

A08-0005 - Amendment to General Plan Policy TC-Xa and related Policies
Addendum

Table of Contents

- I Project Description:
 - Proposed Amendments
 - No Amendment Alternative
 - Analysis

- II Initial Study

- III Addendum
 - Findings
 - Conclusions

- Exhibit A - Proposed Amendments (strikeout/underline version)
- Exhibit B - Proposed Amendments (clean version)
- Exhibit C - Environmental Checklist

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Proposed Amendments:

The Proposed Amendments include changes to General Plan Policy TC-Xa TC-Xb, TC-Xc, TC-Xd, TC-Xe, TC-Xf, and TC-Xh; Tables: TC-2 and TC-3; and Implementation Measures TC-A, and TC-B (Exhibit A and Exhibit B) as described in the Addendum.

As shown in Exhibit A, the proposed Amendments clarify various General Plan Policies in the Transportation and Circulation Element by deletions (indicated by strikeout) or additions (indicated by underlines).

The Proposed Amendments can be summarized into the following basic changes:

1. Clarify the intent to exempt multi-family residential from the provisions of Policy TC-Xa;
2. Allow the Board of Supervisors to let additional roads operate at LOS F instead of requiring each to go to a vote as required in TC-Xa;
3. Allow the County to use other funding resources to pay for road improvements that are currently restricted to developer fees only by TC-Xa;
4. Delete the requirement that the County make separate findings that a project complies with TC-Xa before approval;
5. Clarification of the timing of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP); and
6. Modification to Policy TC-Xf so that single family subdivision must show that all necessary improvements are set for construction in the 10 year CIP or be conditioned to build the improvements and all other projects must show the necessary improvements are in the 20 year CIP

No Amendment Alternative:

There are two optional outcomes if the Proposed Amendments are not approved. One option is that Policy TC-Xa is re-approved by the voters and remains in effect for another 10 years. The second option is that Policy TC-Xa expires (is not re-approved by the voters) in which case Policy TC-Xc would take effect.

The primary differences between TC-Xa and TC-Xc can be summarized as follows:

1. TC-Xc refers to Table TC-3, which is a shorter list of roads allowed to operate at LOS F.
2. Roads may be added to Table TC-3 with a simple majority vote.
3. Requirements for developer-paid traffic impact fees is changed from “shall fully pay” to “shall pay for the portion...to offset and mitigate the traffic impacts reasonably attributable.”

Analysis:

1. Clarify the intent to exempt multi-family residential from the provisions of Policy TC-Xa; The proposed clarification to Policy TC-Xa would clarify that only single family residential development would be denied if they would cause or worsen a road to a Level of Service (LOS) F condition. Previously, the County had applied TC-Xa to multi-family development as well as single family development. This change could possibly result in traffic from a new multi-family project impacting a road and causing congestion associated with the LOS F grade.

Although the LOS standard is often used as a threshold for environmental impact significance, it is actually a policy issue and the policies are typically set in a General Plan or design standards manual. LOS F can be described as a condition where long queues can form behind roadway bottlenecks and where traffic moves in a stop-and-go fashion. LOS E describes traffic conditions at or near capacity of the road where freedom to maneuver is limited and drivers may experience frustration. LOS D describes a stable traffic flow condition, with some poor levels of comfort and convenience. LOS A, B, and C are all good grades of traffic flow with A being the best free flow traffic conditions and C representing stable operating conditions where drivers are affected by others in the traffic stream.

New multi-family development would be required to adhere to other General Plan Policies regarding LOS standards. Policy TC-Xd sets the standard for County maintained roads to be LOS E in the Community Regions and LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions. Since LOS D and E are higher standards than LOS F, those projects now exempted from Policy TC-Xa, would still be evaluated and conditioned to comply with the General Plan LOS standards. The County would likely require the project to make road improvements to mitigate the projects impacts and/or rely on the collection of Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) fees and the construction of road improvements through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

The reliance on the collection of TIM fees and implementation of the CIP may result in some short term LOS degradation since the implementation of the CIP is planned to eventually improve roads to General Plan compliant LOS standards. The potential impact of the clarification to TC-Xa is a possible increase in the length of time for the short term LOS deterioration from a new multi-family project.

This impact was analyzed in the General Plan EIR as Impact 5.4-3: Short-term Unacceptable LOS Conditions Related to Generation of New Traffic in Advance of Transportation Improvements. The analysis concluded that the impact was significant and unavoidable even after mitigation measures were implemented. The impact was unavoidable because several of the roadways identified in the General Plan circulation diagram are necessary to address existing roadway capacity deficiencies caused by existing or approved development and County roadways are impacted from traffic and development outside of the County.

These impacts could not be quantified to any accurate extent because of the variables associated with ministerial and discretionary development improvement timing, implementation of the TIM and CIP systems, and impacts from outside the County.

There is also a proposed change to Policy TC-Xa that would allow the County to use additional funding sources to implement the CIP improvements (further described in Section 3). TC-Xa originally limited the County by restricting certain road improvements to developer funding only. These additional funds could off-set any additional impacts associated with allowing multi-family development to proceed.

In summary, the timely implementation of the CIP improvements to reduce traffic congestion was analyzed in the General Plan EIR and continues to be the primary source of traffic congestion relief for the County. The Proposed Amendments, although exempting multi-family development from the strict interpretation of Policy TC-Xa, also include provisions for increased funding for the CIP and increased update and review periods for the TIM fee program and the CIP. These additional funding and program updates may off-set any additional short-term road congestion impacts from the Proposed Amendments.

2. Allow the Board of Supervisors to let additional roads operate at LOS F instead of requiring each to go to a vote as required in TC-Xa. The Proposed Amendment would allow the Board of Supervisors on a 4/5ths vote to add additional roads to the list of roads allowed to operate at LOS F (General Plan Table TC-2). Currently, this would require approval by the voters. In either case, where the Board takes a 4/5th vote or places an item on the ballot for voter approval, the Board is required to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as each action is a discretionary action. The CEQA process would require the Board to review the environmental impacts of its proposed decision on a case-by-case basis. Since the CEQA process would be unchanged, the impacts of allowing the Board to make the decision verses by voter approval would have no new environmental impact

3. Allow the County to use other funding resources to pay for road improvements that are currently restricted to developer fees only by TC-Xa; As noted above, the Proposed Amendment includes the clarification of TC-Xa to allow “any other available funds” to be used to build road capacity improvements. There should be no negative impact from this change. This change allows the County to use other sources of funds for road improvements. This flexibility is important because many road improvement projects are funded by State or Federal sources and require a County matching amount. With more funding flexibility, more options to seek State and Federal funding becomes available. The exact amount of money and road

improvements is unknown, but may help off-set potential negative impacts from other Proposed Amendments.

4. Delete the requirement that the County make separate findings that a project complies with TC-Xa before approval. The Proposed Amendment would delete the requirement that the County make separate findings that a project complies with TC-Xa before approval. This clarification has no formal effect, since the County is required to make findings of consistency with the General Plan for discretionary projects. In addition, since all discretionary projects are subject to a CEQA analysis whether this provision is deleted or not, the future project specific CEQA analysis would continue to address any project specific environmental impacts. Therefore, no environmental impacts from this Proposed Amendment would result.

5. Clarification of the timing of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The Proposed Amendment includes various clarifications of the timing of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP would be updated every year to show the roads needing improvement over a ten year period. The CIP would also be updated every five years to show the roads needed over the 20 year period.

The extension of the CIP from a five year period to a ten year period would potentially allow development to rely on the CIP instead of providing road improvements and therefore result in an increase in short term LOS reductions. However, these impacts are intended to be off-set by the Proposed Amendment to allow additional funding sources to be used directly for road improvements and as matching funds to attract additional State and Federal moneys. In addition, the increased update periods for the CIP, as well as the TIM fee program, would also improve the County ability to react to changes in traffic patterns, outside County influences, and updates in construction cost estimates.

There is a potential to delay single family development in cases where the development's traffic impacts are projected to trigger large scale roadway capacity improvements that are not currently in the 10 year CIP and which are beyond the ability of the development to finance. This potential delay in development may slow the collection of development impact fees, resulting in a slower timeframe for road improvements. If the roads are already operating at substandard LOS conditions due to existing capacity deficiencies or out of County traffic, then the short-term LOS degradation may persist.

The General Plan EIR required the update of TIM fee programs and CIP to mitigate road capacity impacts. The County has adopted a General Plan compliant TIM fee program and CIP based on the current General Plan Policies. The Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program Draft Supplement to the El Dorado County General Plan EIR was adopted on August 22, 2006. The Supplement identified a projected increase in the severity of one of the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the General Plan EIR- Impact 5.4-2: Increase in Daily and Peak Hour Traffic- and identifies 19 additional roadway segments which are projected to decline below the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance.

The Proposed Amendment will require changes to these programs in the next round of planned updates. Since future updates will occur annually and review roads over a 10 and 20 year

period, the County will have better information to see traffic volume trends and would be more likely to successfully implement the CIP to improve those roads that have the worst LOS first.

6. Modification to Policy TC-Xf so that single family subdivision must show that all necessary improvements are set for construction in the 10 year CIP or be conditioned to build the improvements and all other projects must show the necessary improvements are in the 20 year CIP. As described in Section 5, the Proposed Amendment changes could result in an increase in short term LOS reductions. However, also as described in Section 5, these potential impacts should be off-set by other changes in the Proposed Amendment that allow additional funding opportunities to be used for road improvements and that annual updates of TIM fee program and CIP will allow the County to make road improvements to solve the worst traffic problems first.

II. INITIAL STUDY

The purpose of this section is to review the Proposed Amendment's potential need for supplemental environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. Exhibit C of this Addendum includes the Environmental Checklist from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

The purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any "changed condition" (i.e. changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a changed environmental result. A "no" answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed with mitigations in prior environmental documents (2004 General Plan EIR and 2006 TIM fee Supplement). The environmental categories might be answered with a "no" in the checklist since the approval of the Proposed Amendments do not introduce changes that would result in a modification to the conclusion of the prior environmental documents.

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES

Where Impact was Analyzed in Prior Documents?

This column provides a cross-reference to the pages of the prior environmental documents where information and analysis may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the Amendments will result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior environmental review or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.

Any New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there have been changes to the project site or the vicinity (circumstances under which the project is undertaken) which have occurred subsequent to the prior environmental documents, which would result in the Amendments having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior environmental documents or that substantially increase the severity of a previously identified impact.

Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified as complete is available requiring an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigations remain valid. If the new information shows that: (A) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental documents; or (B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; or (C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects or the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (D) that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative than the question would be answered ‘Yes’ requiring the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. However, if the additional analysis completed as part of this Environmental Review finds that the conclusions of the prior environmental documents remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified environmental impacts are not found to be more severe, or additional mitigation is not necessary than the question would be answered ‘No’ and no additional environmental documentation (supplemental or subsequent EIR) is required.

Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the prior environmental documents provide mitigations to address effects in the related impact category. In some cases, the mitigations have already been implemented. A “yes” response will be provided in either instance. If “NA” is indicated, this Environmental Review concludes that the impact does not occur with this project and therefore no mitigations are needed.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:					
A(1). 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 ration on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	Draft General Plan EIR (pp 5.4-51 to 5.4-56) Impact 5.4-2 Increase in Daily and Peak Hour Traffic. Mitigation Measures adopted, impact remained significant and unavoidable.	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measures 5.4-1(a), 5.4-1(b), 5.4.1(d) and 5.4.1(e).
A(2) 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 ration on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	Draft General Plan EIR (Pp 5.4-57 to 5.4-65) Impact 5.4-3 Short-term Unavoidable LOS Conditions Related to Generation of New Traffic in Advance of Transportation Improvements Mitigation Measures adopted; impact remained significant and unavoidable. See also	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measures 5.4-1(a), 5.4-1(b), 5.4.1(d) and 5.4.1(e).

	2006 TIM fee Supplement.				
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Draft General Plan EIR (pp 5.4-38 to 5.4-51). Impact 5.4-1 Potential Inconsistencies with LOS Policies. Mitigation Measures adopted to reduce impact to less-than-significant.	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measures: 5.4-1(a), 5.4-1(b), and 5.4.1(e).
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?	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	N/A
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	Draft General Plan EIR (pp 5.4-65 to 5.4-69) Impact 5.4-4 Insufficient Transit Capacity. Mitigation Measure adopted; impact remained significant and unavoidable.	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measure 5.4-4

III.ADDENDUM

The following Addendum was prepared in response to the proposed General Plan Amendment for TC-Xa and related Policies (Amendments) pursuant to CEQA and the Government Code. Generally, CEQA Guidelines section 15164, subdivision (a), provides that the County shall “prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15164, subd. (a); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21166.)

CEQA Guidelines section 15162 provides “[w]hen and EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR . . . due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR . . . due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete . . . shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.”

(CEQA Guidelines, § 15162, subd. (a); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21166.)

This Addendum relies on previous environmental analysis prepared for the General Plan, including:

1. Draft General Plan sections referenced in the Table above (SCH 2001082030);
2. Response to Comments Chapter 2.0 Draft EIR Text Changes (pp 2-11 to 2-34);
3. General Plan CEQA Findings of Fact (pp57 to 69);
4. The Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program Draft Supplement to the El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report (adopted August 22, 2006); and
5. Resolution 265-2006 certifying the TIM fee program supplement, issuing a supplemental statement of overriding considerations, and making supplemental findings of fact.
6. This addendum also incorporates by reference and relies, as if fully set forth herein, on the 2004 General Plan EIR and all studies either attached or incorporated therein.

The analysis contained within this Addendum examines the Proposed Amendments and the potential changes in the timing of infrastructure improvements that may result from the clarifications and changes to the road infrastructure capacity improvement Policies of the General Plan.

Findings:

The County of El Dorado (the “County”) certified a Final Environmental Impact Report on the El Dorado County General Plan (SCH#2001082030) (the “General Plan EIR”) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and adopted the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan on July 19, 2004.

The County adopted a TIM Fee Program Draft Supplement to the General Plan on August 22, 2006. The Supplement identified the increase in severity of one significant and unavoidable impact previously identified in the General Plan EIR: Impact 5.4-2 Increase in Daily and Peak Hour Traffic. The Board of Supervisors adopted a Supplemental Statement of Overriding Considerations in Resolution 265-2006.

There are no substantial changes proposed by the Proposed Amendments that require major revisions of the existing EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. As illustrated above, the project is consistent with the existing General Plan, and would only possibly involve minor modifications to the timing of infrastructure improvements required under the General Plan.

There have also been no changes in the circumstances that would result in new significant environmental effects. The General Plan remains substantially unchanged from that previously analyzed and additional environmental review is not necessary. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15162, subd. (a).)

The additional opportunity to use other sources of funding for the necessary infrastructure improvements, moreover, will result in a corresponding decrease in traffic and air quality effects from those previously considered in the EIR. The increased updates to the CIP and TIM fee programs will also correspondingly improve these programs as tools to improve roads and reduce traffic impacts. There have been no substantial changes in the project or circumstances that would result in new

significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects when compared to the impacts previously analyzed.

Conclusion:

The Board may approve the Proposed Amendments, which includes changes to General Plan Policy TC-Xa TC-Xb, TC-Xc, TC-Xd, TC-Xe, TC-Xf, and TC-Xh; Tables: TC-2 and TC-3; and Implementation Measures TC-A, and TC-B (Exhibit A and Exhibit B) as described in Addendum, because the proposed Amendments will not have a significant effect on the environment and remains within the impacts previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

The Proposed Amendments do not require major revisions to the General Plan EIR. No new information or changes in circumstances surrounding the General Plan EIR have occurred since the adoption of the General Plan. Thus, no additional environmental review is required under CEQA prior to the Board's approval of the Amendments.

Exhibit A: Proposed Amendments (strikeout/underline version)

Note: The following is Policy TC-Xa with the proposed clarifications from the April 22, 2008 Board meeting. The underline sections indicate proposed additions and the strikeouts indicate deletions.

Policy TC-Xa The following policies shall remain in effect until December 31, 2018 unless extended by the voters prior to that time:

- Traffic from single family residential subdivision development projects of five or more ~~units or~~ parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.
- The County shall not add any additional segments of U.S. Highway 50, or any other ~~highways and~~ roads, to the County's list of roads (~~shown in Table TC-2~~) that are allowed to operate at Level of Service F without first getting the voters' approval or by a 4/5ths vote of the Board of Supervisors.
- Developer-paid traffic impact fees combined with any other available funds shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.
- ~~County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if county voters first give their approval.~~
- ~~Before giving approval of any kind to a residential development project of five or more units or parcels of land, the County shall make a finding that the project complies with the policies above. If this finding cannot be made, then the County shall not approve the project in order to protect the public's health and safety as provided by state law to assure that safe and adequate roads and highways are in place as such development occurs.~~

Note: The following additional General Plan Policy Amendments are evaluated in this initial study as part of the Board direction to clarify Policy TC-Xa. These additional General Plan Policy Amendments are directly related to TC-Xa and need to be analyzed in order to provide the Planning Commission and Board a full range of options to consider addressing clarification of TC-Xa and concurrency policies. The underline sections indicate proposed additions and the strikeouts indicate deletions.

LEVELS OF SERVICE AND CONCURRENCY

In ~~1998~~ 2008, El Dorado County voters adopted an ~~initiative~~ measure known as Measure ~~Y~~____, the "Control Traffic Congestion Initiative_____." ~~The initiative added several policies to the former General Plan intended to require new development to fully pay its way to prevent traffic congestion from worsening in the County. The initiative measure provided~~ provides that the new policies included in Measure _____ should ~~will~~ remain in effect for ten years ~~and that the voters should be given the opportunity to readopt those policies for an additional 10 years.~~ The policies in this

section reflect the voters' intent in adopting Measure Y ~~by (1) applying the Measure Y policies through 2008, (2) providing for the possible re-adoption of those policies in 2008, and (3) providing alternative policies that will take effect in 2009 if the Measure Y policies are not extended.~~

Policy TC-Xa: The following policies shall remain in effect until December 31, ~~2008~~ 2018 ~~unless extended by the voters prior to that time.~~

TABLE TC-2 EL DORADO COUNTY ROADS ALLOWED TO OPERATE AT LEVEL OF SERVICE F¹ (Through December 31, 2008 <u>2018</u>)		
Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C²
Cambridge Road	Country Club Drive to Oxford Road	1.07
Cameron Park Drive	Robin Lane to Coach Lane	1.11
Missouri Flat Road	U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive	1.12
	Mother Lode Drive to China Garden Road	1.20
Pleasant Valley Road	El Dorado Road to State Route 49	1.28
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.25
	Junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street) to Coloma Street	1.59
	Coloma Street to Bedford Avenue	1.61
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.73
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.16
State Route 49	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.16
	Pacific/Sacramento Street to new four-lane section	1.31
	U.S. Highway 50 to State Route 193	1.32
	State Route 193 to county line	1.51
Notes: ¹ Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations. ² Volume to Capacity ratio.		

Policy TC-Xb To ensure that potential development in the County does not exceed available roadway capacity, the County shall:

A. Every year P prepare an annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) specifying expenditures for roadway improvements to be completed within the next 10 years, to ensure compliance with all applicable level of service and other standards in this plan, identifying improvements expected to be required within the next 20 years, and specifying funding sources sufficient to develop the improvements identified in the 10 year plan; At least every five years prepare a CIP specifying expenditures for roadway improvements within the next 20 years. Each plan shall contain identification of funding sources sufficient to develop the improvements identified.

B. At least every five years, prepare a Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program specifying roadway improvements to be completed within the next 20 years to ensure compliance with all applicable level of service and other standards in this plan; and

~~C.B. Annually monitor traffic volumes on the county's major roadway system depicted in the Circulation Diagram.~~

~~C. Review development proposals to ensure that the development would not generate traffic in excess of that contemplated by the Capital Improvement Program for the next ten years or cause levels of service on any affected roadway segments to fall below the levels specified in this plan.~~

~~Policy TC-Xc — The following policies shall take effect upon the expiration of the policies in Policy TC-Xa-~~

- ~~1. Traffic from residential development projects shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop and go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county except as specified in Table TC 3.~~
- ~~2. Additional segments of U.S. Highway 50 and other highways and roads may be added to Table TC 3 only upon approval of a majority of the Board of Supervisors.~~
- ~~3. Developer paid traffic impact fees shall pay for the portion of road capacity improvements, which would not be paid for through other County revenue sources, necessary to offset and mitigate the traffic impacts reasonably attributable to new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.~~
- ~~4. County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if County voters first give their approval.~~

TABLE TC-3		
El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F¹		
(After December 31, 2008)		
Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C²
U.S. Highway 50-	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)-	1.23-
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway-	1.13-
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead-	1.13-
	Lee House Road to Echo Lake-	1.03-
Notes:-		
¹ Roads improved to their maximum width given right of way and physical limitations.		
² Volume to Capacity ratio.		

~~Policy TC-Xd Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2 or, after December 31, 2008, Table TC-3. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Tables TC-2 and TC-3 as applicable shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of Service will be as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.~~

Policy TC-Xf

~~At the time of approval of a tentative map for a single family residential subdivision of five or more parcels Prior to occupancy for development that worsens (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the developer County shall do one of the following: (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to regional and local roads needed to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the development plus forecasted traffic growth at 10-years from project submittal; or (2) ensure adequate funding is identified and available the commencement of construction of for the necessary road improvements are included in the county's 10 year CIP. and those projects are programmed. The determination of compliance with this requirement shall be based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the and from other reasonably foreseeable projects.~~

~~For all other discretionary projects that worsen (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the County shall do one of the following: (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element; or (2) ensure the construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County's 20-year CIP.~~

Policy TC-Xh

~~All subdivisions shall be conditioned to pay the traffic impact fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued for any parcel created by the subdivision. Until such time as updated traffic impact fees are adopted pursuant to this General Plan, any subdivisions will be required to either (1) execute an agreement agreeing to pay the higher fees, even after building permits have been issued or (2) have a notice of restriction placed on the final map prohibiting the issuance of building permits until the updated traffic impact fees are adopted.~~

Prepare and adopt a priority list of road and highway improvements for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) based on a horizon of ~~five~~ ten years. The Board of Supervisors shall update the CIP every ~~two~~ years, or more frequently as recommended by the responsible departments. The CIP shall prioritize capital maintenance and rehabilitation, reconstruction, capacity, and operational and safety improvements. Non-capital maintenance activities need not be included in the CIP. The CIP shall be coordinated with the five-year major review of the General Plan and shall be included in the annual General Plan review. [Policies TC-1k, TC-1m, and TC-1n]

Responsibility:	Department of Transportation, Planning Department, and Board of Supervisors
Time Frame:	Within six months of General Plan <u>amendment</u> adoption; every one year thereafter.

Revise and adopt traffic impact fee program(s) for unincorporated areas of the county and adopt additional funding mechanisms necessary to ensure that improvements contained in the fee programs are fully funded and capable of being implemented concurrently with new development as defined by Policy TC-Xf. The traffic fees should be designed to achieve the adopted level of service standards and preserve the integrity of the circulation system. The fee program(s) shall be updated annually for changes in project costs, and at least every five years with revised growth forecasts, revised improvement project analysis and list, and revised construction cost estimates to ensure the programs continue to meet the requirements contained in the policies of this General Plan. [Policies TC-Xa, TC-Xb, and TC-Xg]

Responsibility:	Department of Transportation and Planning Department
Time Frame:	First full fiscal year following General Plan adoption.

Exhibit B: Proposed Amendments (clean version)

Note: All proposed amendments would be incorporated into the 2004 General Plan under Goal TC X as follows. Policies TC-Xe, TC-Xg and TC-Xi are not proposed for changes but are included for context.

LEVELS OF SERVICE AND CONCURRENCY

In 2008, El Dorado County voters adopted a measure known as Measure ____, the “_____.” The measure provides that the policies included in Measure ____ will remain in effect for ten years. The policies in this section reflect the voters’ intent in adopting Measure ____.

GOAL TC-X: To coordinate planning and implementation of roadway improvements with new development to maintain adequate levels of service on County roads.

Policy TC-Xa The following policies shall remain in effect until December 31, 2018:

1. Traffic from single family residential subdivision development projects of five or more parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.
2. The County shall not add any additional segments of U.S. Highway 50, or any other roads, to the County’s list of roads that are allowed to operate at Level of Service F without first getting the voters’ approval or by a 4/5ths vote of the Board of Supervisors.
3. Developer-paid traffic impact fees combined with any other available funds shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.

TABLE TC-2		
EL DORADO COUNTY ROADS ALLOWED TO OPERATE AT LEVEL OF SERVICE		
F¹		
(Through December 31, 2018)		
Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C²
Cambridge Road	Country Club Drive to Oxford Road	1.07
Cameron Park Drive	Robin Lane to Coach Lane	1.11
Missouri Flat Road	U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive	1.12
	Mother Lode Drive to China Garden Road	1.20
Pleasant Valley Road	El Dorado Road to State Route 49	1.28
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.25
	Junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street) to Coloma Street	1.59
	Coloma Street to Bedford Avenue	1.61
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.73

TABLE TC-2 EL DORADO COUNTY ROADS ALLOWED TO OPERATE AT LEVEL OF SERVICE F¹ (Through December 31, 2018)		
Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C²
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.16
	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.16
State Route 49	Pacific/Sacramento Street to new four-lane section	1.31
	U.S. Highway 50 to State Route 193	1.32
	State Route 193 to county line	1.51
Notes: ¹ Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations. ² Volume to Capacity ratio.		

Policy TC-Xb To ensure that potential development in the County does not exceed available roadway capacity, the County shall:

A. Every year prepare a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) specifying expenditures for roadway improvements within the next 10 years. At least every five years prepare a CIP specifying expenditures for roadway improvements within the next 20 years. Each plan shall contain identification of funding sources sufficient to develop the improvements identified.

B. At least every five years, prepare a Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program specifying roadway improvements to be completed within the next 20 years to ensure compliance with all applicable level of service and other standards in this plan; and

C. Annually monitor traffic volumes on the county's major roadway system depicted in the Circulation Diagram.

Policy TC-Xc intentionally left blank

Policy TC-Xd Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Table TC-2 and shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of Service will be as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.

Policy TC-Xe For the purposes of this Transportation and Circulation Element, "worsen" is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

A. A 2 percent increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or

- B. The addition of 100 or more daily trips, or
- C. The addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.

Policy TC-Xf At the time of approval of a Tentative Map for a single family residential subdivision of five or more parcels that worsens (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the County shall do one of the following: (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the development plus forecasted traffic growth at 10-years from project submittal; or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County’s 10-year CIP.

For all other discretionary projects that worsen (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the County shall do one of the following: (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element; or (2) ensure the construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County’s 20-year CIP.

Policy TC-Xg Each development project shall dedicate right-of-way and construct or fund improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project. The County shall require an analysis of impacts of traffic from the development project, including impacts from truck traffic, and require dedication of needed right-of-way and construction of road facilities as a condition of the development. For road improvements that provide significant benefit to other development, the County may allow a project to fund its fair share of improvement costs through traffic impact fees or receive reimbursement from impact fees for construction of improvements beyond the project’s fair share. The amount and timing of reimbursements shall be determined by the County.

Policy TC-Xh All subdivisions shall be conditioned to pay the traffic impact fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued for any parcel created by the subdivision.

Policy TC-Xi The planning for the widening of U.S. Highway 50, consistent with the policies of this General Plan, shall be a priority of the County. The County shall coordinate with other affected agencies, such as the City of Folsom, the County of Sacramento, and Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) to ensure that U.S. Highway 50 capacity enhancing projects are coordinated with these agencies with the goal of delivering these projects on a schedule to meet the requirements of the policies of this General Plan.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

MEASURE TC-A

Prepare and adopt a priority list of road and highway improvements for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) based on a horizon of ten years. The Board of Supervisors shall update the CIP every year, or more frequently as recommended by the responsible departments. The CIP shall prioritize capital maintenance and rehabilitation, reconstruction, capacity, and operational and safety improvements. Non-capital maintenance activities need not be included in the CIP. The CIP shall be coordinated with the five-year major review of the General Plan and shall be included in the annual General Plan review. [Policies TC-1k, TC-1m, and TC-1n]

Responsibility:	Department of Transportation, Planning Department, and Board of Supervisors
------------------------	---

Time Frame:	Within six months of General Plan amendment; every one year thereafter.
-------------	---

MEASURE TC-B

Revise and adopt traffic impact fee program(s) for unincorporated areas of the county and adopt additional funding mechanisms necessary to ensure that improvements contained in the fee programs are fully funded and capable of being implemented concurrently with new development as defined by Policy TC-Xf. The traffic fees should be designed to achieve the adopted level of service standards and preserve the integrity of the circulation system. The fee program(s) shall be updated annually for changes in project costs, and at least every five years with revised growth forecasts, revised improvement project analysis and list, and revised construction cost estimates to ensure the programs continue to meet the requirements contained in the policies of this General Plan. [Policies TC-Xa, TC-Xb, and TC-Xg]

Responsibility:	Department of Transportation and Planning Department
Time Frame:	First full fiscal year following General Plan adoption.

Exhibit C Environmental Checklist

Checklist based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G “Environmental Checklist Form”

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 (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
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.

Project Description: The Proposed General Plan Amendment to Policy TC-Xa and related Policies (Amendments) is fully outlined in Exhibit A (strikeout and underline version) and Exhibit B (unmarked version). A brief summary of the impacts are contained in Section I of the Addendum for which this section is Exhibit C. A description of the No Amendment Alternative is included since the General Plan Policies being affected have certain expiration dates involved.

1 AESTHETICS. Would the project: PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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	

Existing Setting: El Dorado County has a broad range of landscapes that change with the gradual increase in elevation. Elevations range from 200 feet above sea level at the County’s western edge, adjacent to Sacramento County, to more than 10,000 feet along the Sierra Nevada crest.

Policy Framework: The El Dorado County General Plan Land Use Element contains policies related to aesthetics that address protection of scenic roads and highways, corridor view sheds, natural landscape features and associated views, rural character, and a sense of community identity. Other policies call for minimizing ridgeline development, on and off-site signs, and excessive lighting. At this time there are a number of roads classified as potential scenic routes, however the only designated State Scenic Highway in El Dorado County is Highway 50 (from the County Government Center in Placerville to the South Lake Tahoe city limits). The entire length of Highway 49 through El Dorado County is eligible for state designation, and scenic viewpoints along Highway 193 are listed in the County General Plan.

Several roadways are classified as existing (Highway 50) or potential State Scenic Highways in the County General Plan EIR Visual Resources discussion. The potential routes include the entire length of Highway 49, a portion of Highway 193, as well as other roads and public scenic viewpoints listed in the General Plan EIR under Table 5.3-1. Important Public Scenic Viewpoints listed include Mt. Aukum Road (E16), Omo Ranch Road, Icehouse Road, Salmon Falls Road southbound, Cold Springs Road, Latrobe Road, Wentworth Springs Road and the Mormon Emigrant Trail (Iron Mountain Road).

Regulatory Setting: Discretionary development in El Dorado County is required to comply with the General Plan pursuant to Policy 2.2.5.2, as well as various permit process findings in Title 17 (Zoning Ordinance) and Title 16 (Subdivisions Ordinance). Discretionary development and road improvement projects are also subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

General Plan Policy 2.4.1.2, in part, requires that the County develop community design guidelines, including the following criteria:

- A. Historic preservation
- B. Streetscape elements and improvements
- C. Signage
- D. Maintenance of existing scenic road and riparian corridors...”

Impact Discussion: The proposed project would typically be considered to have a potentially significant adverse aesthetic impact if it resulted in:

- introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development thereby creating incompatibility with surrounding land uses, structures, or intensity of development;
- substantial change to the natural landscape through removal of significant amounts of vegetation, loss of important open space, substantial alteration of natural character, lack of adequate landscaping or extensive grading visible from public areas; or
- obstruction of an identified public scenic vista or public view.

1 (a - b & c) Substantial impact on scenic vista or visual character. The proposed Amendments as described in Section I (Project Description) could result in additional road construction activities. Some of these road improvements may result in impacts to scenic vistas or other visual resources.

The County does not have any adopted design guidelines for road improvements. Policy 2.4.1.2 indicates that some areas will develop design guidelines in the future. The Missouri Flat Road Corridor has draft design guidelines currently being reviewed, but they primarily address private development and do not address roads.

Since there are no standards or design guidelines to follow for future road improvements, each road project will be evaluated on a case by case basis through a separate, project specific CEQA analysis that will address aesthetic impacts. As a result, the Amendments will have a **less than significant** impact on the environment.

1 (d) Create substantial light or glare. Glare or night lighting could result with the development of new and expanded roads that have additional street lighting. The County Zoning Ordinance, Section 17.14.170 (Outdoor Lighting) applies to “any commercial, industrial, and multi-family, civic, or utility project that proposes to install outdoor lighting.” The lighting standards require the lighting to be hooded or screened to direct the light downward and not impact adjacent properties. The Ordinance requires review of the lighting plan to be reviewed by the Planning Director or the approving authority. Adherence to these provisions will minimize potential light or glare impacts to a **less than significant** level.

Finding: The Amendments may result in additional road improvements, but due to the existing General Plan policies and Zoning provisions, and the fact that each road improvement project will have a separate site-specific CEQA analysis; the Amendments impacts regarding Aesthetics are considered to be **less than significant**.

2 AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:		PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
PSI	Potentially Significant Impact				
PSUMI:	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated				
LTS:	Less-than-significant Impact				
NI	No Impact.				
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	

Existing Setting: Agriculture has long been an important element of life in El Dorado County. Agricultural crop production and associated activities not only contribute to the economic stability of the county, but serve as the foundation of the county’s rural lifestyle, and provide a key element in the sense of community of many rural regions. In 2005, the county had a crop production value of more than \$26 million, excluding timber. The overall contribution of agriculture to the county’s economy (through employment, sales, tourism, and other related activities) totaled approximately \$434 million in 2005 (El Dorado County Department of Agriculture Crop Report 2005).

Policy Framework: Under General Plan Policy 8.1.1.1, “*Agricultural Districts* shall be created and maintained for the purposes of conserving, protecting, and encouraging the agricultural use of important agricultural lands and associated activities throughout the County; maintaining viable agricultural-based communities; and encouraging the expansion of agricultural activities and production. These districts shall be delineated on the General Plan land use map as an overlay land use designation.” The General Plan map depicts seven Agricultural Districts.

Regulatory Setting: The County’s Zoning Ordinance includes provisions for various agricultural zone districts that are identified as Agriculture (A), Exclusive Agriculture (AE), Planned Agriculture (PA), Agricultural Preserve (AP) and Select Agriculture (SA-10). Each district allows the various agricultural uses of grazing, timber production, and fruit and vegetable production, to include processing, and packaging, and each district allows for residential development. The Residential Agricultural zones (RA-20, RA-40, RA-60, RA-80, and RA-160) are also considered agricultural zones, although they are listed separately in the code.

Impacts 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.

2 (a & c) Conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use. The proposed Amendments described in Section I (Project Description) could result in additional road construction activities. Some of these road improvements may result in impacts to Agricultural Resources.

Since each road project will be evaluated on a case by case basis through a CEQA analysis, each road project will address potential impacts to agricultural lands. As a result, the Amendments will have a **less-than-significant** impact on the environment.

2 (b) Conflicts with land under Williamson Act contracts: The AP and AE zones represent lands that are subject to the Land Conservation Act of 1965, also known as the Williamson Act, based on Section 51200(d) of the California Government Code. Under the Williamson Act, property owners voluntarily contract with the County to preserve the land for agriculture in a rolling ten-year period in order to benefit from a property tax reduction. Once a contract is established, the property is labeled as an “Agricultural Preserve.”

The Amendments will not typically result in additional road improvements in the rural areas of the County where the predominant Williamson Act Contract lands are located. Even if such road improvements are adjacent to Williamson Act Contract lands, the road improvement project’s CEQA analysis will address potential impacts to the lands. Therefore potential conflicts with land under Williamson Act contracts are considered **less than significant**.

Finding: The Amendments may result in additional road improvements, but due to the existing General Plan policies and Zoning provisions, and the fact that each road improvement project will have a separate site-specific CEQA analysis; the Amendments impacts regarding Agriculture Resources are considered to be **less than significant**.

3 AIR QUALITY. Would the project: PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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	

Existing Setting: El Dorado County is currently 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. Standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control is administered by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDC AQMD).

Policy Framework: El Dorado County policies related to air quality can be found in the General Plan Public Health, Safety and Noise Element. These policies are focused upon maintaining air quality by adopting and enforcing the El Dorado County Clean Air Act Plan in conjunction with the Air Quality Management District (AQMD); reducing motor vehicle emissions by reducing vehicle trips and encouraging use of clean fuel; expanding transit service; encouraging project design that minimize air contaminants; adopting regulations to mitigate permitted agricultural burning; reducing construction-related emissions through regulation; and monitoring the effects of air pollution on vegetation.

In coordination with the air quality management districts and air pollution control districts of Sacramento, Yolo, Solano, Placer, and Sutter counties, the EDC AQMD prepared and submitted the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in compliance with the California Clean Air Act. This plan addressed the non-attainment status of the region for ozone and particulate matter. These agencies also prepared the 1994 Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan, which was incorporated as part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) to meet the requirements of the federal Clean Air Act.

If a property is located in such an area known to have naturally occurring asbestos and proposes the disturbance of 20 cubic yards or more of earth, the landowner must comply with Air Quality Management District (AQMD) Rule 223-2 which includes submittal of an asbestos dust mitigation plan, fugitive dust prevention, speed limits, warning signs, soil track out prevention, excavated soil management and post-construction mitigation. Alternately a California Professional Geologist may inspect the project site and provide the APMD with a report demonstrating there is no naturally occurring asbestos on the project site. If there is no naturally occurring asbestos or less than 20 cubic yards of earth is disturbed, property owners must still comply with AQMD Rule 223-2. If a County grading permit is required, a Fugitive Dust Plan will be required. The correct materials and relevant fees must be submitted to the AQMD prior to issuance of a grading permit or building permit.

Regulatory Setting: The regional air quality plan, discussed above, addressed the non-attainment status of the region for ozone and particulate matter, and a State Implementation Plan (SIP) was adopted to meet the requirements of the federal Clean Air Act. Standard practices for stationary and point source air pollution control is administered by the County APMD. Since the SIP was adopted, rules limiting dust and other air pollution, such as those for the Asbestos Review area and the County Grading Ordinance, have been implemented by the County.

Impact 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.

3 (a) Conflict with air quality plan. El Dorado County, in adopting the El Dorado County, California Clean Air Act Plan, has set a schedule for implementing and funding Transportation Control Measures to limit mobile source emissions. The proposed project is not anticipated to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan, resulting in **no impact**.

3 (b - c) Violate air quality standards. Project-specific air quality impacts are generally divided into two categories: 1) Short-term impacts related to construction activities; and 2) long-term impacts related to the project operation.

Short-term Construction: When any future roadway or infrastructure improvements require the disturbance of 20 cubic yards or more of earth, the applicant shall comply with Air Quality Management District (AQMD) Rule 223-2 Fugitive Dust-Asbestos Hazard Mitigation, as described in the “General Plan Consistently Checklist” section, previously. Compliance with the previously described requirements at time of grading permit issuance should reduce construction dust air quality impacts to **less than significant**.

Long-term Operations: Potential air quality impacts associated with the proposed any road improvements would be addressed with the individual road improvement CEQA analysis, and often tier off of the General Plan Final EIR.

This impact is considered to be **less than significant** since the General Plan Amendments will not directly exceed the thresholds of the AQMD CEQA Guide. Individual road improvement projects will re-evaluate their site specific impacts with their own future CEQA analysis.

3 (d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children and the elderly and such sites as residences, schools, hospitals, daycare centers, and convalescent homes. Road improvement projects are often located near these facilities and could both improve local pollution conditions by improving traffic congestion, or exacerbate conditions by accommodating increased traffic volumes on roadways. These issues would be addressed in each road improvement projects individual CEQA analysis and the impact is considered to be **less than significant**.

3 (e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Road improvement projects may temporarily release odors from vehicle, construction traffic, asphalt overlay, or other construction sources. Compliance with AQMD rules and regulations are intended to minimize these impacts. In addition, site specific CEQA analysis for future road improvement projects would address any unique circumstances. As a result, potential odor impacts are considered **less than significant**.

Finding: Since the existing rules and regulations include development standards to control dust, odors, and other particulates, the impact would be **less than significant**.

4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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, and 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	

Existing Setting: El Dorado County possesses a wide diversity of native flora and fauna. This diversity can be attributed to a combination of distinct physical characteristics that have resulted in a broad array of habitats. These distinct physical features include a wide range of elevations and varied terrain, diverse substrate material, large tracts of contiguous natural habitat, and a broad range of climatic conditions. Habitats are generally distributed in an integrated mosaic pattern across the county. Coniferous forest is dominant at higher elevations (above 2,500 feet) in the eastern half of the County; oak and hardwood habitats are found throughout the foothill areas; and annual grassland, chaparral, agriculture, and urban development is found primarily in the western third of the county.

Woodland habitats are located primarily at middle and lower elevations in the western half of El Dorado County. The four major woodland habitats are montane hardwood-conifer, montane hardwood, blue oak-foothill pine, and blue oak woodland. These habitats combined cover 252,400 acres in El Dorado County. Woodland habitats range in structure from open savannah to dense forest. Sensitive woodland habitats in the county include montane riparian, valley-foothill riparian, aspen, and valley oak woodland.

Annual grassland covers 81,100 acres and is the only major herbaceous-dominated habitat in El Dorado County. Annual grassland is fairly common at low elevations (i.e., below 2,500 feet elevation) in the western region of the county. This habitat comprises mostly non-native annuals, primarily of Mediterranean origin, but can also include a variety of native herbaceous species. Non-native grasslands have replaced most native perennial grasslands in El Dorado County and throughout most of California.

Policy Framework: The El Dorado County General Plan policies related to biological resources include those addressing conservation of riparian, wetland, and other habitat resources, avoidance of development in ecologically sensitive areas, and protection of forest and woodland resources, including oak woodlands.

Regulatory Setting: There is General Plan policies related to riparian setbacks, retention of tree canopies and restrictions on ground disturbance on slopes above 30 percent, implemented by three interim policies currently in effect:

- An interim policy, to enforce the water resource policies, has been enacted by the County requiring a minimum setback of 100 feet from all perennial streams, rivers, lakes and 50 feet from intermittent streams and wetlands;
- An interim policy limiting grading on slopes greater than 30 percent; and
- An interim policy limiting removal of oak tree canopy areas.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) USFWS has released recovery plans for two special-status biological species groups found in El Dorado County. In 2002, USFWS released the *Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills*, which identifies goals to recover and/or protect six plants that grow only on the gabbro soils found in western El Dorado County. The *Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog* was also released in 2002, with the goal of sufficiently reducing threats and improving the population status of the species to warrant delisting.

Impact 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.

4 (a) Impacts on Listed Species. The General Plan EIR identified five species of plants that are listed by the California Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service as “rare, threatened or endangered.” Another 24 species are listed by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). These species could be affected by anticipated development under the Amendments depending upon the location and scale of the new roads. Direct impacts could include loss of habitat and individuals by the direct removal, degradation, and fragmentation of habitat for special-status species during grading and construction.

The General Plan policies to protect rare, threatened, and endangered species include policies establishing the Ecological Preserve for the gabbro soils plants identified in Chapter 17.71 and policies for discretionary development.

A potentially significant impact would occur if a project would result in the “substantial” impact to a listed plant or wildlife species. Special status plant and wildlife species that are currently rare and restricted to the west slope are primarily the Pine Hill endemic plants that are being protected through a program identified in Section 17.71 of the County Code. These are the most sensitive species due to their limited habitat area. The Ecological Preserve program identifies areas for land acquisition and easements to preserve the plants and their habitat. The County program was adopted in 1998 and further depicted on the General Plan land use map with the Ecological Preserve (EP) overlay.

The only other plant species listed in El Dorado County is the Tahoe yellow cress, but it is limited to the Lake Tahoe Basin.

There could be a potential impact to the other 25 plant species listed by the CNPS, but since these species are not listed by the DFG or USFWS, and are not considered to be in a state of near extirpation or extinction, it is not expected that the Amendments would result in substantial impacts to these species.

Potentially significant impacts on listed animals are not expected to occur because listed species are illegal to kill or harm. In addition, animal species have the ability to move away from construction sites, typically avoiding accidental loss, unlike plant species. There may be impacts associated with lost or fragmented habitat.

The General Plan EIR identified 51 species of animal in El Dorado County that are listed as “special status” although only 10 are listed as Threatened or Endangered.

Pursuant to Policy 2.2.5.20, as implemented through the General Plan Checklist and Zoning Code Section 17.22.300, setbacks from wetlands, streams, and lakes, as well as limits on removal of oak canopy for structures are required, minimizing potential impacts to many of the special status animal species, such as the northwestern pond turtle, yellow legged frog, and northern goshawk. Additional provisions may be required as the Oak Woodland Management Plan is developed. Based on review of the General Plan map of “Special-Status Animal Occurrences” (Exhibit 5.12-6, General Plan EIR), there are no other animal species likely to inhabit areas anticipated for roadway development, except the red legged frog.

The red legged frog critical habitat is identified as a portion of the upper reaches of the Weber Creek drainage shed. The General Plan designation, zoning, and existing parcel sizes in the area of the critical habitat would not likely result in any County road improvement projects in the area.

The proposed Amendments’ primary impact to habitat loss is from conversion of existing undeveloped land (animal habitat) to roadway or other development. However, these improvement projects would be discretionary actions and require separate CEQA review based on the site specific characteristics and any future biological surveys and analysis.

Overall, impacts on Special-Status Species may be considered **less than significant** due to their general location in areas where roadway development is unlikely to occur, but also because roadway improvements will be subject to future, site and project specific, CEQA analysis.

4 (b - c) Loss and Fragmentation of Wildlife Habitat. Implementation of the Amendments would likely result in a sizeable increase in agriculturally-related development in the western foothill region of the county. The western foothill region supports a number of native habitats that are important to wildlife. Some of the native habitat that exists would be reduced by impacts associated with adoption of the Amendments. According to the General Plan, biological diversity is reduced when natural habitats are converted for urban, suburban and agricultural uses. This reduction is compounded by the fragmentation of contiguous natural areas into an increasing number of smaller fragments, each of which may be too small to support viable populations of all the original inhabitants. Habitat removal and fragmentation could result from grading (particularly mass grading) plus the construction of buildings, parking, roads, and related infrastructure. Due to the County interim policy requiring riparian, lake and wetland setbacks, impacts to wetland resources are not anticipated to be significant. The Amendments’ would not likely result in additional impact to loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat is considered **less than significant**.

4 (d) Impacts on Wildlife Movement. Roadway development in western El Dorado County under the Amendments has the potential to reduce the ability of terrestrial wildlife to move unimpeded through this region. The increased roadway development, although minor in comparison with all the urban and suburban development planned for the County, would result in additional barriers to wildlife such as new, fencing, roadways, and more vehicular traffic. The Department of Fish and Game’s Migratory Deer Herd Maps indicate that some of the winter ranges for migratory deer herds are located in rural areas of the County that are not likely to have significant road improvement projects.

Development under the Amendments could also result in impacts on riparian corridors and aquatic habitat, such as removal of riparian vegetation for construction of roadways and bridges, or diversion of stream flows that could impede movement by native fishes.

The primary concern in the General Plan EIR regarding wildlife movement was the continuity of oak woodlands in the north-south corridor where US 50 and suburban development threaten to separate the northern part of the county from the southern. This was also translated into the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay district. However, since all road improvement projects will require site specific CEQA analysis, impacts to wildlife movement will be addressed in the future on a project by project basis. There should be a **less than significant** impact to wildlife movement.

4 (e - f) Conflict with policies, ordinances, tree preservation policies, Habitat Conservation Plan or similar plans. The proposed Amendments are not anticipated to conflict with General Plan tree preservation policies nor will it conflict with the provisions of any adopted habitat conservation plan. Currently El Dorado County has an Ecological Preserve Mitigation program for preservation of a number of rare plants in Section 17.71 of the County Code. This program collects fees from new development in order to purchase and maintain the Ecological Preserve for the rare plants. The rare

plants and the Ecological Preserves are located in the western portion of El Dorado County in the Cameron Park – Rescue – Salmon Falls area because that is location of the serpentine soils that serve as the plants’ habitat.

As stated in the previous section, the Critical Habitat for the California Red-Legged Frog was determined by the US Fish and Wildlife Service in April 2006. The final critical habitat unit is identified on the USFWS maps but can generally be described as a portion of the County along and north of Starks Grade Road, south of US 50, west of Sly Park Road, and east of Newtown Road. There are some parcels within these boundaries that are excluded from the critical habitat area.

Since other plans, such as tree protection plans, would apply to roadway improvements and since there would be little impact on the Ecological Preserves, impacts or conflicts with plans and policies to protect biological resources would be considered a **less than significant impact**.

Finding: Impacts on wildlife movement are considered to be **less than significant** due to the future requirements for all road improvement projects to have future site specific CEQA review.

5 CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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	

Existing Setting: With elevations ranging between 200 feet in the western portion of the county to more than 10,000 feet in the Sierra Nevada to the east, El Dorado County possesses a varied range of ecological zones that have supported diverse prehistoric and historic peoples for thousands of years. In addition to this ecological diversity, the rich deposits of mineral resources, stands of timber, and lush grasslands made the county an attractive location for the development of various industrial pursuits in historic times. Native American occupation and these economic endeavors have left their mark on the landscape and reflect the important role that El Dorado County played in the development of the state of California and of the United States as a whole.

Early Native American occupation has resulted in sites being distributed throughout the county, and stone tool scatters, midden deposits, and small campsites can be found in many areas, particularly where natural water sources are located. In general, such evidence is comparatively subtle, although more substantial traces of intensive prehistoric occupation and activities can be seen in stone quarries and bedrock mortars and large village sites with house pits. Prehistoric artifacts, features, and sites are found throughout the county, although larger sites and more dense midden and artifact deposits tend to occur at lower elevations in the Sierra foothills.

Historic resources, those developed over the past 170 years, include those in protected areas such as the State Marshall Gold Discovery Park, buildings listed on the National Register, as well as other structures in the County that have never been identified or documented as a resource. According to the General Plan EIR, prepared in 2003, more than 1,300 prehistoric and historic cultural resources had been documented within the county as of 2002. Eleven of these resources, including individual buildings, sites and Historic Districts, are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historic Places (CRHR). An additional 79 resources have been determined to be NRHP and CRHR eligible but have not been formally listed. Records of each of these sites are kept at the Northern

California Information Center (NCIC). In addition to these documented cultural resources, there are 26 State Historic Landmarks situated in unincorporated El Dorado County.

Paleontology is the study of the remains, typically fossilized, of various plant or animal species such as dinosaurs and early mammals. Paleontological remains are found in sedimentary rock formations, while El Dorado County's geology is predominantly igneous (volcanic) in nature. The type of sedimentary deposits where such remains might be present is virtually nonexistent, therefore paleontological issues are not considered applicable to El Dorado County.

Policy Framework: El Dorado County policies related to archaeological and historical resources can be found in the General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element. These policies are focused upon ensuring the preservation of the County's important cultural resources. General Plan Policies call for the identification and protection of known archaeological and historic sites, as well as the maintenance of the visual integrity of historical resources and protection of officially listed and eligible resources through a conformity review in accordance with CEQA standards.

Regulatory Setting: Development projects, including those road improvement projects associated with the County CIP or other development, are required under state law to stop all work if archaeological resources are found during grading or construction. Discretionary development would be subject to a range of federal and state regulations including required consultations and adherence to CEQA.

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

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

5 (a - b) Impact historical or archaeological resources. All of the potential cultural impacts associated with the proposed Amendments and its related development are unknown at this time because the exact location of future road improvements and related development is unknown. The exact locations will not be known until individual development applications and road improvement projects are reviewed for CEQA compliance. Pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.5.1.3 a cultural resource study is required prior to approval of discretionary projects, including road improvement projects.

Any level of ground disturbance within the county, regardless of intensity, has the potential to significantly affect cultural resources. As previously noted in this section, prehistoric and historic cultural resources can occur anywhere on the landscape regardless of topography, but areas with various floral, faunal, and mineral resources, areas located near surface water, areas with low degrees of slope occurring in the immediate vicinity of perennial, natural water sources are most likely to contain cultural resources. Although impacts on any lands are a matter of concern regarding prehistoric and historic sites, areas with low slope (<25%) in close proximity to natural water sources are generally more sensitive.

Ground disturbance and the potential loss of culturally sensitive acreage do not constitute the only major potential threats to the integrity of cultural resources in El Dorado County. Historic buildings and structures can be adversely impacted by modification or demolition. Also, new development next to historic structures and buildings can impact the resource by potentially compromising the resource's historic character. The alteration or destruction of historic buildings and structures and their historic settings, particularly those listed on the CRHR/NRHP or determined eligible for listing, constitutes a potential impact.

All these potential impacts would be addressed in future CEQA analysis of road improvement projects. Therefore, this impact is considered **to be less than significant**.

5 (c) Disturb paleontological resources. The type of sedimentary deposits where paleontological remains might be present is virtually nonexistent in El Dorado County, therefore paleontological issues are considered to have **no impact**.

5 (d) Disturbance of human remains. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the steps outlined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines shall be implemented immediately. This is a standard grading and development requirement that applies to all discretionary projects and ministerial permits and related impacts are considered **less than significant**.

Finding: The proposed Amendments impacts to currently identified and unidentified archaeological and historical resources, paleontological resources, and disturbance of human remains is considered to be **less than significant**.

6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i> PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X	

Existing Setting: Geology: El Dorado County is located in the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California, which is east of the Great Valley province and west of the Range and Basin province. The Sierra Nevada province is characterized by steep-sided hills and narrow, rocky stream channels. This province consists of Pliocene and older deposits that have been uplifted as a result of plate tectonics, granitic intrusion, and volcanic activity. Subsequent glaciation and additional volcanic activity are factors that led to the east-west orientation of stream channels. The southwestern foothills of El Dorado County are composed of rocks of the Mariposa Formation that include amphibolite, serpentine, and pyroxenite. The northwestern areas of the county consist of the Calaveras Formation, which includes metamorphic rock such as chert, slate, quartzite, and mica schist. In addition, limited serpentine formations are located in this area. The higher peaks in the county consist primarily of igneous and metamorphic rocks with granite intrusions, a main soil parent material at the higher elevations.

Seismicity: Seismicity is defined as the geographic and historical distribution of earthquakes, or more simply, earthquake activity. Seismic activity may result in geologic and seismic hazards including seismically induced fault displacement and rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides and avalanches, and structural hazards. Based on historical seismic activity and fault and seismic hazards mapping, El Dorado County is considered to have relatively low

potential for seismic activity, and is located beyond the highly active fault zones of the coastal areas of California. However, there are some faults and fault traces in the Gold Hill/ Coloma area that have been identified.

Soils: There are a total of eight soil associations in western El Dorado County, and five of these soil associations occur in the Lower and Middle Foothills region, where existing vineyards are established and new vineyards anticipated.

- Auberry-Ahwahnee-Sierra: Well-drained coarse sandy loams and sandy loams formed in material weathered from granitic rocks.
- Auburn-Argonaut: Well-drained silt loams and gravelly loams formed in material weathered from basic rocks and metasedimentary rocks.
- Boomer-Auburn: Well-drained silt loams and gravelly loams formed in material weathered from basic igneous rocks or metasedimentary rocks.
- Rescue: Well-drained sandy loams formed in material weathered from basic rocks.
- Serpentine Rock Land-Delpiedra: Excessively drained to somewhat excessively drained rock land and loams formed in material weathered from ultra-basic rocks.

Three additional soil associations are present in the more mountainous uplands:

Cohasset-Aiken-McCarthy: Well-drained cobbly loams and loams formed in material weathered from volcanic conglomerate.

Holland-Musick-Chaix: Well-drained coarse sandy loams and sandy loams formed in material weathered from granitic rocks.

Mariposa-Josephine-Sites: Well-drained gravelly silt loams, silt loams, and loams formed in material weathered from meta-sedimentary rocks.

Table 1 - **Soil Characteristics in Western El Dorado County**

Soil Association	Shrink-Swell Potential	Slope Range	Elevation Range (feet)
Auberry-Ahwahnee-Sierra	low/moderate	5–50%	500 - 2,500
Auburn-Argonaut	low/moderate/high	2–70%	500 – 1,800
Boomer-Auburn	low/moderate	2–70%	500 – 3,500
Rescue	low/moderate	2–50%	1,000 – 2,500
Serpentine Rock Land-Delpiedra	moderate	3–50%	500 – 1,800
Cohasset-Aiken-McCarthy	low/moderate	3–50%	2,000 – 5,500
Holland-Musick-Chaix	low/moderate/high	5–70%	1,800 – 5,000
Mariposa-Josephine-Sites	low/moderate	3–70%	1,500 – 5,500

Source: Soil Conservation Service, 1974a

Policy Framework:

Geology and Seismicity: El Dorado County policies related geology and seismic hazards can be found in the General Plan Public Health, Safety and Noise Element. These policies are focused upon minimizing threat to life and property from seismic and geologic hazards through adoption and enforcement of building and site standards. Naturally occurring asbestos soils, rocks and dust, considered an airborne hazard, is regulated primarily by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District, and is more fully addressed in Environmental Checklist Section 3 – Air Quality.

Soils: Policies found in the General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element address two soil-related topics: 1) conservation and protection of important agricultural soils by limiting non-agricultural development on those soils; and 2) minimizing soil erosion and sedimentation through enforcing grading permit provisions, use of BMPs conforming to natural contours and natural drainage patterns, and limiting development on slopes 30 percent or greater.

Regulatory Setting: El Dorado County Development Services enforces building and site standards to minimize impacts related to geologic and seismic hazards, and conservation of soils:

California Building Code (CBC): The State of California provides minimum standards for building design through the CBC [California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24]. The CBC is based on the Uniform Building Code (UBC), which is used widely throughout the United States (generally adopted on a state-by-state or district-by-district basis), and has been modified for conditions within California. State regulations and engineering standards related to geology, seismicity and soils in the UBC (2001) are reflected in the CBC requirements. The UBC includes a seismic zone map to determine applicable seismic standards for proposed structures. Seismic zones range from 0 to 4, with Zone 0 being the least active and Zone 4 the most active. All of El Dorado County is located in Seismic Zone 3 (El Dorado County 2003), and all structures built in the county must comply with UBC requirements for this zone. The design and construction of buildings must comply with the CBC at the time of construction. If a soils/geotechnical study is required for a project, the recommendations of the study must be incorporated in the design of foundations and buildings to ensure the structural integrity of structures and public safety at proposed developments.

County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance: The *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Grading Ordinance) (Chapter 15.14 of the County Code; Ordinance 4719, March 13, 2007) establishes provisions for public safety and environmental protection associated with grading activities on private property. The ordinance sets forth rules and regulations to control excavation, grading, and earthwork construction, including fills and embankments. It establishes the administrative procedures for issuance of permits, and provides for approval of plans and inspection of grading construction and all grading specific to single-parcel site improvements. Single-family residential construction is the exception, unless it exceeds prescriptive standards as defined in the County's *Design and Improvement Standards Manual* (DISM) (Volume III, Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control). Where the grading or earthwork involves multiple parcels, parcel maps, subdivisions, land divisions or roads, the DISM must be used for design purposes. Road improvement projects would be subject to the Grading Ordinance and Grading Design and Improvement Standards Manual (Resolution 47-2007, adopted 3/13/07).

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

6 (a) Increased Development in Areas Potentially Subject to Geologic or Seismic Hazards. Only those earthquake faults considered having a relatively high potential for future earthquake activity, and which have well defined surface fault traces were considered for mapping under the Fault Evaluation Program of the California Division of Mines and Geology. This program was designed to carry out the objectives of the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act of 1972. There are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones currently mapped in El Dorado County, and there are no known faults that transect the project area except for the East Bear Mountain Fault in the Gold Hill Area. The County requires all new structures to be built in accordance with Seismic Zone 3 criteria, as set forth in the UBC. Road improvement projects and new development would be required to comply with County building standards that incorporate standard geologic and seismic safety provisions, therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

6 (b) Rate or Extent of Erosion and Sedimentation. Increases in erosion are often attributable to new construction, which generally involve removal of vegetation and site grading. The erosion potential of soils in the County varies depending on location, and erosion hazards generally increase in areas with steep slopes. However, road improvement projects are subject to the grading ordinance, which imposes restrictions on the time construction activity could occur and prescribes best management practices. Revegetation and stabilization of all disturbed soils both within and outside of County right-of-ways may be required. Compliance with this ordinance will reduce any potential impacts to a **less than significant** level.

6 (c) Increased Development in Areas Susceptible to Landslide Hazards. Increased roadway development could potentially allow development to occur in areas susceptible to landslide hazards. Landslide hazard areas in the county have not been formally mapped, but can be inferred based on past occurrences, site topography, and climate characteristics. Landslides and avalanches are more likely to occur in the central portions of the county, generally corresponding to the American River area and Highway 50 east of Pollock Pines. Based on a relatively minor amount of development anticipated to occur in this area due to elevation above 4,000 feet, potential landslide impacts would be minimal. Moreover, most road improvement projects will be located on the western end of El Dorado County where these hazards are very limited. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

6 (d) Location of structures on expansive soils. Roadway and new development on expansive soils could potentially occur. However, El Dorado County does not have substantial amounts of expansive soils, and new development would be required to conform to County building standards, which are designed to address structural integrity of new structures. Roadway projects would conduct site specific geotechnical studies and would incorporate any protective measures identified in such a study. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

6 (e) Have soils incapable of supporting septic systems. The El Dorado County Environmental Management Department has established specific design standards for the site evaluation and design of sewage disposal systems to be applied to any parcel proposing to develop an individual, on-site sewage disposal system. Any proposed on-site septic system will be required to meet these design standards, subject to review and approval of the Environmental Management Department as part of the building permit process. Development projects that exceed the County Environmental Management Departments areas of jurisdiction would likely be required to comply with the State Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards. Road improvement projects may need to address impacts on existing septic systems or systems permitted by the RWQCB in the project design and CEQA analysis. As a result, soil-related impacts associated with disposal of waste water are considered **less than significant**.

Finding: There impacts associated with geologic and seismic hazards, or soil erosion and sedimentation are considered to be **less than significant**.

7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>		PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
PSI	Potentially Significant Impact				
PSUMI:	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated				
LTS:	Less-than-significant Impact				
NI	No Impact.				
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	

Existing Setting: Hazardous Waste Generated by Small Business, Industry, and Government. While hazardous waste is generated by a variety of land uses, small businesses and industry account for most of the hazardous waste generated in El Dorado County. Generators are classified based on the quantity of hazardous materials generated. Small businesses and government facilities may be classified as Small Quantity Generators (SQGs) or Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators (CESQGs). Industries are typically classified as SQGs or Large Quantity Generators (LQGs).

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains the Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database, also known as the CalSites database, which contains information on properties in the state where hazardous substances have or may have been released. According to the General Plan EIR, no sites within El Dorado County have been classified as a confirmed hazardous material site, also known as a State Superfund site or CalSite. Three sites have been classified as potential hazardous material sites that require future reevaluation before a final classification, and 26 other sites have been reported to DTSC but have been referred to other agencies, such as the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), or local agencies. DTSC also maintains the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List database, also known as the Cortese List database, which contains information on hazardous material sites provided by various state and local agencies. Agencies are required by CEQA to use the Cortese List to identify locations of hazardous materials release sites when considering development proposals (DTSC 2002). The County currently does not contain sites that are identified on the Cortese List (DTSC 2003b).

Policy Framework: El Dorado County policies related to hazards and hazardous materials are located in the General Plan Public Health, Safety and Noise Element. The overall focus of this General Plan Element is to provide guidelines for protecting the residents from existing and potential hazards related to fire (including wildland fire), aviation safety, hazardous materials, and emergency response plans. Other Public Health, Safety and Noise Element policies related to fire protection (see Public Service section); seismic (see Geology and Soils section); flood (see Hydrology and Water Quality); air quality and noise are covered in their respective sections. Naturally occurring asbestos soils result in an airborne hazard that is regulated by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District, and which is discussed in Section 3 – Air Quality.

Policies related to fire (especially wildland fire) hazards involve meeting fire code, defensible space requirements, fuel management strategy, and limiting development in very high fire hazard areas unless a “Fire Safe Plan” is approved by fire protection agency representatives. Aviation-related hazards policies involve minimizing the public’s exposure to airport-related safety hazards by requiring new development around airports to be compatible with that use. Policies related to hazardous materials involve regulation of the use, storage, manufacture, transport and disposal of hazardous materials in accordance with State and Federal regulations. Emergency response policy involves the El Dorado County Operational Area Multi-Hazards Emergency Operations Functional Plan which serves as the County’s emergency response implementation plan.

Regulatory Setting: Road improvement projects would be required to comply with any applicable regulations. However, in general, road improvement projects do not affect or are affected by these regulations.

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

7 (a - b & c) Create a public hazard through transport, use, accident, or emission of hazardous materials. The Amendments will allow the development of additional roadway improvements to mitigate planned and anticipated residential and non-residential growth. During the construction there may be hazardous materials or substances used which may remain on various premises. The proper use and storage of any such hazardous material or substances should limit exposure and the potential for explosion or spills. The El Dorado County *Hazardous Waste Management Plan* serves as the implementation program for the management of any hazardous wastes in order to protect the health, safety, and property of residents in the vicinity. If a future business involves the storage of reportable quantities of hazardous materials, then prior to building permit issuance the applicant is required to submit a hazardous materials business plan to the Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Division of Environmental Management, and include payment of applicable fees. Implementation of local requirements would reduce impacts from the potential use or transport of significant amounts of hazardous substances or materials as a result of the project to **less than significant**.

7 (d) Located on a hazardous material site. Based on a search of the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List (checked in July 2007), there are only a few sites that are known hazardous materials sites. Roadway improvement projects would include CEQA analysis and a review of this same list and would take appropriate actions if the roadway project was near such a site and therefore related impacts are considered to be **less than significant**.

7 (e - f) Within an airport land use plan or private airport. Road improvement projects would not normally conflict with provisions of any Airport Land Use Plan. Potentially, light fixtures, streetlights might encroach onto an airport height restriction area, but by following the FAA and Caltrans Division of Aeronautics noticing and/or permit requirements, conflicts can be minimized. Therefore, impacts from airport safety hazards are considered **less than significant** as long as road improvement projects comply with Federal, State and local aviation standards and safety requirements.

7 (g) Interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan. The Amendments will not interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the project area as long as the roads that are developed meet fire safe and other emergency response requirements. As such, the Amendments are not anticipated to interfere with the County emergency management plans and the impacts are considered **less than significant**.

7 (h) Expose people to risks associated with fire. Some road improvement project sites will be located in areas of high to very high severity for wildland fires as identified on the El Dorado County Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map. This map, prepared by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, represents moderate (yellow), high (orange), and very high (red) fuel rankings based on inputs such as fuel, slope, brush density, and tree density. However, large portions of new road improvement project properties will already be cleared for irrigated vineyards, structures and parking areas. When a road improvement project building permit application is submitted it will be required to meet standards related to the adopted Fire Safe regulations such as provisions for water supply, all-weather access with adequate emergency vehicle turn-around or a loop access road, and other fire code provisions subject to review and approval by the appropriate fire agency. Therefore, impacts from wildland fire hazards are considered **less than significant** as long as road improvement project operators are in compliance with local fire safe requirements.

Finding: All these potential impacts would be addressed in future CEQA analysis of road improvement projects. Therefore, this impact is considered **to be less than significant**.

8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i> PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	

Existing Setting: On the western slope of El Dorado County groundwater occurs primarily in fractures of the rock typical in the region. In the County, as in other parts of the Sierra Nevada foothills, alluvium consisting of unconsolidated deposits of clay, silt, sand, and gravel laid down by flowing water occurs only in small areas too thin to provide a significant amount of storage. Thus the amount of usable groundwater is limited. A cooperative study entitled *Georgetown Divide Water Management Study* prepared by the Department of Water Resources describes water supply alternatives available to the Georgetown Divide area and includes a discussion of the groundwater situation on the western slope. The following is an example from that study:

“Many wells are drilled in hard crystalline rock that lies at or near the ground surface or under the thin layers of alluvium. In rock formations, water moves through and is stored in fractures in the rock mass. The width of each fracture usually decreases with depth, causing diminished water flow and storage capacity. The amount of water that can be stored and transmitted in such fractures is generally small compared to the amount that can be held and conveyed in a porous alluvial aquifer.”

As future development occurs in areas beyond pipeline service, both quantity and quality of groundwater sources could be affected. This potential impact was analyzed under the General Plan EIR and found to be ‘significant but unavoidable’. However, implementation of Policies 5.2.1.11 and 5.2.3.4 would “help minimize the significance of future groundwater-related impacts.”

Policy 5.2.1.11: “The County shall direct new development to areas where public water service already exists. In Community Regions, all new development shall connect to a public water system. In Rural Centers, all new development shall connect either to a public water system or to an approved private water system.”

Policy 5.2.3.4: “All applications for divisions of land and other discretionary or ministerial land uses which rely on groundwater for domestic use, or any other type of use, shall demonstrate that groundwater is adequate as part of the review and approval process. The county shall not approve any discretionary or ministerial projects unless the County finds, based on evidence provided by the applicant, or other evidence that may be provided, that the groundwater supply for the project in question is adequate to meet the highest demand associated with the approval in question.”

Policy Framework: El Dorado County policies related to hydrology and water quality are located in various elements of the General Plan. Water Quality and Quantity policies (see the Conservation and Open Space Element) are focused upon preserving and protecting the supply and quantity of the County’s water resources through maintenance and improvement of underground and surface waters. Methods promoted include use of riparian buffers, utilization of natural drainage patterns, and water conservation, reclamation, and re-use.

The Public Health, Safety and Noise Element contains flood hazard policies which support minimizing loss of life and property in accordance with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) guidelines, California law, and the El Dorado County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. These guidelines and regulations support continued participation in the national flood insurance program, and prohibit placement of new dwelling units, septic systems, as well as accessory or high occupancy structures within FEMA delineated 100-year flood zones. Protection of life and property of County residents is also promoted by use of an overlay zone limiting new development within delineated dam failure inundation zones.

The Public Services and Utilities Element contains goals and policies related to provision of public services including water supply, wastewater collection and treatment, and storm drainage services. Discussion of these services is found in Section 13 – Public Services.

Regulatory Setting: An interim policy, to enforce the water resource policies described above, has been enacted by the County requiring a minimum setback of 100 feet from all perennial streams, rivers, lakes and 50 feet from intermittent streams and wetlands.

The County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.25 - Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, incorporates measures requiring all ministerial and discretionary development proposed for construction in FEMA Special Flood Hazards Areas, to obtain a County permit. As such, it is unlikely that road improvements will occur within designated flood zones if other areas are available.

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

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

8 (a) Violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Specific water quality objectives have been established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and any project not meeting those

objectives are required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. Road improvement projects will address water quality standards by implementing the County Storm Water Management Plan or by acquiring a permit from the RWQCB. Adherence to these provisions and regulations will reduce potential impacts related to water quality to **less than significant**.

8 (b) Impacts on groundwater supplies. The geology of the Western Slope portion of El Dorado County is principally hard crystalline, igneous, or metamorphic rock overlain with a thin mantle of sediment or soil. Groundwater in this region is found in fractures, joints, cracks, and fault zones within the bedrock mass. These discrete fracture areas are typically vertical in orientation rather than horizontal as in sedimentary or alluvial aquifers. Recharge is predominantly through rainfall infiltrating into the fractures. Movement of this groundwater is very limited due to the lack of porosity in the bedrock. Because of this, the 2004 General Plan EIR noted that impacts to adjacent lots cannot be determined. General Plan Policy 5.2.3.4 requires that all applications that rely on groundwater, whether discretionary or ministerial, demonstrate that adequate groundwater is available. The adequacy is subject to review by the Environmental Management Department.

As such, impacts that substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge to ground water supplies from road improvements are considered to be **less than significant**.

8 (c - f) Changes to drainage patterns, causing erosion, flooding, or water quality impacts. The *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (§15.14.440 and 15.14.590). The standards included in the Grading Design Manual (Volume III of the Design and Improvement Standards Manual, Resolution 47-2007, adopted March 13, 2007) would apply to any site development for new road improvement project.

Erosion control plans are required as part of the submittal requirements for a grading permit (Section D.2 of Design Manual Volume IIID). The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit storm water runoff causing erosion and discharge of sediment from a site.

However, grading for road improvement projects will require an erosion control plan. The plan will need to address mitigation of sediment runoff beyond project boundaries and may require revegetation and stabilization of all disturbed soils. Depending on the extent of grading, a permit from the RWQCB may be required. Compliance with the grading ordinance and RWQCB permit requirements will reduce any potential impacts to a **less than significant** level.

8 (g - h) Impacts from 100 year flood zone proximity. As discussed under Regulatory Framework, above, the County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.25 - Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, incorporates measures required of all development (ministerial and discretionary) that is proposed for construction in FEMA Special Flood Hazards Areas. As such, it is unlikely that road improvements will be proposed within designated flood zones if other areas are available, resulting in no impacts. However, if development is be proposed within flood hazard areas, measures would be required to reduce identified impacts to **less than significant** levels by the current zoning ordinance.

8 (i) Risks associated with flooding from levee or dam failure. The California Dam Safety Act requires dam owners to submit inundation maps to the California Office of Emergency Services showing the extent of inundation resulting from a potential dam failure. This Act also requires that local jurisdictions adopt emergency evacuation and control procedures for areas located below dams to limit loss of life, injury, and property. El Dorado County has adopted a Multi-Hazard Functional Plan to be implemented by the County's Office of Emergency Services. The General Plan EIR identifies those dams that have the potential to inundate residential and rural areas. An overlay zone delineating dam failure and inundation areas will recognize those parcels at risk. In the event a road improvement project is developed adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the area with floodwaters, measures would be required at the building permit stage to reduce identified impacts to **less than significant** levels.

8 (j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. 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. There is no potential for a seiche or tsunami for most road improvement project areas in western El Dorado County. However, a mudflow containing heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water could result from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. As indicated above (see item 8(i)), in the event a road

improvement project is developed adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the area with floodwaters, measures would be required at the building permit stage to reduce identified impacts to **less than significant** levels.

Finding: All these potential impacts would be addressed in future CEQA analysis of road improvement projects. Therefore, this impact is considered **to be less than significant**.

9 LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i> PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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	

Existing Setting: El Dorado County has experienced rapid growth over the past 20 years. The countywide population increased from 85,812 in 1980 to approximately 163,585 in 2002. The majority of this development is focused in the area nearest to the Sacramento County line and along U.S. 50.

The county encompasses approximately 1,145,385 acres (see Table 2). Excluding the waters of Lake Tahoe and Folsom Reservoir, the county encompasses 1,110,103 acres. Of this, approximately 46 percent is in public ownership and 54 percent is privately owned. Only 196,355 acres, or 17 percent of the total land in the County, have been developed, with the majority of this being for residential development. The General Plan indicates that the County has existing commitments (projects that have received a building permit, have an approved tentative parcel map or subdivision map, or are part of an approved development agreement) for 14,565 additional dwelling units in the western part of the County.

Agricultural lands and forestlands make up a large percentage of the undeveloped lands in the county. Forestlands occupy 636,000 acres, or 55 percent of the County, with 377,000 acres being under federal control in the El Dorado and Tahoe National Forests, and 259,000 acres in private production. According to the General Plan, in 1997 the County had 153,472 acres of agricultural land used as farm or grazing land, comprising approximately 13 percent of the County total. Of this, 41,852 acres was being protected under the Williamson Act.

Table 2

Developed and Undeveloped Land in El Dorado County

Category	Acres	Percent of Total Acres
Lake Tahoe/Folsom Reservoir	35,282	3.08
Developed	196,355	17.14
Undeveloped – Farming and Grazing	153,472	13.40
Undeveloped – Forestlands	636,000	55.53
Total Undeveloped	913,748	79.78
Total (excluding major water bodies)	1,110,103	96.92
Total El Dorado County Acres	1,145,385	100.00

Policy Framework: The General Plan Land Use Element contains principles, goals, objectives and policies to guide the intensity, location and distribution of land uses. The General Plan Land Use Map graphically represents the Land Use Element. The land use analysis contained in the discussion of impacts (see below) provides assistance toward balancing the Element's principles, goals, objectives and policies, which frequently have competing interests.

Central to all Land Use Element policy is the planning concept areas of Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions. The designations of Community Region and Rural Center are applied to existing communities. The designation of Rural Region is applied to the remaining unincorporated area. Community Regions and Rural Centers contain the highest concentration of high- and medium-density residential uses and commercial lands. Community Regions are centered on existing larger communities (El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Shingle Springs, and Camino/Pollock Pines) that generally have well-developed infrastructure. Rural Centers are centered on smaller communities (such as, but not limited to: Coloma, Somerset, Mt. Aukum) that provide limited services but are focal points for the surrounding rural areas. The remaining Rural Regions are to remain largely agricultural or otherwise rural. All of the General Plan designated Agricultural Districts are located in Rural Regions. The Amendments, as currently proposed, supports road improvement project development on properties in Rural Regions rather than Rural Centers and Community Regions.

Regulatory Setting: The County's primary regulatory tool for implementing General Plan policies and associated land use designations is its Zoning Ordinance (County Code Title 17). Zoning regulates the extent and type of development that can occur in the unincorporated areas of the county. Zoning identifies uses that are allowed by right in each zone and uses that require a special or temporary use permit, or other form of discretionary approval. The Zoning identifies standards for development in various zones, including sign standards, off-street parking requirements, height, and setback requirements. Development standards vary for each zone and may specify limitations on the dimensions of buildings, parcel sizes, setbacks, and uses.

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
- Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
- Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
- Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.

9 (a) Impact by dividing an established community. Implementation of the Amendments may result in additional road improvements to meet General Plan requirements. These road improvements are necessary to implement the General Plan and accommodate the growth anticipated through the General Plan and the General Plan land use map. As such, it is not anticipated to result in land uses that would physically divide an existing community, therefore **no impacts** are expected.

9 (b) Impact from General Plan or other policy conflicts. The Amendments should not create any inconsistency with existing land uses, adopted plans, policies and goals of El Dorado County. All land uses allowed by the General Plan Policies and Land Use Map will remain intact. Compliance with the General Plan for discretionary projects and road improvement projects would result in this impact being **less-than-significant**.

9 (c) Conflict with habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. As discussed in Section IV, Biology, the proposed Amendments is not anticipated to conflict with the provisions of any adopted habitat conservation plan, or similar provision, because discretionary development is required to analyze these impacts in site specific CEQA review. Therefore, the impact is considered to be **less-than-significant**.

Finding: All these potential impacts would be addressed in future CEQA analysis of road improvement projects. Therefore, this impact is considered **to be less than significant**.

10 MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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

Existing Setting: Pursuant to the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA), the California State Mining and Geology Board oversees the Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) classification system. The MRZ system characterizes both the location and known/presumed economic value of underlying mineral resources. Local agencies are required to use the classification information when developing land use plans and making land use decisions. Mineral land classification reports and maps have been developed for the project area, specifically the Auburn (1983), Camino and Mokelumne Hill (1987), Folsom (1984), Georgetown (1983), and Placerville (1983) 15-minute quadrangles. These mineral land classification reports and maps are available for review at California Geologic Survey offices and El Dorado County Planning.

According to the General Plan EIR the mineral resource classification system uses four main MRZ categories based on the degree of available geologic information, the likelihood of significant mineral resource occurrence, and the known or inferred quantity of significant mineral resources. Areas classified as MRZ-2 are considered important mineral resource areas. Designated Mineral Resource (MR overlay) areas are based on mineral resource mapping published in the mineral land classification reports referenced above.

The General Plan EIR Important Mineral Resources Map (Exhibit 5-9.6) depicts MRZ-2 areas within the County as lineal band approximately 1 to 2 miles wide, running north-south in the vicinity of Highways 49 (south of Highway 50) and 193 (north of Highway 50). Where the MRZ-2 zones overlapped Community Regions and Rural Centers, the MR overlay was not applied because of the inherent conflicts with mineral resource extraction activities and the existing, established residential and other higher intensity land uses within those planning concept areas. Areas where MRZ-2 lands were not included in the overlay designation include portions of the Placerville and Diamond Springs community regions, portions of the Garden Valley and Kelsey Rural Centers, and part of the Crystal Boulevard platted lands area as depicted on the General Plan land use map. Overall, the majority of the county's important mineral resource deposits are located in the western third of the county, in the areas where road improvement project and related uses are also located or may be developed.

Policy Framework: El Dorado County policies related to conservation of mineral resources can be found in the General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element. These policies are focused upon identification and protection of important mineral resources from incompatible development, as well as regulation of extraction to ensure that environmental and land use compatibility issues are considered prior to issuing a new or revised special use permit and reclamation plan. As noted in the text above, the MR overlay was not applied to existing, established residential and other higher intensity land uses within planning concept areas, but was applied to rural lands.

Regulatory Setting: As described above and pursuant to SMARA, the County is required to use the California State Mining and Geology Board Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) classification information when developing land use plans and making land use decisions. Zoning Ordinance Section 17.14.095 (Mineral Resource Development) requires the approval of a special use permit for strip and pit mining projects with a 10,000 foot distance from residences and other sensitive uses. Chapter 17.46 includes a Mineral Resources District (MR) to provide for the orderly development and protection of mineral resources from incompatible and unrelated land uses; however there are lands designated by the State as MRZ-2 that are not zoned by the County as MR.

Impact 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-2, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

10 (a - b) Results in the loss of known mineral resources. All of the potential mineral resource impacts associated with the proposed road improvements are unknown at this time because the exact location of future roads is uncertain. The exact locations will not be known until individual road improvement projects are reviewed for General Plan consistency. In the current process, lands designated with the General Plan MR overlay and parcels adjacent are flagged for review as being near the MR overlay. As a result, impacts to mineral resource extraction are considered to be **less than significant**.

Finding: There are **no impacts** associated with mineral resources.

11 NOISE. Would the project result in: PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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	

Existing Setting: Noise, often defined as unwanted sound, can be generated by a number of sources, including mobile sources such as automobiles, trucks, and airplanes, and stationary sources such as construction sites, machinery, industrial operations, and speaker systems. Noise generated by mobile sources typically attenuates at a rate between 3.0 to 4.5 dBA per doubling of distance. Noise generated by stationary sources, such as construction equipment, typically attenuates at a rate between 6.0 to about 7.5 dBA per doubling of distance from the source. The rate of attenuation generally depends on the ground surface and the number of objects between the noise source and the receiver. For instance, hard and flat surfaces, such as concrete or asphalt, have lower attenuation rates than soft surfaces, such as uneven or vegetated terrain.

Sound levels can be reduced by placing barriers between the noise source and the receiver. Barriers contribute to decreasing noise levels when the structure breaks the line of sight between the source and the receiver. Buildings, walls, berms, and dense foliage can all act as noise barriers. Average attenuation rates of noise barriers can vary considerably depending on design, and range from approximately 5 to 10 dBA. Attenuation rates of 15 to 20 dBA are possible, but are more difficult to attain (EPA 1971, Lipscomb and Taylor 1978).

When community noise interferes with human activities or contributes to stress, public annoyance with the noise source increases, and the acceptability and the threat to public wellbeing are the basis for land-use planning policies preventing exposure to excessive community noise levels. Unfortunately, there presently is no completely satisfactory way to measure the subjective effects of noise, or of the corresponding reactions of annoyance and dissatisfaction. This is primarily because of the wide variation in individual thresholds of annoyance and habituation to noise. Thus, an important way of determining a person's subjective reaction to a new noise is to compare it to the existing environment to which one has adapted: the so-called "ambient" environment. In general, the more a new noise exceeds the previously existing ambient noise level, the less acceptable receivers, or individuals, will judge the new noise to be.

Policy Framework: El Dorado County policies related to noise can be found in the General Plan Public Health, Safety and Noise Element. These policies are focused upon protection of noise sensitive development (e.g. - residences, hospitals, schools and churches) from new uses that would generate incompatible noise levels, and conversely, to discourage noise-sensitive uses from locating near sources of high noise levels. Noise standards for different times of the day (daytime, evening, and night) provide for: 1) maximum allowable noise exposure for transportation noise sources; 2) noise level performance protection standards for noise sensitive land uses affected by non-transportation sources; and 3) maximum allowable noise exposure for non-transportation construction noise sources. Distinct construction noise standards are provided for Community Regions; Rural Centers, and Rural Regions.

Regulatory Setting: The County's current noise ordinance is Section 9.16 of the County Code. Section 9.16 states, in part: "9.16.050: Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, it is unlawful for any person to willfully make, emit, or transmit or cause to be made, emitted, or transmitted any loud and raucous noise upon or from any public highway or public thoroughfare or from any aircraft of any kind whatsoever, or from any public or private property to such an extent that it unreasonably interferes with the peace and quiet of another's private property." This provision allows the Sheriff to respond to noise complaints and enforce the ordinance.

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL and General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11 and Table 6-3.
- 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.

11 (a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. The Amendments will likely result in increased ambient noise levels in the vicinity during construction and during subsequent traffic operations. Construction impacts are addressed in subsection (d).

Under General Plan Policy 6.5.1.14, a noise ordinance will be adopted by the County to control unnecessary noise including implementation of the noise standards of Table 6-2. Until then, the Sheriff has the authority to respond and control "loud and raucous" noise. Construction standards are contained in General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11. Therefore, noise impacts should be **less than significant**.

11 (b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise. Normal construction activities may create groundborne vibration and noise from activities such as grading or blasting. These impacts could be significant if they become regular occurrences or result in property damage to adjacent structures. There are existing standards and ordinances for grading and blasting that would be incorporated into all applicable road improvement projects that would generally address any potential impacts. In addition, the site specific CEQA analysis required for future road improvement projects would address any issues that are not adequately addressed in existing Grading Ordinance and blasting requirements. Under these conditions, the impacts from groundborne noise and vibration would be **less than significant**.

11 (c) Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Future road improvement projects construction will generally not result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels since construction noise is not permanent in nature, but more variable, occasional, and temporary. These noise impacts are addressed in subsections (a) and (d). Permanent road

noise from future road projects was addressed in the General Plan EIR as Impact 5.10-2. The impact was considered in the General Plan EIR as significant and unavoidable and findings of overriding consideration were made. Pursuant to General Plan Policy 6.5.1.9, noise created by new roadway improvement projects shall be required to mitigate the impacts so as not to exceed the levels specified in General Plan Table 6-1. As such, the site specific CEQA analysis required for future road improvement projects would address any issues that are not adequately addressed in existing Grading Ordinance and blasting requirements. Under these conditions, the impacts from a permanent increase in ambient noise levels would be **less than significant**.

11 (d) Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise. The construction of a road improvement project may increase ambient noise levels temporarily. Standard construction practices includes use of heavy equipment such as graders and loaders, various powered equipment such as generators and compressors, and many hand tools and power tools, all of which create some range of noise. General Plan Table 6-5 establishes regulations for construction noise.

TABLE 6-5 MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NOISE EXPOSURE FOR NONTRANSPORTATION NOISE SOURCES IN RURAL REGIONS—CONSTRUCTION NOISE			
Land Use Designation	Time Period	Noise Level (dB)	
		L_{eq}	L_{max}
All Residential (LDR)	7 am–7 pm	50	60
	7 pm–10 pm	45	55
	10 pm–7 am	40	50
Commercial, Recreation, and Public Facilities (C, TR, PF)	7 am–7 pm	65	75
	7 pm–7 am	60	70
Rural Land, Natural Resources, Open Space, and Agricultural Lands (RR, NR, OS, AL)	7 am–7 pm	65	75
	7 pm–7 am	60	70

The standards of Table 6-5 will be implemented through a new noise ordinance, but until these standards are codified, any road improvement project will be required to be consistent with the General Plan and will be required to comply with the standards of Table 6-5. Some exceptions may be allowed to alleviate traffic congestion and safety hazards (Policy 6.5.1.11). Compliance with the General Plan noise standards would reduce the impact to a **less than significant** level.

11 (e - f) Noise associated with proximity to airport or airport land use plan. Under the Amendments, roads and new development may be built in locations within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. However these uses will be subject to the provisions of the airport land use plan including noise mitigation policies of those plans. There are only four general aviation airports in El Dorado County and each has an Airport Land Use Plan. While there are other private airstrips that exist in some rural areas, the air traffic associated with these strips is extremely small, typically limited to the property owner or emergency flights. Impacts from airports would be a **less than significant impact**.

Finding: Compliance with General Plan noise standards will reduce potential impacts to **less than significant** levels.

12 POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i> PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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

Existing Setting: Population and Housing impacts are associated with either creation of residential development in locations that are environmentally sensitive or incompatible, or in development projects that result in the removal of residential development from the market, creating impacts on the displaced residents.

Policy Framework: El Dorado County policies related to population and housing is located in the General Plan Housing Element. Policies are focused upon increasing the amount of affordable housing and maintaining the current pool of affordable housing. As discussed in the General Plan Land Use Element, population and housing is intended to be concentrated in Community Regions and Rural Centers rather than Rural Regions.

Regulatory Setting: The County General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and associated maps are the primary rules that regulate County population growth and housing density.

Impact 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.

12 (a) Induce substantial population growth. The Amendments as proposed will not induce population growth directly by developing new residences or providing infrastructure that would create residential development beyond what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

12 (b - c) Displace substantial numbers of housing or people. The Amendments will neither displace people nor existing housing or would prevent the construction of housing elsewhere. **No impact** is anticipated as a result.

Finding: The impacts regarding Population and Housing are considered to be **less than significant**.

<p>13 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></p> <p>PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.</p>	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
a. Fire protection?			X	
b. Police protection?			X	
c. Schools?				X
d. Parks?				X
e. Other government services?			X	

Existing Setting: Fire protection, police protection, parks, libraries and other governmental services and public school services are provided by a range of County agencies and special districts throughout the County.

Policy Framework: The General Plan Public Services and Utilities Element addresses policies related to emergency services, schools, library services, and cultural facilities. These policies require that adequate public services are built and operated to serve new development based on the applicable requirements of each responsible service purveyor. Issues related to water supply, wastewater collection, storm drainage, solid waste, and utility services are discussed below, in the Utilities and Service Systems section (Section 16).

Regulatory Setting: Most public service providers collect fees with building permits (such as Fire Departments and school districts) that are intended to cover the service providers’ costs for capital improvements due to the direct and indirect impacts associated with increased uses from new development. There are no sheriff services impact fees. A “public service” fee has recently been established in the El Dorado Hills/Cameron Park/Shingle Springs area to fund a new sheriff’s substation. Park fees for capital park improvements are only collected by the El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park Community Services Districts (CSD). Other park land dedication requirements may result from the subdivision of land. There are five library areas in the County and some library areas are supported in part by parcels or dwelling assessment fees, as well as County general funds.

Impacts 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.

13 (a) Fire protection. Fire protection is provided by local Fire Protection Districts, often with both paid and volunteer staff. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) also have personnel and equipment available in El Dorado and Amador Counties, primarily for wildland fire events in timber production areas. Local fire districts focus on structural fire protection and the CDF focuses on wildland fire protection. All agencies respond to emergency calls through the central dispatch center located in Camino. Local fire departments also provide emergency medical services. The impacts of emergency access are further described in the Transportation section of this Initial Study.

The Amendments would not affect fire protection services, but would affect how road improvements are provided by new development. In all new development, the local Fire Protection Districts are entrusted with enforcement of the adopted Fire Codes that will minimize any potentially significant impacts. Therefore, the potential impact is actually **less-than-significant**.

13 (b) Police protection. Police protection is provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office (EDSO), primarily for property crimes and other criminal activity. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) conducts patrols and handles traffic accidents and violations on and near state highways. Some backup is provided by the Placerville Police Department (in areas close to Placerville). The Amendments would not affect Police protection services. Therefore, impacts related to police protection are considered **less than significant**.

13 (c) Schools. There are a number of public school districts in the County. Further description can be reviewed in the General Plan EIR (Volume 2 of 3, starting with page 5.7-39). Schools are not directly impacted by the Amendments. Schools are generally funded by the State, but also collect fees with building permits, both residential and non-residential, and these fees provide construction funds for schools to increase capacity. Impacts related to schools are considered **less than significant**.

13 (d) Parks. Parks and recreation opportunities are provided by El Dorado County, City of Placerville, El Dorado Hills CSD, Cameron Park CSD, Georgetown Divide Recreation District, El Dorado Irrigation District, US Forest Service, BLM, and the State of California. Parks are not directly impacted by the Amendments or the potential increase in road improvement projects. Impacts to parks generally occur when additional residents move into an area and overburden existing park facilities. Impacts related to parks are considered **less than significant**.

13 (e) Other government services. Libraries and other government services are primarily provided by El Dorado County. General government would not be impacted by the Amendments or increased road improvement project facilities. Permit and inspection fees for various services are charged by most agencies to cover the cost of services.

However, the County Development Services Department and Department of Transportation may be adversely affected if the Amendments are not developed in an easily understandable format. General Plan Policy 10.1.2.3 states that "All County regulations and procedures shall be written in a concise and easy to understand manner." Efforts should be made to re-organize and restate the related Transportation Policies in such a manner that it is easily read and understood. The current road improvement policies of the County have been criticized for being too complicated. Policy direction and language ranges from the "specific and mandatory" to more general and "judgment" oriented policies, yet they are inexorably linked. County staff has also found the Amendments to be complicated and acknowledge that, at minimum, minor changes could be incorporated for clarification. Therefore, the impact is **less than significant**

Finding: Impacts to Public Services are considered to be **less than significant**.

14 RECREATION PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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	

Existing Setting: In El Dorado County there is a range of Federal, State and County agencies, land conservancies, and other service providers that operate a number of active and passive park facilities that are open to residents and visitors.

Policy Framework: El Dorado County policies related to recreation can be found in the General Plan Parks and Recreation Element. These policies focus upon funding, development and operation of regional, community and neighborhood parks, trails and other recreational facilities to serve County residents and visitors. There are also policies that promote greater capitalizing on the recreational, natural and historical resources of the County through tourism and recreational based businesses and industries, including tourist related events, lodging and other facilities.

Regulatory Setting: There does not appear to be any County land use regulations that directly relate to the proposed Amendments, since new development is required to provide parkland through the County’s Quimby Act Ordinance (16.12.090). Some Community Services Districts and Recreation Districts also collect capital improvement fees for parks.

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

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

14 (a - b) Increase use of parks or require construction of new parks. The proposed Amendments would not create a significant increase in local population that would impact the use of recreational facilities in the area, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No construction of recreational facilities such as sports fields are anticipated from the Amendments. New residential development provides park land, park in-lieu fees, and, in some recreation districts, capital improvement fees for acquisition and development of parks. As such, recreational related impacts are considered **less than significant**, and no mitigation is recommended or required.

Finding: Impacts to Recreational issues is considered to be **less than significant**.

15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i> PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Existing Setting: El Dorado County’s transportation system is focused around the roadway network. Most people travel in the County in automobiles because of topography and low-density development patterns that have limited the viability of facilities or services related to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian use.

The roadway network is rural in character but is urbanizing in the western portion of the County. U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50) is the primary transportation corridor extending through the County. Other state highways (i.e. - Highways 49 and 193), County arterials, and a network of local public and private roads constitute the remainder of the roadway system.

Local road circulation is constrained by the foothill topography that includes many east-west ridges and rivers prevalent in the Sierra foothills. County roads often follow historic wagon trails and roads from the mid and late 1800’s. Rural roads can be steep and narrow as compared to new roads in urban areas. Older bridges over creeks and rivers can be limited to one lane of traffic. New development often requires the realignment of these existing local roads and improvement to current standards.

Policy Framework: The El Dorado County General Plan Transportation Element contains policies related to county roadways. The primary focus of these policies is on the major county roads, including a number of 2-lane regional roads. To meet General Plan policies for funding and maintenance, the County adopted a new “2004 General Plan Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program,” effective August 22, 2006. Fees are collected at the time each building permit is issued, in order to pay for road improvements identified in the “Fee Program Project List – 2004 General Plan” (Resolution 266-2006). The TIM fees apply to residential and non-residential development and is annually updated each May based on a number of factors, including costs of construction, changes in the Capital Improvement Program list, and County growth patterns, as represented by roadway traffic counts being monitored by DOT.

Regulatory Setting: Road improvement project facilities are assessed TIM fees at the building permit stage. The fees, based on square footage, are higher for commercial uses such as restaurants and offices, while lower for industrial uses including storage and warehousing. These fees contribute each development’s fair share toward improving the County road system identified in the Fee Program Project List. The roads addressed in the TIM fee program are typically major roads including Latrobe Road, Lotus Road and Mother Lode Drive. Some of the rural two-lane roads (e.g. – Perry Creek,

Mount Aukum and Fair Play Roads) are included in the TIM fee program but are only scheduled for specific safety and spot improvements.

Impact 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.

15 (a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. As discussed above, the majority of non-County maintained roads are two lane roads in the rural areas of El Dorado County. LOS thresholds, prepared for the EDC Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Update 2005 for two lane roads are contained in the following table:

Table 3 Level of Service Thresholds for Minor 2-Lane Roads

Code	Facility Type	LOS peak hour count				
		A	B	C	D	E
2R	Minor 2-lane (24’ wide pavement)	90	200	680	1410	1740
W22	Minor 2-lane (22’ wide pavement)	80	180	610	1250	1550
W20	Minor 2-lane (20’ wide pavement)	70	160	540	1110	1370
W18	Minor 2-lane (18’ wide pavement)	60	130	450	930	1150

General Plan Policies TCXa, TC-Xc, TC-Xd, and TC-Xe provide the General Plan standards in terms of Level of Service (LOS) for new development. TC-Xd provides that the LOS standard “for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions...” A review of Table 3 indicates that in order to maintain a Level of Service “D” or greater on minor 2-lane roads, there would need to be no more than 930 vehicles per hour (i.e. – 465 vehicles per lane per hour) during peak hour on the narrowest road.

The LOS thresholds are calculated as an average daily peak hour impact. Temporary exceedances of the thresholds identified for a few days or more do not generate traffic that would exceed the LOS thresholds over the average traffic load.

The Amendments, in terms of development, would not directly increase traffic on local roads. However, certain types of development such as apartment projects and mixed use development would no longer be held to the LOS standard of Policy TC-Xa. Instead, the LOS standards of TC-Xd would apply. TC-Xd sets the LOS standards at LOS E or D depending on location in the Community Region (LOS E) or Rural Regions/Rural Centers (LOS D).

In summary, new development under the proposed Amendments is not anticipated to result in increased that would result in lowering of LOS thresholds inconsistent with the General Plan and therefore the impact should be **less than significant**.

15 (b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? The County General Plan includes a number of Policies assigning level of service standards to the existing roadway network. The LOS standards generally identify the p.m. peak hour traffic volume because it represents the highest hourly volume during a typical weekday. Occasionally the a.m. peak can be the peak hour, such as in the case of Highway 50. The p.m. peak on Highway 50 is on the eastbound lanes and the a.m. peak is on the westbound lanes. These LOS standards are calculated in the General Plan EIR for most county roads from the “Minor Two-Lane Highway” to “Four Freeway Lanes” (Table 5.4-1 on page 5.4-6 of the El Dorado County General Plan EIR).

For many of the rural roads the County reviewed in the 2005 TIM Fee update, additional thresholds were developed for those less than 24 feet wide. These standards were identified in subsection 15 (a) as Table 3.

Based on the discussion in subsection 15 (a) it was concluded that it would be unlikely that new development or road improvement project activities under the proposed Amendments would create exceedances of the LOS thresholds and therefore the impact is considered to be **less than significant**.

15 (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: No change to air traffic is expected. El Dorado County has four general aviation airports, none of which is likely to be affected by the Amendments or location of road improvements. Development within an airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) area would be required to adhere to the policies and standards in the CLUP. **No impact** would be anticipated.

15 (d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? There are many County roads in rural areas that are narrow, have sharp curves and narrow bridges or are steeper than roads in more urbanized areas. The Amendments would not increase the number of hazards but would result in some improvements to some of these roads.

The County constantly monitors accident reports, citizen complaints, and road conditions for potential safety improvements including signage, spot improvements, and guardrails. However, upgrading roads to remove all existing deficiencies of rural county roads is not likely to occur due to lack of construction funds and because of the negative impacts of tree removal or other environmental impacts. A number of County roads are currently programmed for improvements as listed in the 2004 General Plan Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program, effective August 19, 2006 and the Fee Program Project List – 2004 General Plan (Resolution 266-2006). Rural roads with low traffic volume are scheduled for spot improvements and some safety improvements, involving maintenance and road side vegetation control. Certain major county roads are scheduled for significant improvements through the County Capital Improvement Program as a result of the residential development that utilizes those roads.

The Amendments would both increase the funding opportunities for completing road improvements, yet possibly allow certain apartment and mixed use development projects to impact roads beyond the LOS F threshold of Policy TC-Xa. However, the other General Plan Policies, such as TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf, should require new development to bring roads back to LOS E or D

CIP road improvement standards required in General Plan Policy TC-1a and implemented through Measure TC-A and TC-B, as well as County design standards for minimum width, sight distance, traffic controls, striping, etc., would improve any existing safety issues on County roads. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant**.

15 (e) Result in inadequate emergency access? The typical nature of the rural County roads includes: variable road alignments and sight distances that limit the speed of emergency vehicles; variable widths of roads, including narrow stretches, one lane bridges, and obstacles such as trees, brush, utility poles, ditches, and culverts that minimize opportunities for vehicles to pull out of traffic. Therefore, the Amendments would only serve to improve these conditions and improve emergency access. Therefore, the Amendments would have **no impact** on emergency access.

15 (f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? The Amendments would not have any impacts on parking capacity. Road improvement planning, analysis, and environmental review would address any site specific parking related issues. The Zoning Ordinance provides standards for off-street parking for residential and non-residential development and would be required as part of any new development. Therefore, the Amendments would not have an impact on parking capacity resulting in a **less than significant impact**.

15 (g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? Transit plans and alternative transportation would generally be addressed along with any road improvement projects. As a result, there are **no impacts** associated with this item.

Finding: The Amendments is anticipated to improve the County ability to provide road improvements since the funding restrictions are lifted. However, additional development exceptions are also proposed and may contribute to short term

increases in traffic congestion. These exceptions would allow apartment and mixed use projects to proceed without compliance with Policy TC-Xa. However, adherence to other General Plan policies, including additional flexibility for funding road improvements, and project-by-project CEQA analysis is anticipated to provide the County with the necessary information to mitigate potential impacts for future projects, and therefore the Amendments' impacts will be **less than significant**.

16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i> PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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 storm water 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	

Existing Setting: Road improvement projects are typically constructed on existing roads that also are used for other public utilities. Electrical power, cable television, and telephone lines are often located overhead of existing and proposed roads. Underground, water lines, sewer lines, reclaimed water lines, and storm water pipes are typically located beneath existing or proposed roads. During road improvement projects, the relocation, protection, and expansion of these facilities are a major concern. More information on utilities and public service systems is available in the General Plan EIR, starting with pages 5.6-1 (Volume 1 of 3).

The County waste management programs include contracting for solid waste collection and disposal, including recycling provisions. Solid waste is sorted for recyclables and then transported to the Lockwood Landfill in Nevada.

Regulatory Setting: In addition to utilities and service system requirements set by service providers, development is required to comply with all aspects of the County Solid Waste Management Ordinance (Section 8.42).

Impact 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.

16 (a, b, g) Impacts from wastewater treatment, treatment facilities, and compliance with federal, state, and local regulations. Road improvement projects would have no impact on wastewater treatment or similar operations. The road projects do not place demands on these systems, but associated residential or non-residential development may place demands on these systems. EID is the primary provider for these services and operates its facilities under the required permits from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). These permits are specific to each facility and require proper handling of waste and annual monitoring reports.

Potential impacts related to wastewater and possibly solid waste disposal from road improvement projects are considered to be **less than significant**.

16 (c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? All new road improvement projects would be required to meet county standards for drainage facilities and to address the road's impacts to any existing drainage facilities. Since these facilities would be located generally on the road improvement project site, the impacts of construction would be **less than significant**.

16 (d, e) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? Water supplies would not be affected by road improvement projects. Water for dust control and construction requirements is usually minimal amounts and used on a temporary basis, often trucked from off-site. Potential impacts related to public water supply for road improvement projects are considered to be **less than significant**.

16 (f) Landfill capacity. Some road improvement project waste products are collected and transferred to the Lockwood Landfill in Nevada. Typically, due to the weight and cost of transferring these wastes, often the material is reused or recycled on the project site or for other nearby sites. The Lockwood landfill has adequate capacity for additional waste generated by land development, as described in the General Plan EIR, for the foreseeable future. (Reference General Plan EIR page 5.6-22). There are also other landfills that may be utilized for waste disposal. As a result, potential impacts related to solid waste disposal of road improvement project waste is considered to be **less than significant**.

Finding: There are **no impacts** associated with utilities and service systems.

17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project: PSI Potentially Significant Impact PSUMI: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated LTS: Less-than-significant Impact NI No Impact.	PSI	PSU MI	LTS	NI
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	

Existing Setting: The potential environmental impact from the Amendments is the potential for new road improvement projects to be developed.

Policy Framework: The El Dorado County General Plan Update was adopted on July 19, 2004. The General Plan was upheld in a Referendum vote on March 5, 2005. Policy 2.2.5.20 requires that all development be required to comply with the General Plan until such time that an updated Zoning Ordinance is adopted, so that policies and mitigation measures of the General Plan are implemented immediately to minimize potential environmental Impacts.

Regulatory Setting: All discretionary development, including road improvement projects, is required to be consistent with the Policies of the County General Plan. Road improvement projects also must comply with technical standards in the various County and State design manuals. All discretionary projects, including road improvement projects, must comply with the environmental review process of CEQA.

Impact Discussion:

17 (a) The Amendments do not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment because all policies and mitigation measures incorporated into the General Plan would be implemented with the construction of new road improvement projects. However, site specific and localized impacts may result from additional traffic and site specific conditions. These localized impacts are site specific and could result in localized environmental impacts. The environmental impacts are primarily noise, dust, and traffic related. Other impacts may be associated with aesthetics. These impacts can be mitigated by each road improvement projects discretionary review and approval process, including the required CEQA review. CEQA requires the County to implement all feasible mitigation measures, or adopt findings of overriding consideration along with an Environmental Impact Report. There would be a **less-than-significant** impact.

17 (b) The analysis within this Initial Study includes cumulative analysis associated with the normal and expected growth in the road network is based on the anticipated growth planned in the County General Plan and analyzed in the County General Plan EIR. There would be a **less-than-significant** impact.

17 (c) The Amendments would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. There would be a **less-than-significant** impact.

Finding:

There is no additional mitigation measure needed for the Mandatory Findings of Significance, since no additional significant impacts have been identified.

Other Considerations:

Cumulative Impacts:

This section addresses the proposed Amendments' potential to contribute to cumulative impacts in light of the previous cumulative analysis provided in the General Plan EIR.

Cumulative Setting:

The General Plan Draft EIR was prepared in May 2003 and Responses to Comments was released in January 2004. The Board of Supervisors adopted the General Plan and certified the Final EIR on July 19, 2004. (SCH 2001082030)

The General Plan adoption was upheld by referendum vote on March 5, 2005.

Since the date of EIR certification, pending litigation on the General Plan was resolved by the Superior Court ruling on August 31, 2005 and the Settlement Agreement approved by the Board of Supervisors on April 18, 2006.

None of these events changed the General Plan growth projections, impact analysis, or impact conclusions. Therefore, the cumulative analysis provided in the General Plan EIR is still valid and provides the worst-case analysis for cumulative project effects.

Cumulative Impact Analysis:

Aesthetics: The Amendments do not result in potentially significant impacts to view of scenic resources. Therefore the cumulative impacts identified in the General Plan EIR under Visual Resources are not increased as a result of the Amendments and the Amendments will have no impact on cumulative aesthetic impacts in the region.

Agricultural Resources: The Amendments could result in potentially significant impacts by converting choice agricultural lands for road improvement projects. The impacts would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis and mitigation measures incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore the cumulative impacts identified in the General Plan EIR under Agriculture and Forestry is not increased as a result of the Amendments and the Amendments will have **no impact** on cumulative agricultural resource impacts in the region.

Air Quality: The Amendments would not result in additional air quality impacts. Air Quality impacts would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis and mitigation measures incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore the cumulative impacts identified in the General Plan EIR under Air Quality are not increased as a result of the Amendments and the Amendments will have **no impact** on cumulative air quality impacts in the region.

Biological Resources: The Amendments would not result in any impacts on biological resources that were not contemplated by the General Plan. Potential impacts would also be evaluated on a project by project basis and mitigation measures incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore the cumulative impacts identified in the General Plan EIR under Biological Resources are not increased as a result of the Amendments and the Amendments will have **no impact** on cumulative biological resource impacts in the region.

Cultural Resources: The Amendments would not result in any impacts on cultural resources that were not contemplated by the General Plan. Potential impacts would also be evaluated on a project by project basis and mitigation measures incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore the cumulative impacts identified in the General Plan EIR under Cultural Resources are not increased as a result of the Amendments and the Amendments will have **no impact** on cumulative cultural resource impacts in the region.

Geology and Soils/Mineral Resources: The Amendments would not result in any significant impacts related to Geology and Soils. Therefore the Amendments would have **no impact** to the cumulative impacts addressed in the General Plan EIR for Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The Amendments would not result in any significant impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Therefore the Amendments would have **no impact** to the cumulative impacts addressed in the General Plan EIR for Human Health and Safety.

Hydrology and Water Quality: The Amendments would not result in any significant impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality. Therefore the Amendments would have **no impact** to the cumulative impacts addressed in the General Plan EIR for Water Resources.

Land Use Planning: The Amendments implements policies of the General Plan pertaining to the Transportation and Circulation Element and the Policies requiring minimum Levels of Service standards are applied to new development projects. The Amendments proposes to clarify the language of Policy TC-Xa and related policies in such a way to address ongoing concerns about affordable housing, needed commercial development, and the concurrency requirements such as timing of improvements and timing of residential permit issuances. Since the Amendments do not change the overall intent of the General Plan and the County's legal authority to hold new development accountable for its fair share of road improvement requirements, the Amendments has no additional cumulative impact on Land Use Planning. The General Plan EIR properly addressed cumulative impacts of the General Plan land use policies and land use map and the Amendments does not change that analysis. The Amendments is anticipated to have **no impact** on cumulative Land Use conditions in the region.

Noise: The Amendments impacts associated with noise are addressed through implementing noise policies of the General Plan. Therefore the Amendments would have **no impact** on cumulative impacts addressed in the General Plan under Noise.

Population and Housing: The Amendments will not have any impacts associated with Population and Housing and would have **no impact** on cumulative impacts addressed in the General Plan under Land Use and Housing.

Public Services: The Amendments would not have any impacts associated with Public Service and would have **no impact** on cumulative Public Service impacts in the region.

Recreation: The Amendments will not have any impacts associated with Recreation and would have **no impact** on cumulative impacts addressed in the General Plan under the recreation portion of Public Services.

Transportation: The Amendments could result in potentially significant impacts by increasing traffic on some rural county roads, increasing maintenance of roads, and contributing to specific areas of traffic congestion. However, the remaining unchanged General Plan policies will continue to hold new development to a higher standard of service than that required by Policy TC-Xa. Policy TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf all work together to hold new development accountable for its fair share of necessary road improvements to maintain Level of Service standards anticipated by the General Plan EIR. Therefore the cumulative impacts identified in the General Plan EIR under Traffic and Circulation is not increased as a result of the Amendments and will have **no impact** on cumulative traffic and circulation impacts in the region.

Utilities and Services: The Amendments will not have any impacts associated with Utilities and Services and would have **no impact** on cumulative impacts addressed in the General Plan under the Utilities section.

Finding: There were no Mitigation Measures identified in the Initial Study. No impact of the Amendments would exceed the anticipated impacts analyzed in the General Plan EIR for cumulative impacts. No additional mitigation measures are required because the Amendments has **no impact** from a cumulative impact perspective.

Determination

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 within this Initial Study.

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Roger Trout, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____ For: El Dorado County

Report preparation and consultations

Initial Study drafted and prepared by Development Services Staff:

Larry Appel, Deputy Director of Planning
Roger Trout, Principal Planner

County Departments Commenting on Amendments:

Paula Frantz, County Counsel
Craig McKibbin, Department of Transportation

References

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 (Revised Grading Design Manual, 2-5-07 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors on 3-13-07 (Resolution #047-2007))

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Revised Grading Ordinance, 2-5-07 Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719) Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170)

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards manual

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.)

Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program Draft Supplement to the El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH 2001082030).