



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Residential Density Bonus Ordinance in accordance with Government Code 65915 (Statewide Density Bonus Law)

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

Contact Person: Shawna Purvines

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Unincorporated El Dorado County, 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, 95667

Project Applicant's Name and Address: County of El Dorado, 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, 95667

Project Agent's Name and Address: County of El Dorado, 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, 95667

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

Project Location: Unincorporated Area, El Dorado County.

Assessor's Parcel No: N/A

Zoning: N/A

Section: N/A **T:** N/A **R:** N/A

General Plan Designation: All Residential Land Use Designations

Description of Project: The project is to amend the Zoning Ordinance to address the requirements of Chapter 4.3 §65915 of California Code requiring local governments to provide incentives that will encourage developers to build affordable housing in the form of both: 1) a density bonus, and 2) exceptions from normally applicable zoning and other development standards. The law requires each city and county to adopt an ordinance that specifies how compliance with this section will be implemented.

The Ordinance would apply to all areas of the County where residential uses are permitted.

The project being analyzed as part of this environmental document is simply the Zoning Ordinance Amendment, and not any specific development proposal. In the future, each individual residential development project being proposed and requesting a density bonus pursuant to this Ordinance would need to undergo separate and specific CEQA review, beyond this document.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The project covers the entire unincorporated area.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| | Aesthetics | Agriculture Resources | Air Quality |
| | Hydrology / Water Quality | Land Use / Planning | 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: Shawna Purvines For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed
Name: _____ For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from a proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance.

The amendment would add an ordinance that specifies how the County will comply with Government Code 4.3, §65915 related to density bonus. The Density Bonus ordinance will allow future applicants to seek an increase in the residential density of a project if the project includes a specific percentage of qualifying housing units for affordable or senior housing. Applicants may also be entitled to a density bonus if a project includes, or provides for, certain amenities such as a childcare facility.

It is important to note that, while the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment will not result in a physical change to the environment, it may, in limited cases, make the permitting process for conforming projects easier by removing or reducing certain regulatory barriers through concessions or waivers, for specific types of housing production. However, all projects will remain subject to discretionary action, all of which are subject to environmental review under CEQA. In addition, proposed projects would be reviewed to determine compliance with the County's development standards. Any concessions relating to matters that affect aesthetic issues can be denied if found to not be necessary for the financial viability of the project or if found to have a negative effect on the health, safety and welfare of the residents of the County.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project is located on parcels designated residential in the unincorporated area of El Dorado County.

Project Characteristics

The project would amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a density bonus on parcels designated residential in the unincorporated area of the County. A density bonus is an increase in density over the otherwise maximum allowable residential density under the applicable General Plan designation. The amount of density bonus units an applicant may request can vary. The bonus is determined by the amount of units set aside as affordable and the applicable category used (low, very low, moderate, or senior). California Government Code section 65915-65918 requires local jurisdictions to adopt ordinances that are consistent with the provisions of the Code.

Background

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from a proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. Below is additional information regarding data used in the analysis of this study.

1. Population, Housing and Land Use

On June 9, 2006, Bay Area Economics (BAE) presented findings of their review of the countywide land use forecasts utilized in preparing the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan. The County of El Dorado commissioned this review in order to ascertain whether the land use forecasts remain valid or whether conditions have changed such that the County should consider undertaking an update of those forecasts for revising projections of the rate at which land will be developed within the county. The land use forecasts are contained in the document titled: El Dorado County Land Use Forecasts for the DRAFT General Plan, dated March 5, 2002, by Economic and Planning Systems, hereafter "Land Use Forecast Report".

Based on a review of the Land Use Forecast Report and currently available population projections for El Dorado County, BAE recommend that the County should not conduct an update of the residential absorption projections contained in the Land Use Forecast Report. Similarly, an updated land use forecast based on the newer El Dorado County employment forecast available from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) would likely not yield a residential absorption estimate of greater precision than that already contained in the Land Use Forecast Report. In addition to the comparison of long-term growth projections, research for this evaluation included documenting actual growth trends in El Dorado County since the Land Use Forecast Report was completed. Based on this information, it appears that the growth assumptions in the Land Use Forecast Report were reliable, and in fact somewhat conservative from an environmental impact standpoint. Therefore, findings indicate that the County could expect similar growth rates that are equal to or less than what is projected in the 2004 General Plan.

2. Transportation/Circulation

The existing physical conditions for the transportation system serving El Dorado County have been described in detail in the General Plan EIR, with updated information regarding anticipated roadway levels of service (LOS) provided in the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the (TIM Fee SEIR) certified August 22, 2006. The General Plan EIR describes specific transportation system components in the County, including the regional roadway system, state highways, major County roads, and including public transit, non-motorized transportation, and aviation.

The Department of Transportation would likely require a traffic study prior to any new residential development projects requesting a density bonus. The study would determine if the project would worsen the Level of Service of any roads serving the proposed project. The study would recommend mitigation measures for any increase in traffic in the project area.

Focus

The EIR for the County General Plan was developed as a program EIR that was “intended to provide information at a more general level of detail” (EDC 2004). As described in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, a program EIR can be used to simplify the task of preparing environmental documents on later parts of the program. The General Plan Housing Element Implementation program HO-7 requires the adoption of an Affordable Housing Density Bonus Ordinance that is in accordance with State law and therefore has already been considered in the General Plan EIR. As a result and where appropriate, this document incorporates by reference information and conclusions of the General Plan EIR, including topics on regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, and other factors that would apply to the plan as a whole.

Due to the nature of the project there is a lack of site-specific knowledge with which to conduct a site-specific environmental review. Therefore, this environmental review is conducted at a “plan” level of analysis, rather than the more detailed site-specific level. No actual site-specific development is proposed by the Zoning Ordinance amendment. Therefore, an analysis which includes more detailed, site-specific information about any potential development impacts is not feasible at this time and would occur when the appropriate agency prepares a future environmental document in connection with site-specific project activities, pursuant to CCR §15152 (c).

The proposed ordinance regulates density bonuses for qualified projects. As a result, the land use density of a qualified project may increase and/or development standards, including setbacks and height restrictions, may be modified. Higher density and modification of development standards may result in higher or bulkier structures relative to surrounding land uses. All projects are required to comply with existing policies and development standards except those that may be waived/reduced as a concession or incentive required by the ordinance. The number of concessions or waivers will be limited by the ordinance.

Project Schedule and Approvals

This Initial Study is being circulated for public and agency review for a 30-day period. Written comments on the Initial Study should be submitted to the project planner indicated in the Summary section, above. Following the close of the written comment period, the Initial Study will be considered by the Board of Supervisors in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to comply with CEQA. The Board will also determine whether to approve the Zoning Ordinance Amendment at that time.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a & b. **Scenic Vista and Resources.** Future project sites may be identified by the County as a scenic view or resource. However, without specific details regarding future developments, it is impossible to determine potential impacts to scenic vistas within the County with any precision. The project does not involve any direct physical changes to the environment. Future projects will most likely remain subject to discretionary action, all of which are subject to environmental review under CEQA, which includes a review of aesthetic impacts. As details of the proposed building design and grading are known, CEQA review, separate from this IS/ND would be required to assess any potential impacts. In addition, future development would be reviewed to determine compliance with the County's development standards as well as to determine impacts to scenic vistas. Any concessions relating to matters that affect aesthetic issues can be denied if found to not be necessary for the financial viability of the project or if found to have a negative effect on health, safety and welfare. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this amendment.
- c. **Visual Character.** The amendment would have no effect on projected future development levels and therefore would not result in any impacts beyond those identified in the adopted General Plan and EIR. Future development would be required, unless waived/reduced per the ordinance, to be consistent with adopted General Plan policies that reduce degradation of visual resources. General Plan policies 2.6.1.1, 2.6.1.6, 7.5.2.1, 7.5.2.2 and 7.5.2.3 provide protection of visual character in the County. The proposed ordinance regulates density bonuses for

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

qualified projects. As a result, the land use density of a qualified project may increase and/or development standards, including setbacks and height restrictions, may be modified. Higher density and modification of development standards may result in higher or bulkier structures relative to surrounding land uses. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this amendment.

- d. **Light and Glare.** Since the amendment is not a physical development proposal, it would not result in impacts from lighting and glare. The amendment would have no effect on projected future development levels and therefore would not result in any impacts beyond those identified in the adopted General Plan and EIR. Prior to approval of any development, Planning Services would review the proposed project to determine if whether future outdoor lighting sources comply with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. The potential lighting sources would be required to be consistent with the existing conditions in the area unless otherwise waived/reduced. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this amendment.

Finding

The amendment would have no effect on the projected future development levels and therefore would not result in any impacts beyond those identified in the adopted General Plan and EIR. No mitigation is necessary.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

- a. There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
 - b. The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
 - c. Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a.-c. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would not alter the location or nature of development described in the General Plan and EIR. The proposed changes would simply allow for additional housing in areas already planned for residential uses. Any incentives or concessions granted from existing development standards or other policies and regulations would first need a finding, by the decision makers, to have no adverse impacts upon public health and safety or the physical environment. Individual proposals for residential development would be analyzed pursuant to CEQA which includes impacts to adjacent lands. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning in the project vicinity and would not adversely impact any properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract.

FINDING: It has been determined that the project would not result in any impacts to agricultural lands or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. .

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No 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 toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

a-c.

Air Quality Plan and Standards. Since the level of development would not increase as a result of the amendment, construction air quality impacts would be comparable to those identified in the adopted General Plan. Under buildout conditions, development would result in a temporary generation of emissions resulting from site grading, excavation and other development related activities. Future development would be required to comply with Air Quality Management District (AQMD) rules during project construction. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for onsite and offsite improvements, a Fugitive Dust Plan would be required. No new impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this amendment.

d-e.

Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors. The amendment would have no effect on future projected development levels and therefore would not result in any impacts beyond those identified in the adopted General Plan and EIR. Future development will be required to comply with District rules during project construction. Compliance with District rules will reduce short-term potential impacts to a less than significant level. Potential long-term impacts will be addressed through the discretionary review application process. Approval of future uses through this process will impose mitigation requirements to reduce potential impacts. No additional impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this amendment.

Finding

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the proposed Zoning Ordinance

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

amendment would not cause any additional construction that could affect air quality. The Zoning Ordinance update would have no effect on future development levels and therefore would not result in any impacts beyond those identified in the adopted General Plan and EIR. No mitigation is necessary.

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

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

| IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|
| failure of a levee or dam? | | | |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | X |

Discussion:

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

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

a., b. & f.

Water Quality, Groundwater Standards. The Zoning Ordinance amendment is not a physical development with the potential for causing adverse impacts in the area of hydrology and water quality. None of the proposed regulations or changes to the Zoning Ordinance would adversely affect hydrology and water quality. As noted previously, any proposal is required to be analyzed separately under CEQA as part of a project specific environmental review, were development and construction methods would be assessed. General Plan Policies 5.4.1.2, 7.1.2.2, 7.1.2.1, 7.1.2.3, 7.2.3.7, and 7.2.3.10, combined with the related County and state regulatory and permit programs, would prevent impacts from being significant. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

c., d & e

Erosion Control Plan. The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment would not result in additional development beyond what is currently planned. Prior to approval of any future development, the Department of Transportation would review the proposed project and would require a Grading Plan for any proposed road improvements. The Grading Plan would be required to be in conformance with the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*. The

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

Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

g. thru j.

Flooding Seiche, tsunami or mudflow. The project is not a physical development that could cause flood concerns. None of the proposed regulations or changes to the Zoning ordinance would result in greater flood or tsunami concerns. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

Finding

The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment would not result in any additional development beyond what is currently planned. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a. **Established Community.** The Zoning Ordinance amendment would not alter the location or nature of development described in the General Plan and EIR. All future development projects will continue to be regulated by the General Plan Land Use Element and the Zoning Ordinance. No impacts that were not previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.
 - b. **Land Use Plan.** The General Plan EIR identified less than significant impacts associated with consistency with applicable plans, policies and regulations of other agencies under 2025 conditions. The Zoning Ordinance Amendment is not a physical development capable of dividing an established community. The proposed changes would simply allow for additional housing in areas already planned for residential uses. Any incentives or concessions granted from existing development standards or other policies and regulations would first need to be determined by the decision makers to have no adverse impacts upon public health and safety or the physical environment. Individual proposals for residential development would be analyzed pursuant to CEQA. No additional impacts that were not previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.
 - c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** The Zoning Ordinance amendment codifies the State Density Bonus Law, and each city and county in the state is required to implement its requirements. The County has not adopted a HCP and any bonus granted would be located in areas targeted for higher density residential development. The amendment is consistent with the General Plan, which offers broad policies and programs, and stipulates requirements for habitat conservation. The amendment would allow exceptions to certain provisions of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, as allowed and required by state law. Future development projects will continue to be analyzed under CEQA. No impacts that were not previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

Comment [PNM1]: You might just point out here that no HCP has been adopted by the County and any bonuses would be in areas suitable for higher intensity residential development.

Finding

The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment would not result in any additional development beyond what is currently planned. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-d. **Noise Standards.** The Zoning Ordinance amendment would have no effect on the location or nature of development. All future development projects will continue to be regulated by the General Plan Land Use Element, Zoning Ordinance and Noise Ordinance. All future development will be subject to General Plan Policy 6.5.1.1 regarding construction noise.

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

Construction activities would be limited to 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. during weekdays and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on weekends and federally recognized holidays. Adherence to California Building Code requirements for onsite noise would be required. The General Plan EIR concluded that short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant. No impacts that were not previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

e & f. **Airport Noise.** As described in the General Plan EIR, 2025 and buildout conditions would result in an increase potential exposure of new noise-sensitive receptors to aircraft noise by potentially increasing localized development in areas within the aircraft noise contour. Because the specific site designs and locations are not currently known, it is conceivable that an increased number of receptors could be exposed to aircraft noise levels. General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires all projects, including single-family residential, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport to be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable CLUP. Policy 6.5.2.2 states that the County shall develop and apply a combining zone district for areas located within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of airports. Lastly, Policy 6.5.2.3 requires all airports which have not developed noise level contours consistent with the General Plan forecast year of 2025 to update the respective Master Plans and CLUPs to reflect aircraft operation noise levels in the year 2025. Therefore, implementation of relevant General Plan goals and policies would help to protect both existing and proposed sensitive land uses and receptors. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would have no effect on the location or nature of development. No impacts that were not previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

Finding

Potential short- and long-term noise sources will be required to comply with established noise standards and policies. The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment would not result in any change in the amount or location of development beyond what is currently planned. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

| VII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | X |

Discussion:

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth.** Adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not alter existing land use designations in the unincorporated County. Population forecasts were derived based on housing projections, which would not change under the projected 2025 conditions as analyzed by Bay Area Economics in their review of EPS’s study utilized in the General Plan. The project does not consist of any physical development. Consequently, the proposed regulations do not result in the displacement of current housing. As specific development projects are proposed, along with information about any existing residences on the site, these projects would need to undergo separate CEQA review. As part of this amendment, no impacts would result that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

Finding

The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed amendment either directly or indirectly. No mitigation measures are required.

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

VIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. *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:*

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|----------|
| a. Fire protection? | | | | X |
| b. Police protection? | | | | X |
| c. Schools? | | | | X |
| d. Parks? | | | | X |
| e. Other government services? | | | | X |

Discussion:

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

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

a. **Fire Protection.** Adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not alter existing land use designations or development patterns in the unincorporated County. New fire protection and emergency medical services and facilities are developed primarily in response to population growth within the County. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would not increase the overall anticipated population growth analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Prior to any new development, the Fire Department will review the plans to determine the adequacy of fire protection services in the area. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact

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

fees at the time a building permit is secured. As part of this Zoning Ordinance update, no impacts would result that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

- b. **Police Protection.** General Plan Policies 5.1.2.1 through 5.1.2.3 require new development to contribute its fair share to the cost of law enforcement services. These policies ensure that law enforcement facilities are planned and built in accordance with the need generated by the higher intensities of development. Adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not alter development plans for the unincorporated County, and therefore no new impacts to police protection services would occur that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.
- c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** General Plan goals and policies provide guidelines to ensure coordination with schools, parks and other services. Impact fees are collected at the time a building permit is secured to help offset any growth impacts. No change to the location or magnitude of development would occur as a direct result of the Zoning Ordinance amendment, and therefore no new impacts to schools, parks or other similar facilities would occur that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

Finding

The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

a.& b.

Since the project is not a particular development proposal, there would be no impacts to recreation facilities. As individual development projects are proposed in the project area, separate CEQA review would be undertaken to determine the specific project's impacts to recreation.

FINDING: No significant impacts to recreation or open space will result from the project. The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

a-b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** The existing physical conditions for the transportation system serving El Dorado County are described in detail in the General Plan EIR, with updated information regarding anticipated roadway levels of service (LOS) provided in the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the (TIM Fee SEIR) certified August 22, 2006. The General Plan EIR describes specific transportation system components in the County, including the regional roadway system, state highways, major County roads, and including public transit, non-motorized transportation, and aviation. The Department of Transportation would likely require a traffic study prior to any development that could cause significant impacts. The study would determine if the project would worsen the Level of Service of any roads serving the proposed project, and would recommend mitigation measures for any increase in traffic in the project area. Since the project is not a particular development proposal, adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not alter existing land use designations or development patterns in the unincorporated County. As individual development projects are proposed, separate CEQA review would be undertaken to determine specific project impacts to traffic and circulation. No new impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

c thru f.

Traffic increase, Hazard, Emergency Access and Parking: Adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not alter existing land use plans or development patterns in the unincorporated County. No new development would be authorized as part of the Zoning Ordinance update. Prior to development of any project, the applicant will be required to mitigate any traffic hazards, provide road improvements and to increase the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to fire safe regulations and may be placed as conditions of approval for future development. The applicant will also be required to submit plans demonstrating compliance with the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning ordinance. Any incentives or concessions granted from existing development standards or other policies and regulations would

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

first need to be determined by the decision makers to have no adverse impacts upon public health and safety or the physical environment. Individual proposals for residential development would be analyzed pursuant to CEQA. No new impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- g. **Alternative Transportation.** Adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not alter existing land use plans or development patterns in the unincorporated County. No new development would be authorized as part of the Zoning Ordinance update. The 2004 General Plan EIR determined that insufficient transit capacity was significant and unavoidable under both the year 2025 and building out conditions and a Statement of Overriding Consideration was adopted with the EIR. The determination was based on insufficient spaces at park-and-ride lots to serve the population. The Zoning Ordinance update would not increase the total amount of residents nor would it increase the overall demand on transit. Under buildout conditions, there is an anticipated increase in population and therefore it is probable that additional needs for transit services would be created. Prior to any new development, the El Dorado Transit Authority would review the project and would determine if additional alternative transportation improvements are necessary. No new impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Finding

The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts to traffic and transportation that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

| XI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | X |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | X |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | X |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded | | | | X |

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

| XI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|
| entitlements needed? | | | |
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | X |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | X |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | X |
| h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand. | | | X |

Discussion:

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
 - Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
 - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
 - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a. **Wastewater.** New or expanded onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS) and private community disposal systems would be required to serve the developments outside the service area of EID's wastewater collection system. This project recommends the County develop a program that allows for the increase in density for residential projects of 25% but not to exceed

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

35%. Under General Plan 2025 conditions and its associated population growth, all development is expected to lead to a substantial increase in OWTS resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts. The Zoning Ordinance update would not result in an increase of development levels for the 2025 conditions above what has already been identified and reviewed in the adopted General Plan. The 2004 General Plan implemented Policy 5.3.2.4, which establishes a septic system monitoring program that requires monitoring of septic systems as necessary. New development will be subject to Policy 5.3.2.4, coupled with the design requirements for OWTS as imposed by the County. No new impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

b., d., e.

New Facilities. The 2004 General Plan development assumptions provide the basis for the projections of the type, location, and capacity of County water supply demands. It has been determined that most of the increase in water demand caused by the 2004 General Plan would occur within El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) service area, while the area served by the Grizzly Flat Community Services District (South County) would experience the greatest growth in demand in terms of percentage change. Limited amounts of growth are expected in the Georgetown Public Utilities District (North County) service area. Under 2025 conditions the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not result in increased development beyond what was projected under the adopted General Plan. As such, there would be no increase in the demand for water supply and this impact would remain comparable to the significance of this impact as evaluated in the adopted General Plan EIR. The adopted General Plan incorporated three policies and an implementation measure (Policy 2.2.5.20, Policy 5.2.1.9, Policy 5.2.1.10, and Measure LU-C) in order to address the likelihood of surface water shortages. Policy 2.2.5.20 and Measure LU-C establish a General Plan conformity review process for all development projects. Policy 5.2.1.9 requires applicants of proposed development to submit verification that adequate surface water supply from existing water supply facilities is adequate and physically available to meet the highest demand that could be permitted by the approval on the lands in question. Policy 5.2.1.10 establishes County support of water conservation and recycling projects that can help reduce water demand and projected shortages. In addition to these General Plan provisions, the County would continue to be required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 610 and 221 regarding the identification and verification of water supply service for future development requests as part of their project consideration. Future development will be required to connect to existing facilities or demonstrate the existing capacity in the area. No new impacts that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

c. **Storm Water Drainage.** Any drainage facilities required to serve new development will be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. No new impacts that were not

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

previously addressed in the General Plan EIR would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- f & g. **Solid Waste.** The General Plan EIR addressed solid and hazardous waste disposal under Impact 5.6-1, and determined that the impact would be less than significant under both 2025 and buildout conditions. Since the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not result in a level of development exceeding growth projections in the General Plan, no new impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
- h. **Power.** Since the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not result in a level of development exceeding growth projections in the General Plan, no new impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

Finding

The Zoning Ordinance amendment would result in no impacts to utilities and service systems that were not previously addressed in the General Plan EIR. No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion

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

- a. Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21083.3 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15177, the County has determined that the Zoning Ordinance amendment is within the scope of the General Plan EIR adopted July 2004 and the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the (TIM Fee SEIR) certified August 22, 2006. Therefore, this initial study only looks at issues specific and unique to the Zoning Ordinance amendment and current setting conditions, and does not re-evaluate issues adequately addressed in the previous General Plan EIR or Supplemental EIR. This review does not address Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources, Biological and Cultural Resources, Recreation, and Hazards, which were previously addressed in the General Plan EIR and will not be affected by this project. Therefore, this project will not degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat, threaten plant or animal communities or eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory. No new impacts would occur that were not previously addressed.
- b. No new development would be authorized as part of the Zoning Ordinance amendment. Prior to development, additional reports and studies would be necessary to determine the potential impacts to the project site and to the neighborhood. There would be no significant impacts related to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry, air quality, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, noise, population/housing, public services, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, there would be no additional impacts beyond those previously addressed in the General Plan EIR and related supplemental analyses.
- c. Due to the type of the proposed project, activities proposed, and general environmental conditions analyzed in the General Plan EIR, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly. No additional impacts beyond those previously addressed in the General Plan EIR and related supplemental analyses would occur.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report

- Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report
- Volume II - Response to Comment on DEIR
- Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR
- Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR
- Volume V - Appendices

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume I - Goals, Objectives, and Policies

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

El Dorado County General Plan Amendment (TIM FEE) Supplemental EIR, August 2006

El Dorado County General Plan Amendment, (FAR) Supplemental EIR, July 2007

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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