The existing 800 square-foot residence will be the Second Residential Unit.

Exterior to the main building, there will be an accessible toilet room accessed by a covered breezeway, a patio with a sitting wall for special events, a picnic lawn, and a 19-foot by 20-foot by 32-foot tall observation tower with a single accommodation toilet on the tower's main floor, and 262 square-foot bedroom on the top floor. The first floor of the observation tower will also include a "you-pick" fruit and berry sales area.

The applicant proposes to provide indoor and outdoor amplified music which complies with the Noise Element of the 2004 General Plan.

The following is a summary of the proposed mixed-use building categorized by use and by floor:

Upper Level	1,200	s.f. total
Lodging, two bedrooms now, three later when bath is removed.	1,100	s.f.
Stair	100	s.f.
Middle Level	4,919	s.f. total
Bake shop	554	s.f.
Toilet rooms	433	s.f.
Offices	271	s.f.
Miscellaneous (storage/hallways)	330	s.f.
Multi-purpose Main Hall)	2,924	s.f.
Lodging (one storage/bedroom)	185	s.f.
Lower Level	4,800 sq. ft.	s.f. total
Pantry, cold storage, office	766	s.f.
Agricultural products, storage and sales	4,034	s.f.
Total square footage, all three floors	11,338	s.f.
Outside toilet and storage building	441	s.f. total
Outside observation tower	992	s.f. total
One bedroom	262	s.f.

The activities/uses proposed are described as "enterprises" and six are proposed:

1. **Ranch Marketing Enterprise:** Sale of fruits, berries, vegetables, pumpkins, and Christmas trees as well as renting space to vendors of handicrafts. Vendors and their customers will have the opportunity to also use the picnic area, hiking paths, the "you-pick" operation, and the observation tower.
2. **Harvest Lodge Enterprise (multi-use hall):** Space for events such as agricultural marketing promotional events, family reunions, weddings and receptions, etc. A portable bandstand, and

indoor and outdoor dance areas are proposed. The Bake Shop kitchen facilities will be made available to allow caterers to prepare and serve food for events (see bake Shop Enterprise).

3. **Bake Shop Enterprise:** When the owner is not using the commercial kitchen to process their own agricultural products, the kitchen would be available to caterers to prepare and serve food at special and promotional events.
4. **Agricultural Lodging Enterprise:** Proposed to provide for small groups of 15 people or less an opportunity to experience farm life with an overnight stay at the farm with sleeping quarters and a prepared meal. The lodging of guests would not occur when larger events are planned for the Harvest Lodge multi-purpose areas.
5. **Artistic Enterprise:** Areas provided throughout the orchard and facilities as venues for bird watchers, painting artists, photographers, etc. along a 0.5 mile hiking trail and riding path. A limited number of small-scale outdoor music events, and a permanent old-west theme photo back drop adjacent to the nature path in the eastern portion of the parcel in Picnic area No. 2 are also included in the project.
6. **Community Service Non-Profit Enterprise:** Facilities will be made available to school groups for outdoor education, Boy and Girl Scouts, 4-H, school and recreational team sports banquets, service club dinners, farm bureau, farm trails, neighborhood meetings, charity events, etc.

The following types of events are proposed:

Note: *Indicates El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance reference for proposed uses.

Commercial Events (38 total events):

- 12 events per year with less than 125 people for commercial purposes. *17.14.180.B.1.fii
- 12 special events per year with more than 125 people but less than 250 people. *17.14.180.2.b.ii
- 12 outdoor patio events at one evening per month not to exceed 125 people. *17.14.180(b)
- 2 outdoor theatrical performance special attraction events per year with more than 250 people but less than 300 people.
*17.14.180.3.i

Promotional Events (24 total events):

- 12 outdoor promotional events per year *17.14.180.B.1.g
- 12 indoor promotional events per year *17.14.190.B.g
- Concurrent with promotional events, a maximum of 40 crafters for sale of handicraft items only. Booth/sales area not to exceed 4,000 square feet total area.

Total Number of Proposed Events: 62

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park)
Site:	PA-30/RE-10	AL/A	Single-family residence
North:	RE-10	AL/A	Northeast: Commercial Cattle grazing/single family residence. Northwest: Miniature horse operation, single family residence, commercial status unknown.
East:	PA-30	MDR	Not in agricultural production/single family residence.
South:	AE	AL	Southwest: Commercial horse stables/single family residence, 15 acres. Southeast: Walnut orchard with single family

West:	RE-10/RA-20 NR	residence, commercial status unknown, 41 acres. Commercial grazing on leased vacant land.
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado County Department of Transportation, El Dorado County Fire Protection District, El Dorado County Agricultural Commission, El Dorado County Air Quality Management District, El Dorado County Environmental Health Division.		

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

- (a) Scenic Vista. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- (b) Scenic Resources. The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>)). There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- (c) The approval of the special use permit for the proposed ranch marketing enterprise will not directly change any views from what is currently available. There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- (d) The approval of the special use permit for the proposed ranch marketing enterprise would potentially allow new lighting for the parking lot areas and adjacent to structures. The application of the lighting standards in County Code (Section 17.14.170) are designed to reduce lighting and glare impacts by the uses of mandated top and side shielding and the placement of light poles and fixtures so that no light and glare will escape onto any neighboring property. General Plan Policy 2.8.1.1 directs that development shall limit excess nighttime light and glare from parking area lighting, signage, and buildings. The submitted preliminary lighting plan can be found to conform to Section 17.14.170, and is designed to be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America’s (IESNA) full cut-off designation, and pole lights be limited to 14-foot maximum height. It will be recommended by Planning Services staff that the 50 percent of the lights be turned off at the close of business and security lights be on motion sensors. As conditioned and as proposed with the preliminary lighting plan, the project would have a less than significant impact on nighttime views in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Finding: The agriculturally oriented project can be found to be compatible with similar ranch marketing enterprises in the Pleasant Valley area and therefore will have a less than significant affect on aesthetics. For this “Aesthetics” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

(a, c) El Dorado County has established the Agricultural District (-A) General Plan land use overlay designation and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are areas of “Prime Farmland” and as being within the Agricultural District (-A) General Plan land use overlay designation adjacent to the project site. All of the project area except the former two-acre site of the existing 800 square-foot dwelling is located within the Agricultural District Overlay. The proposed project area contains Sierra very rocky sandy loam (Shd) with 15 to 30% slopes, Sierra sandy loam with eroded type soils and 9 to 15% slopes (SfC2), and Argonaut loam with a seeped variant (AoB). Only SfC2 is classified as unique and soils of local importance and both SfC2 and AoB are identified as “choice” agricultural soil by the El Dorado County Agriculture Department.

The project would result in the conversion of choice soils available for crops in the areas used for the structures, parking lots, accessory structures to be used in support of the ranch marketing enterprises however, a good portion of that area with those soils is sloped, contains the wetland/ riparian areas and the majority of the native oak trees on the site and not really good tillable, row crop areas. The El Dorado County Agricultural Commissioners have expressed concerns that ranch marketing endeavors and their associated structures and supporting developed areas do not dominate lands containing choice agricultural soils: Because there is the potential for the loss of choice soils on this site, it would be recommended that the following mitigation measures be added to the project and as mitigated, the impacts from the project would be less than significant:

Mitigation Measures for Agricultural Resources [1]

MM Agr-1: *The applicant shall continue to maintain five acres or more in Agricultural production using Best Management Practices. A work plan shall be submitted to the El Dorado County Agricultural Department for the*

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

next two years with an annual review by the Agricultural Commission for the two years following the approval of S07-0017, including an updated work plan and progress report; with no special events permitted until the five-acre production requirement has been met and finding that the planned walking paths and birding areas are compatible with agricultural production pursuant to General Plan Policy 8.2.2.1..

- (b) The ranch marketing proposal will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. There would be no impacts from the project.

Finding: As conditioned and mitigated, impacts to agricultural land would be less than significant. For this “Agriculture” category, there would be less than significant impacts.

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

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- (a) El Dorado County has adopted the Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). Any activities associated to the grading and construction of this project would pose a less than significant impact on air quality because the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) will require the project implement a Fugitive Dust Mitigation (FDM) plan during grading and construction activities. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions below a level of significance. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

(b, c) Currently, El Dorado County is classed as being in "severe non-attainment" status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone (O3). Additionally, the County is classified as being in "non-attainment" status for particulate matter (PM10) under the State's standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County's air pollution control program to meet the State's ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) administers standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control. Projected related air quality impacts are divided into two categories:

- Short-term impacts related to construction activities; and
- Long-term impacts related to the project operation.

Short-term, superficial, minor grading and excavation activities that could be associated with the finish grading associated with future development permits and improvements to the existing roadway, development of the parking areas and the direct vicinities of the multi-purpose building, observation tower and primary residence, but that type of construction typically would only last a few days and intermittently at that.

Mobile emission sources such as automobiles, trucks, buses, and other internal combustion vehicles are responsible for more than 70 percent of the air pollution within the County, and more than one-half of California's air pollution. In addition to pollution generated by mobile emissions sources, additional vehicle emission pollutants are carried into the western slope portion of El Dorado County from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area by prevailing winds. The project parcels are accessed off of Bucks Bar Road. Future grading would potentially emit minor, temporary and intermittent criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and would be subject to El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District standards at that time. The subject parcel is located in an asbestos review area and District Rule 223.2 Fugitive Dust-Asbestos Hazard Mitigation shall be adhered to during any future development permit pursuant to direction from the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District. Impacts would be less than significant.

- (d) Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as schools, hospitals, daycare centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. General Plan Policy 6.7.6.1 requires that the County ensure that new facilities in which sensitive receptors are located (e.g., schools, child care centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, and hospitals) are sited away from significant sources of air pollution. It has been determined that the proposed ranch marketing project is more than one mile from any sensitive receptors in the area, and any impacts from the project would be less than significant.
- (e) The uses listed above in the "Project Description" section potentially allowed after the approval of this project proposal do not, under normal circumstances, create any excessive objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Any future development would require the submittal of a development application and the potential project specific impacts would be analyzed at that time. As discussed above, no impacts on air quality would occur and no mitigation is required. For this "Air Quality" category, there would be less than significant impacts.

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

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

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

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

(a, f) There would be no potentially significant effects to federal or State threatened species or to County rare plant species associated with the subject parcel map proposal property.

The proposed parcels do not fall within designated critical habitat or core areas for the Red-legged and Yellow-legged frog species. (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7). The project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted or approved habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

(b, c) A biological assessment report dated May 17, 2007 was prepared by Michael Baad, Ph.D., Department of Biological Sciences, C.S.U.S was submitted which addressed the potential impacts to the wetland/riparian habitat. The study found approximately 8.3 acres of jurisdictional “waters of the U.S.” The study concluded that the intermittent

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

stream running from northeast to southwest together with adjacent marsh and seep/swale habitats make up the majority of those wetland areas. E.I.D.'s Crawford Ditch transverses the northern portion of the parcel and the leaks in the unlined ditch have resulted in small patches of wetland herbaceous plants. Various seeps and draws were determined to be the source of the development of the existing swales that feed the Long Ravine that eventually empties into the North Fork of the Consumnes River. There is an untapped spring sending small amounts of water into a shallow impression/swale in the vicinity of the northwest corner of the existing barn that basically dries up within a short distance.

General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 directs the County to provide buffers and special setbacks for the protection of riparian areas and wetlands with a minimum setback of 100 feet from all perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and 50 feet from intermittent streams and wetlands. These interim standards may be modified in a particular instance if more detailed information relating to slope, soil stability, vegetation, habitat, or other site- or project-specific conditions supplied as part of the review for a specific project demonstrates that a different setback is necessary or would be sufficient to protect the particular riparian area at issue. The submitted biological study considered slope, soil stability, vegetation, habitat, and the project-specific conditions supplied with the project description and it was determined that an alternative minimum setback of 25 feet from the delineated wetlands would be sufficient to protect the particular riparian areas at issue. Development immediately adjacent to wetland and riparian features should be planned so the impacts on those resources are minimized. With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant. To insure that those recommendations are practiced the following mitigation measure is recommended:

Mitigation Measure for Biological Resources [1]

MM Bio-1: *The applicant shall site bridges, roads and pipelines to limit the disturbance area to limit the disturbance area to previously disturbed areas where feasible. A 25-foot setback requirement for wetland features delineated in Map 2 in the biological assessment report dated May 17, 2007 prepared by Michael Baad, Ph.D., Department of Biological Sciences, C.S.U.S. shall be shown on the final site plan submitted for the building permit. All development plans shall be reviewed for compliance for adherence to those standards by El Dorado County Development Services, Building Services Division in conjunction with the Planning Services Division staff prior to issuance of any development permit.*

In April of 2007, the applicant entered into an agreement with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to implement conservation practices including Practice 391 (Riparian Forest Buffer), Practice 359 (Wetland Enhancement), and Practice 644 Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management). The on-going implementation and monitoring contract expires in 2014 and most stages are scheduled to be completed in 2011.

- (d) The wetland/riparian corridor will be left virtually intact and natural wildlife habitat areas and birding paths currently exist and will be utilized as they exist with minor alterations for low impact public access. Based on that fact, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on migration patterns of the wildlife that have utilized the site prior to the proposed development. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (e) The subject parcel is located in the blue oak-foothill pine habitat type which is typical of areas mostly found below 3000 feet elevation. (El Dorado County General Plan EIR, 5.12-7, May 2003). Existing vegetation on the site consists predominantly El Dorado County native oaks, pines with riparian trees in the vicinity of the intermittent stream corridor. A site visit, analysis of aerial photos and the proposed site plan by staff determined the subject 50.59-acre parcel had an El /Dorado County native oak tree canopy coverage of 60 percent. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires that 70 percent of the existing oak tree canopy for the project area to be retained. Two El Dorado

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

County native oak trees over 6-inches in diameter are to be removed during the construction of the parking lot to the southwest of the proposed ranch marketing building. Impacts would be less than significant.

The project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted or approved habitat conservation plan.

Finding: For this “Biological Resources” category, as mitigated, the impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

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

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

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

(a-d) A Cultural Resource Assessment for Proposed Improvements for the Pleasant Valley Harvest Project, Peak and Associates, Inc., May 21, 2007, Job #06-187, did not reveal any historical, cultural or prehistoric resources or artifacts either and concluded that the project, as currently designed, will not affect important cultural resources. Impacts would be less than significant. Because of the possibility in the future that ground disturbances could turn up significant cultural resources anywhere in the County, the following would be added as a condition to the staff report address any potential future discovery:

In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The Planning Services shall review the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit, to ensure that this notation has been placed on the grading plans.

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

Finding: Based upon the Cultural Resource Assessment, it is determined that for this “Cultural Resources” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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	

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.

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

- (a) There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated approximately 800 feet southwest of a portion of the Melones fault zone. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive. (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001). Impacts would be less than significant.
- (b, c) **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** All grading activities exceeding 50 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During any future site grading and construction of foundations and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions and that is addressed by grading permits. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (d) **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the site contains Sierra very rocky sandy loam (Shd) with 15 to 30% slopes, Sierra sandy loam with eroded type soils and 9 to 15% slopes (SfC2), and Argonaut loam with a seeped variant (AoB) soils. These soils are listed as having low to moderate shrink-swell potential. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (e) Percolation tests and septic design were submitted for Environmental Health Division review and they determined they are acceptable for the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: No significant geophysical impacts would occur from the ranch marketing request either directly or indirectly. For this "Geology and Soils" category, the impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

(a, b) **Hazardous Substances.** The project being considered is for ranch marketing enterprise which does not directly involve introducing a scenario that would introduce the routine use, transport, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

(c) **Hazardous Emissions.** The proposed applications would not directly allow any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. Any future development proposal would be evaluated through the grading and/or building permit processes for those impacts at that time. There would be no direct impact.

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

- (d) **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List). No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the subject site are known to have occurred. There would be no direct impact with the approval of this project request. There would be no impact.
- (e) **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.
- (f) **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impact.
- (g) **Emergency Response Plan.** The existing roads that provide emergency evacuation capabilities to the north and to the south are currently passable with all weather surfaces between 14 to 20 feet wide. The emergency response plan for the special use permit area would also be further analyzed for impacts at the time of the building permit review for the new barn and single family dwelling. There would be no impact.
- (h) **Fire Hazards.** The ranch marketing project would not directly allow any operations (e.g., use of hazardous materials or processes) that would substantially increase fire hazard risk under normal circumstances. Emergency response access to the site and surrounding development would not be adversely affected as the roads exist and there are two potential emergency exit roadways. El Dorado County Fire Protection District has recommended the project be conditioned to either add a private water system or add to the EID water system, and add fire hydrants in order to meet fire flow requirements for fire fighting. As conditioned, the impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: No Hazards or Hazardous conditions would occur with the subject application requests and no mitigation is required. For this “Hazards” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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			X

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
sources of polluted runoff?			
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		X	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

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

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

- (a) **Water Quality Standards.** The proposed development that could potentially occur because of the approval of the subject application will generate wastewater that would connect to a septic system. Stormwater runoff from potential future development is required to be directed to an engineered drainage system and to contain water quality protection features in accordance with an NPDES stormwater permit if it is deemed applicable. These requirements will be further analyzed and then conditioned specific to the future development proposal. There would be a less than significant impacts as the existing drainage patterns will not be significantly changed.
- (b) **Groundwater.** Potable and irrigation water is supplied by El Dorado Irrigation District. There is an approved well currently being used by the existing second residential unit. Impacts to groundwater would be less than significant.
- (c) **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit stormwater runoff and discharge from a site. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. Compliance with an approved erosion control plan will reduce erosion and siltation on and off site. A grading permit through either Building Services or El Dorado County Department of transportation would be required for any future development to address grading, erosion and sediment control. The permit required for the road improvements will be reviewed as well for compliance. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- (d) **Existing Drainage Pattern.** The proposed project encompasses 88.484 acres. The rate of surface runoff from development will be minimized through the application review process and the initiation of Natural Resource Conservation Service Best Management Practices; there would be a less than significant impact from the current proposal’s minor road improvements and future impervious surfaces created with the development proposal.
- (e) **Stormwater Runoff.** There would minor changes from stormwater runoff directly caused by the approval of this application request and minor road improvements as the proposal does not involve major amounts of grading. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (f) **Water Quality.** Wastewater and stormwater runoff from any future potential development would be analyzed further to assure water quality protection standards have been established. As proposed, the special use permit request would not involve major physical changes to the environment and Best Management Practices will be applied during any soil altering activities. There would be no direct impact.
- (g, h, i) **Flooding.** No portion of the project is within the limits of the floodplain, as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate map. Therefore, no flooding impacts are expected. There would be no impacts.

FIRM. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0725 C, revised December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

- (j) **Inundation.** A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a water body. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. There would be no potential impact from mudflow because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a dam or other water body. There would be no impact.

Finding: As mitigated and conditioned, no significant hydrological impacts would occur with the project. For this “Hydrology” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;

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

- Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
 - Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
 - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- (a) **Established Community.** The project site is in an area designated by the General Plan as Planned Agricultural 30-acre with an overlay designation of Agricultural. A ranch marketing enterprise would be in keeping with the General Plan allowable uses in an Agricultural District and would not physically divide an established community as agricultural ranch marketing enterprises of some size and operation can be found in the Pleasant Valley community. The impacts from this particular proposal would be less than significant.
- (b) **Land Use Plan.** The General Plan designates the subject site as Agricultural Lands (AL) with Agricultural District (A) Overlay. This land use designation identifies those areas suitable farming, ranching and ranch marketing activities while attempting to conserve agriculturally important soils. The ranch marketing proposal would be compatible and appropriate in a Rural Region. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) **Habitat Conservation Plan.** The proposed project is not located in an area covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or a Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). There would be no impact.

Finding: The ranch marketing enterprise would be consistent with the General Plan intent for uses in Agricultural Districts as well as being consistent with similar uses in the Pleasant Valley area. As mitigated and conditioned, there will be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan. For this “Land Use” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- (a, b) **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist are present, (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001), and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. (El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7). There would be no impact.

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

Finding: No impacts to energy and mineral resources would occur and no mitigation is required. For this “Mineral Resources” category, there would be no impacts.

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

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

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

(a, b, c, d)The ranch marketing project is not listed under Table 6-1 of the General Plan as being a use subject to maximum allowable noise exposures from transportation source. As such, review by an acoustical analysis as to the impacts from outside noise coming into the project area was not provided as part of the project application submittal. The analysis focused on if the project itself would generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Tables 6-2 of the General Plan by amplified music. The applicant submitted *Noise Impact Evaluation for Pleasant Valley Harvest* prepared by Peter Wolfe, Architect and Garry Gates Engineering, dated September 26, 2007 lists the following project noise sources:

On-site Outdoor Noise Sources	
1	Day – to – day agriculture operations
2	Residential noise associated with the primary residence and second residential unit.

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

3	Vehicular traffic to and from the site
4	General public crowd noise/conversation
5	Amplified music and/or voice
On-site Indoor Noise Sources	
1	Crowd noise/conversation
2	Amplified music and/or voice

The project may result in an increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Presently, a parcel must have either five acres of permanent crop or ten acres of annual crop under cultivation to qualify for inclusion in ranch marketing activities. The applicant has approximately 7 acres of cleared arable land planted with 52 varieties of fruit trees and berries within the central portion of the parcel thereby meeting these criteria. The accessory uses include allowing events with up to 250 people in attendance and picnic areas for ranch marketing related activities. These accessory uses, specifically those involving outdoor events, may result in a permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels. The noise standards in a rural area are applied at a point 100 feet from any adjoining residence. All surrounding parcels currently have 200-foot setbacks for non-agricultural compatible structures applied to them with the current PA-30 zoning. All outdoor events, which have the potential to increase the ambient noise levels, are subject to the following Noise Level Performance Protection Standards contained in table 6-2 of the General Plan:

TABLE 6-2 NOISE LEVEL PERFORMANCE PROTECTION STANDARDS FOR NOISE SENSITIVE LAND USES AFFECTED BY NON-TRANSPORTATION* SOURCES						
Noise Level Descriptor	Daytime 7 a.m. - 7 p.m.		Evening 7 p.m. - 10 p.m.		Night 10 p.m. - 7 a.m.	
	Community	Rural	Community	Rural	Community	Rural
Hourly L_{eq} , dB	55	50	50	45	45	40
Maximum level, dB	70	60	60	55	55	50

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

Each of the noise levels specified above shall be lowered by five dB for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring impulsive noises. These noise level standards do not apply to residential units established in conjunction with industrial or commercial uses (e.g., caretaker dwellings).

The County can impose noise level standards which are up to 5 dB less than those specified above based upon determination of existing low ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site.

In Community areas the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving property. In Rural Areas the exterior noise level standard shall be applied at a point 100' away from the residence. The above standards shall be measured only on property containing a noise sensitive land use as defined in Objective 6.5.1. This measurement standard may be amended to provide for measurement at the boundary of a recorded noise easement between all effected property owners and approved by the County.

*Note: For the purposes of the Noise Element, transportation noise sources are defined as traffic on public roadways, railroad line operations and aircraft in flight. Control of noise from these sources is preempted by Federal and State regulations. Control of noise from facilities of regulated public facilities is preempted by California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulations. All other noise sources are subject to local regulations. Non-transportation noise sources may include industrial operations, outdoor recreation facilities, HVAC units, schools, hospitals, commercial land uses, other outdoor land use, etc.

General Plan Goal 6.5 directs that it be ensured that County residents are not subjected to noise beyond acceptable levels. Objective 6.5.1 directs that existing residential development be protected from new uses that would generate noise levels incompatible with residential uses. Policy 6.5.1.10 directs that in order to provide a comprehensive approach to noise control, the County shall:

- A. Develop and employ procedures to ensure that noise mitigation measures required pursuant to an acoustical analysis are implemented in the project review process and, as may be determined necessary, through the building permit process.
- B. Develop and employ procedures to monitor compliance with the standards of the Noise Element after completion of projects where noise mitigation measures were required.

Under General Plan Policy 6.5.1.14, a noise ordinance will be adopted by the County to control unnecessary noise that will include, but not be limited to, “amplified music in commercial establishments.” Until then, excessive noise resulting from outdoor events held on the project parcel will be mitigated custom to the site specific situations. The project is proposed to have amplified music at the special events.

Pursuant to the submitted *Noise Impact Evaluation for Pleasant Valley Harvest*, a portable audio meter was used to measure the outdoor noise sources at the property lines in different scenarios. Estimated noise sources were determined based upon a project-specific 75 dB (maximum) amplified music noise source at the Lawn/Patio Area which was determined by testing and observation to be the maximum amplification necessary for this specific project. Estimated noise levels included adjustments for speaker direction, atmospheric absorption and building shielding. Noise levels were calculated for distances from the source from five feet to 1,950 feet. Estimates of indoor uses were not tested as proposed indoor use will not result in excessive property line noise levels due to noise level reductions resulting from building shielding, existing vegetation and topography.

The noise source for the testing at the property lines with the portable audio meter was recorded music playing through an 800-watt amplifier connected to two, 400-watt speakers. The noise source was directed at the typical

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

point of maximum loudness 100 feet from the noise source. Observations were made at the property lines on the direct line between the noise source and the Lawn/Patio Area noise sources and the dwellings on each adjacent parcel and at the parcel entrance at Pleasant Valley Road. The indoor noise sources were not tested as proposed indoor use will not result in excessive property line noise levels due to building shielding.

Based solely on calculated levels, the noise study concluded that the noise levels at the west and southwest parcel boundaries by 1.96 dB and 0.57 respectively. Direct observations and testing with the portable audio meter which includes speaker orientation, atmosphere, topography and existing vegetation indicated property line noise levels ranging from undetectable to 55 dB. And thus would not exceed the General Plan noise standards as long as amplification levels are less than 75 dBA at 100 feet from the noise source specific to this parcel as the nearest dwelling is approximately 720 feet away from the Lawn/Patio area and approximately 160 feet from that parcel boundary. The next closest dwelling is approximately 1,900 feet away. With mitigation, impacts will be less than significant. To ensure compliance with the General Plan the following mitigation measures are recommended:

Mitigation Measure for Noise [4]

MM Noise-1: *All outdoor amplified music shall be limited to noise levels generated by a 75dB (maximum) noise source at the Patio, as shown on the site plan, (a maximum of 800-watt amplification) through the use of the applicant’s sound equipment only. Said equipment shall have permanent mechanical volume control stops and shall comply with all provisions of General Plan Policy 6.5.1.6.*

MM Noise-2: *All outdoor amplified music or voice at locations other than the Patio area shall be limited to a noise source of less than 50 dB average and 60 dB maximum between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. and 45 dB average and 55 dB maximum between 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. at all parcel boundaries through the use of the applicant’s sound equipment only. Said equipment shall have permanent mechanical volume control stops and shall operate at all times within all requirements of General Plan Policy 6.5.1.6.*

MM Noise-3: *Applicant is responsible for monitoring all sound levels and enforcing time restrictions for all events occurring on the subject parcel for compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan noise standards. Outdoor amplified music and voice shall not occur prior to 10:00 a.m. or after 10:00 p.m. daily.*

MM Noise-4: *Project construction shall only occur between the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekends, and on federally-recognized holidays.*

Short-term noise impacts may also be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities in the parcel vicinity during construction and grading for the new multi-use building and main dwelling. El Dorado County requires that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations are required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan. As mitigated, impacts would be less than significant

- (b) The ranch marketing proposal will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. There would be no impact.
- (e) General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including single-family residential, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a County owned/operated airport facility. There will be no impact.

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

(f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant impacts to receptors or from noise sources would occur with the ranch marketing proposal either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, as mitigated, the impacts would be a less than significant impact.

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

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

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

(a) The proposed project will not induce growth directly or indirectly by providing infrastructure that would create development beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. The development area on the project site is designated on the 2004 General Plan Land Use Map for agricultural development. The impacts would be less than significant.

(b, c) The proposed ranch marketing project will not displace people or existing housing, which will prevent the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There would be no impact.

Finding: The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed ranch marketing project either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, there would be a less than significant impact.

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

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

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

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

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

- (a) **Fire Protection:** The El Dorado County Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. The District was solicited for comments to determine compliance with fire standards, El Dorado County General Plan, State Fire Safe Regulations as adopted by El Dorado County and the California Uniform Fire Code. The District did not respond with any concerns that the level of service would fall below the minimum requirements as a result of the proposed parcel map. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (b) **Police Protection.** The project site will be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department with a response time of 8 minutes to 80 percent of the population located in the Community Regions. For the rural areas, there is no standard minimum level of service or response time. Currently, the County has 0.89 sworn officers per 1,000 daytime populations. The project proposal would not significantly impact current response times to the project area. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) **Schools.** The State allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The project proposal will not directly generate the need for additional school facilities and will not impact school enrollment, as the project would not result in a dominant residential component. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (d) **Parks.** Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, and an in-lieu fee amount for the subdivision of land. Provisions to provide parkland were not included as part of the proposal in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of County Code. The project proposal will not significantly increase the demand for parkland. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

(e) **Other Facilities.** No other public facilities or services will be directly substantially impacted by the project. Any future potential impacts would be further analyzed in the in any future development application process. The impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant impacts would occur with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.

(a, b) The proposed ranch marketing project would not substantially contribute to an increase in demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to recreation and open space resources would occur with the special use permit application. For this “Recreation” category, there would be no impacts.

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	

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

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
 - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
 - Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.
- (a, b) Access to the site is directly off of Bucks Bar Road which is County maintained. Comments were received from the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) indicating that the level of service (LOS) will not be significantly impacted by the proposed ranch marketing proposal as traffic patterns and occurrences are varied and sporadic as to time of day and time of week. Past studies of similar isolated ranch marketing proposals in rural areas have shown a project proposal such as the subject one does not worsen traffic pursuant to the General Plan definition of worsen. DOT staff determined that pursuant to Policy TC-Xe, the proposed use for Pleasant Valley Harvest will not "worsen" traffic and will therefore not require a traffic study. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns as there are no publicly or privately operated airports or landing fields in the project vicinity. There would be no impact.
- (d) The project will not substantially increase hazards because it will not introduce any potentially hazardous off site improvements. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (e) Access to the project parcel is proposed to be via an encroachment onto Bucks Bar Road. A grading permit will be required in order for the El Dorado County Building Services Division to review all required on site road improvements prior to issuance of the grading permit, and an encroachment permit will be required for Department of Transportation to review the ingress/egress onto Bucks Bar Road. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (f) The project requires 108 parking spaces of which 5 are to be accessible spaces and one of those needs to be van accessible. The applicant proposes 147 total spaces of which 136 are to be full-sized spaces, seven accessible spaces and four RV spaces. The impacts would be less than significant.
- (g) The proposed ranch marketing project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. There will be no impact

Finding: As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts would occur with the rezone either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, there would be less than significant impacts.

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

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

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

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

(a, b, e) **Wastewater:** The El Dorado County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the current application requests along with the submitted percolation tests and septic design and found they were adequate for the proposal. Impacts would be less than significant.

(c) **Stormwater Drainage:** All required drainage facilities for the encroachment, access roadway and parking lots will be fine tuned during the grading permit process required by El Dorado County Building Services Division and DOT. The project will implement NRCS Practices 391, 359 and 644 within the wetland/riparian areas to reduce stormwater impacts and will use Best Management Practices with their grading permit under supervision of the

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

Building Services Division and El Dorado County Resource Conservation District. Impacts would be less than significant.

- (d) **Potable Water:** The submitted Facility Improvement Letter (FIL0707-191) from El Dorado Irrigation District, dated July 27, 2007 that stated they can continue to provide water for the proposed project which as proposed, will not require additional EDUs of water supply but would require an extension of the existing 10-inch waterline from Bucks Bar Road in order to meet the required fire flow for adequate fire protection. With that extension, impacts would be less than significant.
- (f) **Landfill:** In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility / Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) are allowed to be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal site. All other waste materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years. There would be no impact.
- (g) **Solid Waste:** County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. The solid waste pickup area currently noted on the submitted site plan will be adequate for the project. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant utility and service system impacts would occur with the subject application. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, the impacts would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

- (a) As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have no significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources as all facilities exist. As mitigated for setbacks and with strict adherence to Natural Resource Conservation District Best Management Practices, the impacts on fish habitat (Item IV), would be less than significant. Potential impacts on rare or endangered plant species are discussed in detail in Item IV above, the

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

Biological Resources section. Impacts on special-status plant or animal species as a result of the proposed ranch marketing project would be less than significant.

- (b) Due to the existing site specific conditions and type of project proposed and types of activities proposed, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, with mitigation, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, land use/planning, mineral resources, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- (c) Any future development plan that attempts to expand the current uses proposed by this application request would require the submittal of a revision to the approved special use permit which would then be taken back to the Planning Commission for review and any new potential project specific impacts would be analyzed at that time in relation to all applicable laws as they have been with the subject proposal. The impacts from lighting and noise are conditioned and mitigated to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. With mitigation, environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9
Appendix A
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

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

Findings of Fact of the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors for the General Plan

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

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

County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719)

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Cultural Resource Assessment for Proposed Improvements for the Pleasant Valley Harvest Project, Peak and Associates, Inc., May 21, 2007, Job #06-187

Biological assessment report dated May 17, 2007, prepared by Michael Baad, Ph.D., Department of Biological Sciences, C.S.U.S

Facility Improvement Letter (FIL0707-191) from El Dorado Irrigation District, dated July 27, 2007

Noise Impact Evaluation for Pleasant Valley Harvest prepared by Peter Wolfe, Architect and Garry Gates Engineering, dated September 26, 2007