


# EXHIBIT A




**A 09-0006/Z 09-0012**

**PIERCE TRUST REZONE**  
VICINITY MAP  
APN: 327-140-07

**GENE E. THORNE & ASSOCIATES, INC.**  
ENGINEERS, PLANNERS, SURVEYORS  
4080 Plaza Goldorado Circle, Cameron Park, California 95682  
TEL: 530-677-1747 OR 916-985-7745 FAX: 530-676-4205  
EMAIL: mapping@thornecivil.com

# EXHIBIT B



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co Assessor's Office for assessment purposes only.

Acresages Are Estimates



Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Grey Text Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles

Rev. Mar. 22, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 327, Pg. 14 County of El Dorado, CA



## A 09-0006/Z 09-0012

# EXHIBIT C



**Project No. A09-0006/Z09-0012**  
**General Plan Land Use Map**

# EXHIBIT D



N



**Project No. A09-0006/Z09-0012**  
**Zoning Map**



# EXHIBIT F



## El Dorado Irrigation District

George A. Wheelton – *President*  
Division 4

George W. Osborne – *Director*  
Division 1

Bill George – *Director*  
Division 3

John P. Fraser – *Vice President*  
Division 2

Harry J. Norris – *Director*  
Division 5

Jim Abercrombie  
*General Manager*

Thomas D. Cumpston  
*General Counsel*

RECEIVED

OCT 09 2009

GENE E. THORNE  
& ASSOCIATES

In Reply Refer To: FIL1009-033

October 6, 2009

Elizabeth Ann Williams, Trustee  
P.O. Box 319  
Citrus Heights, CA 95610-0319

Subject: Facility Improvement Letter (FIL), Pierce Rezone & GPA  
Assessor's Parcel No. 327-140-07 (Diamond Springs)

Dear Ms. Williams:

This letter is in response to your request dated July 31, 2009. This letter is valid for a period of two years. If facility improvement plans for your project have not been submitted to the El Dorado Irrigation District (District) within two years of the date of this letter, a new Facility Improvement Letter will be required.

Design drawings for your project must be in conformance with the District's *Water, Sewer and Recycled Water Design and Construction Standards*.

This project is a commercial development on 4.770 acres. Water service, sewer service, and fire hydrants are requested. The property is within the District boundary. This letter is not a commitment to serve, but does address the location and approximate capacity of existing facilities that may be available to serve your project

### Water Supply

In terms of water supply, as of January 1, 2007, there were 2426 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) available in the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region. Your project as proposed on this date would require 4 additional EDUs of water supply.

### Water Facilities

The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District has determined that the minimum fire flow for this project is 1500 GPM for a two-hour duration while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. According to the District's hydraulic model, the existing system can deliver the required fire flow. In order to provide this fire flow you must construct a water line extension connecting to the 8-inch waterline located on the property to be developed. The hydraulic grade

**A 09-0006/Z 09-0012**

line for the existing water distribution facilities is 1928 feet above mean sea level at static conditions and 1859 feet above mean sea level during fire flow and maximum day demands.

The flow predicted above was developed using a computer model and is not an actual field flow test.

### **Sewer Facilities**

There is a 6-inch gravity sewer line located in Missouri Flat Road. This sewer line has adequate capacity at this time. In order to receive service from this line, an extension of facilities of adequate size must be constructed.

### **Easement Requirements**

Proposed water lines, sewer lines, and related facilities must be located within an easement accessible by conventional maintenance vehicles. When the water lines or sewer lines are within streets, they shall be located within the paved section of the roadway. No structures will be permitted within the easements of any existing or proposed facilities. The District must have unobstructed access to these easements at all times, and does not generally allow water or sewer facilities along lot lines.

Easements for any new District facilities constructed by this project must be granted to the District prior to District approval of water and/or sewer improvement plans, whether onsite or offsite. In addition, due to either nonexistent or prescriptive easements for some older facilities, any existing onsite District facilities that will remain in place after the development of this property must also have an easement granted to the District.

### **Environmental**

The County is the lead agency for environmental review of this project per Section 15051 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA). The County's environmental document should include a review of both offsite and onsite water and sewer facilities that may be constructed by this project. You may be requested to submit a copy of the County's environmental document to the District if your project involves significant off-site facilities. If the County's environmental document does not address all water and sewer facilities and they are not exempt from environmental review, a supplemental environmental document will be required. This document would be prepared by a consultant. It could require several months to prepare and you would be responsible for its cost.

### **Summary**

Service to this proposed development is contingent upon the following:

- ◆ The availability of uncommitted water supplies at the time service is requested
- ◆ Approval of the County's environmental document by the District (if requested)



- ◆ Approval of an extension of facilities application by the District
- ◆ Approval of facility improvement plans by the District
- ◆ Construction by the developer of all onsite and offsite proposed water and sewer facilities
- ◆ Acceptance of these facilities by the District
- ◆ Payment of all District connection costs

Services shall be provided in accordance with El Dorado Irrigation District Board Policies and Administrative Regulations, as amended from time-to-time. As they relate to conditions of and fees for extension of service, District Administrative Regulations will apply as of the date of a fully executed Extension of Facilities Agreement.

If you have any questions, please contact Marc Mackay at (530) 642-4135.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Elizabeth D. Wells".

Elizabeth D. Wells, P.E  
Engineering Manager  
Waste/Recycled Water Engineering Division

EW/MM:sk



Enclosures: System Map

cc: Roger Trout, Director- El Dorado County Development Services Department,  
2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

Rob Combs, Assistant Fire Chief – Fire Marshal, Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire  
Protection District, P.O. Box 741, Diamond Springs, CA 95619-0741

Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc., 4080 Plaza Goldorado Circle,  
Cameron Park, CA 95682-8257





Scale: 1" = 250'

System Map

WARNING: For schematic purposes only. Exact pipe location must be

WATERLINE

DATE: October 2, 2009

Pierce Rezone & GPA

APN: 327-140-07

SYS. No.: 65:23,24

A 09-0006/Z09-0012

# EXHIBIT G



## DIAMOND SPRINGS AND EL DORADO COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 18, 2010

Roger Trout, Director  
El Dorado County  
Development Services  
2850 Fairlane Court, Building C  
Placerville, Ca 95667

RE: Application #A 09-0006 & Z 09-0012

Mr. Trout

The Diamond Springs – El Dorado Community Advisory Committee met on February 18, 2010. During the course of this meeting, application # A 09-0006 & Z 09-0012 were considered under Agenda Item # 1. In examining this application, the Committee reviewed the following:

The project was presented by Kathy Russell on behalf of the Developer / Owner. Committee Member Cunningham expressed concern with the three residential parcels next to the property that will be directly affected. Committee member Smart questioned if the site is a logical commercial area, raising a concern over dead end roads. Ms. Russell's reply was that she was not coming forward with a project. The owners just want to rezone to sell. Generally, the Committee feels they don't have enough information to forward comment. Ms. Russell states she is only asking the Committee to comment as to if it is logical to zone this land commercial. Comments from the public as follows:

**Stephanie Swank, public** – Feels the community wants family entertainment such as an ice rink. Wishes developers would develop existing buildings rather than bare land. Doesn't like a mixed use zoning.

**Jamie Butler, public** – Concerned with negative declarations. Wants large scale planned development rather than piece by piece. Concerned with keeping oak trees and community identity. (Brenda Bailey will be discussing community identity in director items).

10 MAR - 1 AM 11:18  
RECEIVED  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**Richard Boylan, public** – Concerned that Mother Lode Drive will look like Missouri Flat Road with too many commercial properties. This project will have frontage on Mother Lode Drive. Property owners argue Mother Lode has commercial already. Todd Cunningham addresses the Committee stating that the property is on Greenleaf, not Mother Lode and is surrounded by commercial zoning by six of nine properties.

**Sue Taylor, public** – Concerned with general community identity. Doesn't feel there is enough information to make a decision. Hopes the Committee has a plan for community development.

**Chuck Wolf** – Doesn't understand why this project is before the Committee at this time. Concerned that the County is designing around our communities rather than incorporating the communities. Tells Committee they have charge of protecting agricultural and historical identities.

**Debbie Harlow** – Asks why this is before Committee and what the purpose of the Committee is. Committee answers, they are a medium to involve the public.

**Motion:**


Committee Member Cunningham moves to forward the project for rezone and General Plan amendment. The project would be moved with the stipulation that the Developer contact the remaining three residential property owners for comment the aforementioned public comments would be sent to planning as well.

**Comment on Motion:**

Committee Member Bailey states she cannot support negative declarations, not enough information. Committee Member Stroud expresses there is not enough information to make a decision. Roger Trout tells the Committee they only need to decide if this is the correct zone to rezone to. Todd Cunningham repeats his motion to forward to El Dorado County Planning Department for consideration for the general plan and rezone. Requests direct outreach by the property owners to adjoining residential parcels prior to planning and to attach the public comments to the minute order.

**Motion Fails**

Sincerely,



Todd Cunningham  
Secretary

# EXHIBIT H



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

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

**Project Title:** A09-0006/Z09-0012 / Pierce Trust

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

**Contact Person:** Jason R. Hade, AICP, Senior Planner

**Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Nelle Pierce Trust, 6800 Greenleaf Drive, Placerville, CA 95667

**Project Applicant's/Agent's Name and Address:** Elizabeth Ann Williams, P.O. Box 319, Citrus Heights, CA 95610

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:** Gene E. Thorne & Associates, 4080 Plaza Goldorado Circle, Cameron Park, CA 95682

**Project Location:** The subject property is located on the east side of Greenleaf Drive approximately 300 feet south of the intersection with Missouri Flat Road in the Placerville periphery area.

**Assessor's Parcel Number(s):** 327-140-07      **Parcel Size:** 4.77 acres

**Zoning:** One-Acre Residential (R1A)

**Section:** 23      **T:** 10N   **R:** 10E

**General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential (MDR)

**Description of Project:** General Plan Amendment from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Commercial (C) and a Zone Change from One-Acre Residential (R1A) to Commercial – Planned Development (C-PD). No development is proposed at this time. Primary project access would be provided via an existing connection to Greenleaf Drive. Any future development at the project site would be served by public sewer and water provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	R1A	MDR	Residential/Single-Family Residence and Accessory Structures
North:	C/R1A	C	Commercial/Restaurant, Motel, and Single-Family Residences
East:	R1A	C	Commercial/Single-Family Residence
South:	R1A	MDR	Residential/ Single-Family Residences
West:	R1A	MDR	Residential/ Greenleaf Drive

**Briefly Describe the environmental setting:** The project site is bound by a restaurant, motel, and single-family residences to the north, single-family residences to the south and east, and Greenleaf Drive to the west. Elevation of the project site is approximately 1,850 feet above sea level. The site has predominantly moderate slopes and contains mixed oak woodlands. Existing improvements within the parcel include a vacant cabin, a contemporary ranch style residence, sheds, septic tanks, water, power, and a driveway.

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

El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading/Encroachment Permit

El Dorado County Environmental Management Department: Fugitive Dust Plan

CAL FIRE/El Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire District: Fire Safe Plan

El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading/Encroachment Permit  
 El Dorado County Environmental Management Department: Fugitive Dust Plan  
 CAL FIRE/El Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire District: Fire Safe Plan

**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 and Forestry Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology / Soils
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	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: Jason R. Hade Date: 4/1/10  
 Printed Name: Jason R. Hade For: El Dorado County

Signature: Pierre Rivas Date: 4-1-10  
 Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change request. No development is proposed at this time. Any future development would require the submittal of a development plan application with further environmental review.

#### Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within the Placerville Periphery area. The project site is surrounded by a restaurant, motel, single-family residences, and Greenleaf Drive.

#### Project Characteristics

The project would change the site's General Plan land use designation from MDR to C and rezone the site from R1A to C-PD.

##### 1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Primary project access would be provided via an existing connection to Greenleaf Drive. Traffic and parking impacts would be analyzed further upon submittal of a development plan for the subject site.

##### 2. Utilities and Infrastructure

Existing site improvements consist of a vacant cabin, single-family residence, and sheds. The site would be served by public sewer and water provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District. Fire protection services would be provided by the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire District and CAL FIRE.

##### 3. Population

No development is proposed at this time. As such, no population would be added by the request. However, a mixed-use development could be submitted as part of a future development plan application. The mixed-use ordinance permits a maximum density of 16 units per acre in Community Regions. The project site is located within the Diamond Springs/El Dorado Community Region and contains 4.77 acres. As such, approximately 76 units could potentially be constructed under a future development plan application. If that were to occur, such a development plan would add approximately 213 people to the population in the immediate vicinity, assuming 2.8 persons per household.<sup>1</sup>

##### 4. Construction Considerations

No construction is proposed as part of the request.

#### 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 Lead Agency in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency will also determine whether to approve the project.

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

<sup>1</sup> El Dorado County General Plan, July 2004, Chapter 2 Land Use, Table 2-2, Page 19.

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of Mitigation Measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the Mitigation Measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. CEQA Section 15152. Tiering- El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR

This initial study tiers off of the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR (State Clearing House Number 2001082030) in accordance with Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines. The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR is available for review at the County web site at <http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm> or at the El Dorado County Development Services Department located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. All determinations and impacts identified that rely upon the General Plan EIR analysis and all General Plan Mitigation Measures are identified herein. The following impact areas are tiering off the General Plan EIR:

Air Quality  
Biological Resources  
Land Use/Planning  
Noise  
Population/Housing

Any future development would require the project applicant to obtain permits for grading from Development Services and obtain an approved Fugitive Dust Plan from the Air Quality Management District.

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**

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

**Discussion:**

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

- a) **Scenic Vista.** No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway would be affected by this project. No impacts would occur.
- b) **Scenic Resources.** The proposed project would have no impact on existing scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources as the project is not located within a corridor defined as a State scenic highway.
- c) **Visual Character.** No development is proposed at this time. Future development of the site would require the submittal of a development plan application and further CEQA review. All proposed oak tree canopy removal would be consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. No impacts would occur.
- d) **Light and Glare.** The proposed project would have no significant effect or adversely affect day or nighttime views adjacent to the project site. Future development would require the submittal of a preliminary outdoor lighting plan prior to approval to ensure conformance to Section 17.14.170 of County Code. As such, no impacts would occur at this time.

**FINDING:** It has been determined that there would be no impacts to aesthetic or visual resources. Identified thresholds of significance for the “Aesthetics” category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?			X
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
  - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
  - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a) **Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.** Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that no areas of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected by the project. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use map for the project and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.
- b) **Williamson Act Contract.** 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. No impacts would occur.
- c) **Forest land.** There is no forest land at the subject site or within the project area. No impacts would occur.
- d) **Loss of Forest land or Conversion of Forest land.** As there is no forest land at the subject site or within the project area, no loss of forest land or conversion of forest land would occur. As such, no impacts would occur.

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

- e) **Conversion of Prime Farmland or Forest Land.** No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

**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. The surrounding area is developed with residential and commercial development. For this “Agriculture” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, 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 PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
  - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) **Air Quality Plan.** 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 would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of this plan as no development would occur prior to the approval of a development plan application which would require additional environmental review. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Air Quality Standards.** The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that it would have an insignificant impact on air quality as no construction is proposed. Additional air quality analysis would be conducted at the time of a development plan submittal. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- c) **Cumulative Impacts.** No cumulative impacts would occur as no construction is proposed. Additional air quality analysis would be conducted at the time of a development plan submittal. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) **Sensitive Receptors.** The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because no construction would occur. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- e) **Objectionable Odors.** No objectionable odors would occur because no construction would occur. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** As discussed above, no development is proposed at this time. Future development at the subject site would be subject to the submittal of a supplemental air quality analysis to be prepared at time of development plan application submittal to analyze specific potential impacts from the proposed development plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;
- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;

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

- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species; or
  - Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.
- a) **Special Status Species.** No special status species were identified at the subject site. As no development is proposed at this time, specific biological impacts would be further addressed at time of development plan application submittal. No impacts would occur.
  - b) **Riparian Habitat.** The project proposes no impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. As no construction is proposed, no impacts would occur.
  - c) **Wetlands.** According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wetland Inventory Map, no wetlands are located at the project site. As such, no impacts would occur.
  - d) **Migration Corridors.** There are local populations of deer in and around the project area. However, this project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any migratory deer herd habitats as shown in exhibit 5.12-7 of the El Dorado County General Plan EIR and is not considered a refuge as shown by the California Department of Fish and Game Deer Zone Map (Location D-5). No impacts would occur.
  - e) **Local Policies.** The project site is not located within an Important Biological Corridor as designated in the General Plan. Future development of the subject site would require a discretionary planned development application with further CEQA review and would have the option of complying with either Option A or Option B of Policy 7.4.4.4. Impacts would be less than significant.
  - f) **Habitat Conservation Plan.** There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans that are applicable to the subject site. The project site is not in critical habitat or a recovery plan core area for the California Red-Legged Frog. The project site is not in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service recovery plan boundary for the Pine Hill plants. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** There would be less than significant impacts to biological resources, oak trees and/or oak woodland tree canopy because no development is proposed at this time. Future development would require the submittal of a development plan application with additional environmental review. As such, less than significant impacts would occur in the 'Biological Resources' category.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a & b) **Historic or Archeological Resources.** The applicant submitted a “Cultural Resources Study of the Pierce Trust Project Assessor’s Parcel No. 327-140-07 6800 Greenleaf Drive, Placerville, El Dorado County, California 95667” prepared by Historic Resource Associates in August 2009. According to the study, “Following a field investigation of the project area, no historic, prehistoric, or historic archaeological sites, features, or objects were discovered, nor were any significant historic buildings, structures, or objects identified. No further cultural resource investigations are recommended.” (*Cultural Resources Study of the Pierce Trust Project Assessor’s Parcel No. 327-140-07 6800 Greenleaf Drive, Placerville, El Dorado County, California 95667, Historic Resource Associates, August 2009*) No development is proposed at this time so no impacts would result for the proposed project. Future development would be subject to standard conditions of approval concerning cultural resource protection.

c) **Paleontological Resources.** A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or know fossil locales. No impacts would occur as no grading is proposed at this time.

d) **Human Remains.** No construction is proposed at this time so no impacts would occur. For future development, in the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, standard conditions concerning cultural resource protection would be implemented immediately.

**FINDING:** No impacts would occur as no construction is proposed at this time. Standard conditions of approval concerning cultural resource protection would be applied to the future build out of the site under an approved development plan. Established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
iv) Landslides?			X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

**Discussion:**

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

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

a) **Seismic Hazards.** According to the Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas (Jennings, 1994) and the Peak Acceleration from Maximum Credible Earthquakes in California (CDMG, 1992), no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones (Special Studies Zones) are located on the project site. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating structures in the project area would be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.

b) **Soil Erosion.** No grading is proposed at this time. Future development would be subject to the submittal of a grading and drainage report as well as further environmental review. All proposed grading for future development must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.

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

- c) **Geologic Hazards.** As stated in the *Custom Soil Resource Report for El Dorado Area, California*, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the soils on the project site are primarily comprised of three soil types: Auburn very rocky silt loam (2 to 30 percent slopes); Boomer gravelly loam (3 to 15 percent slopes); and Boomer very rocky loam (30 to 50 percent slopes). All future grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
- d) **Expansive Soils.** The erosion hazard for Auburn very rocky silt loam and Boomer gravelly loam is slight to moderate while the erosion hazard for Boomer very rocky loam is high. Expansive soils would be further evaluated during review of the development plan application. Based upon this information, the impact from expansive soils would be less than significant.
- g) **Septic Capability.** Public sewer service would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District as stated in a Facility Improvement Letter dated October 6, 2009. (*Facility Improvement Letter (FIL), Pierce Rezone & GPA Assessor's Parcel No. 327-140-07 (Diamond Springs), El Dorado Irrigation District, October 6, 2009*) No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts would result from geological or seismological anomalies on the project site as no grading is proposed at this time. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that would result in significant impacts. For the "Geology and Soils" category, established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

<b>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X

- a) **Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** The project would not result in the generation of green house gasses (GHGs), which could contribute to global climate change because no construction is proposed at this time. No impacts would occur.
- b) **Conflict with Policy.** The project does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** It has been determined that the project would result in no impacts to greenhouse gas emissions because no construction is proposed. For this "Greenhouse Gas Emissions" category, no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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,			X



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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
  - Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
  - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a) **Hazardous Materials.** No significant amount of hazardous materials would be transported, used, or disposed of for the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Hazardous Materials Release.** No significant amount of hazardous materials would be utilized for the project. Current County records indicate that the subject site is not located within the Asbestos Review Area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Hazardous Materials Near Schools.** As proposed, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school because no construction is proposed at this time. No impacts would occur.

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

- d) **Hazardous Sites.** The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there would be a no impact from hazardous material sites.
- e) **Aircraft Hazards.** *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project would not be subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There would be no impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations and the over-flight of aircraft in the vicinity of the project.
- f) **Private Airstrips.** *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights in the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would occur.
- g) **Emergency Plan.** The proposed project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. This is based upon the location of the nearest fire station, site access, availability of water for fire suppression, and provisions within the County emergency response plan. The County emergency response plan is located within the County Office of Emergency Services in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville. Impacts would be less than significant.
- h) **Wildfire Hazards.** No development is proposed at this time. Future development would require the submittal of a planned development application which would be reviewed at that time by the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District. As such, no impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wild land fires. For this "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded. Future development would require the submittal of a discretionary planned development application and further environmental review to evaluate hazardous materials and fire safe issues.

<b>XI. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
  - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
  - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
  - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
  - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) **Water Quality Standards.** Public sewer service would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District as stated in a Facility Improvement Letter dated October 6, 2009. (*Facility Improvement Letter (FIL), Pierce Rezone & GPA Assessor's Parcel No. 327-140-07 (Diamond Springs), El Dorado Irrigation District, October 6, 2009*) Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Groundwater Supplies.** There is no evidence that the project would reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The proposed project would be required to connect to public water. No impacts would occur.
- c) **Drainage Patterns.** No grading and ground disturbances are proposed. Future development would be required to comply with the standards contained within the *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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

d & e)

**Drainage Runoff.** Drainage impacts would be reviewed prior to development plan approval. No grading is proposed at this time. Therefore, substantial drainage pattern alteration or runoff would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) **Water Quality.** The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area due to construction activities or long-term project operation. Stormwater and sediment control measures outlined by the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* that implement a project specific Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SWMP), the state’s Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Program (SWPPP) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) would be required to be designed with grading and drainage plans. The designs would also include and implement pre- and post- construction Best Management Practices (BMPs), as well as permanent drainage facilities, in order to address the issue of water quality. As a result, there would be a less than significant impact.

g & h)

**Flood-related Hazards.** The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 06017C0775E) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.

i) **Dams/Levees.** The subject property within the Placerville Periphery area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters. No impacts would occur.

j) **Tsunamis.** The proposed project is not located near a coastal area, and therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to tsunamis. No volcanoes or other active volcanic features are near the project site and, therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to mudflows. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** No significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

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

- a) **Established Community.** The project would not result in the physical division of an established community. As proposed, the Commercial General Plan land use designation and zone district would be compatible with the existing and proposed surrounding commercial and residential land uses and would not create land use conflicts with surrounding properties. Future development of the site would require the submittal of a discretionary planned development application to ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Land Use Consistency.** As proposed, the project is consistent with specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use goals, objectives, and applicable policies of the 2004 General Plan including 2.2.5.21, land use compatibility and 2.2.5.3, rezoning evaluation criteria. The zone change request would be consistent with the proposed Commercial General Plan land use designation.

Build-out of the subject site would require the submittal of a planned development application for further discretionary review. This project meets the land use objectives established for the property. As no conflict exists between the project and applicable land use policies, potential environmental impacts would be considered to be less than significant.

- c) **Habitat Conservation Plan.** The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other conservation plan. This condition precludes the possibility of the proposed project conflicting with an adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

**FINDING:** For the “Land Use Planning” section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

- a) **Statewide Mineral Resources.** The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan. No impact would occur.

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

b) **Local Mineral Resources.** The Western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value. No impact would occur.

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

<b>XII. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i></b>				
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?				<b>X</b>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				<b>X</b>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				<b>X</b>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>

**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 & c)

**Noise Exposures and Short-term Noise Increases.** Compliance with General Plan noise thresholds would be determined at time of development plan application submittal when development is proposed. Because no construction is proposed at this time, no impacts would occur.

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

b & d)

**Ground borne Shaking and Long-term Noise Increases.** Persons adjacent to the project vicinity would not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration because no construction is proposed. No impacts would occur.

e) **Public Airport Aircraft Noise.** The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards contained within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport. No impacts would occur.

f) **Private Airport Aircraft Noise.** The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** For this “Noise” category, no impacts would occur as no construction is proposed at this time. Further CEQA review would occur prior to development plan approval.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a,b,c) **Population Growth.** To avoid impacts associated with an increase in population growth potential displacement of housing or residents, General Plan Policy 2.9.1.2 requires that every five years, as part of the General Plan review and update, actions can be taken to decrease forecasted impacts in areas where higher intensity development is found to have a market demand. A recent study conducted by Bay Area Economics in June 2006 concluded that “Based on the actual growth rates within El Dorado County since 2002 compared to the growth projections contained in the Land Use Forecast Report, it appears that the growth assumptions in the Land Use Forecast Report are reliable, and in fact somewhat conservative from an environmental impact standpoint.” No development is proposed at this time. As such, no population would be added by the request. However, a mixed-use development could be submitted as part of a future development plan application. The mixed-use ordinance permits a maximum density of 16 units per acre in Community Regions. The project site is located within the Diamond Springs/El Dorado Community Region and contains 4.77 acres. As such, approximately 76 units could potentially be constructed under a future development plan application. If that were to occur, such a development plan would add



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

approximately 213 people to the population in the immediate vicinity, assuming 2.8 persons per household. Therefore, potential impacts as a result of increased population and displacement of housing or residents would be considered less than significant.

**FINDING:** The project would not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project would not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or expanding infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a) **Fire Protection.** The Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. The Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District would review the development plan application prior to approval. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Police Protection.** The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. No specific minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a



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

ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. Impacts to response times would be analyzed at time of development plan application submittal and would require further CEQA review. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Schools.** The project site is located within the Mother Lode Union School District. The affected school district was contacted as part of the initial consultation process and no comments were received. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) **Parks.** Impacts to parks cannot be evaluated until a development plan application is submitted. There would be no impact.
- e) **Government Services.** No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** Impacts to public services and facilities would be further evaluated upon submittal of a development plan application. No significant public service impacts are expected at this time as no construction is proposed. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>XV. RECREATION.</b>				
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a) **Parks.** No development is proposed at this time. Impacts to recreation would be further analyzed at time of development plan application submittal. No impacts would occur.
- b) **Recreational Services.** The project does not propose any on-site recreation facilities. Further review of this issue would occur at time of development application submittal. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** No impacts to recreation or open space would result from the project. For this “Recreation” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?		X	
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards 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. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			X

**Discussion:**

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

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

a & b)

**Traffic Increases/Level of Service Standards.** General Plan policies, primarily those listed under Goal TC-X, require the developer and the County to review, and if necessary mitigate, the project’s short term traffic impacts. As this is only an amendment and rezone at this point, with no development proposed, it is premature to attempt such an analysis. Impacts for residential use on the surrounding road system were analyzed in the 2004 General Plan Environmental Impact Report but future development may require additional traffic studies if projects exceed thresholds. Comments were received from the Department of Transportation detailing proposed conditions that would apply to future development. Therefore, the conversion to a commercial designation would be consistent with Goal TC-X as it represents an approximate 0.86 percent increase in the Commercially designated land area within Market Area #3 (Diamond Springs) as analyzed in the El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Because no construction is proposed at this time, impacts would be less than significant. Further CEQA review would be required prior to development plan approval.

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

- c) **Air traffic.** The project would not result in a change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity. No impacts would occur.
- d) **Design Hazards.** Design hazards would be reviewed by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation at time of development plan application submittal. No impacts would occur.
- e) **Emergency Access.** The Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District would review emergency access issues at time of development plan application submittal. No impacts would occur as no development is proposed.
- f) **Alternative Transportation.** The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project was sent to the El Dorado County Transit Authority for review and no comments or concerns were received. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** As discussed above, no development is proposed at this time and traffic impacts would be further evaluated at time of development plan application submittal. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;

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

- 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 Requirements.** Public sewer service would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District as stated in a Facility Improvement Letter dated October 6, 2009. (*Facility Improvement Letter (FIL), Pierce Rezone & GPA Assessor's Parcel No. 327-140-07 (Diamond Springs), El Dorado Irrigation District, October 6, 2009*) No impacts would occur.
- b) **Construction of New Facilities.** Public water and sewer service would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District as stated in a Facility Improvement Letter dated October 6, 2009. (*Facility Improvement Letter (FIL), Pierce Rezone & GPA Assessor's Parcel No. 327-140-07 (Diamond Springs), El Dorado Irrigation District, October 6, 2009*) In order to receive water service, the construction of a water line extension connecting to the eight-inch water line located on the property to be developed would be required. Additionally, a District six-inch gravity sewer line located in Missouri Flat Road has adequate capacity at this time to serve future development at the subject site. In order to receive service from this line, an extension of facilities of adequate size would need to be constructed. Impacts from the required facility upgrades and construction would be less than significant.
- c) **New Stormwater Facilities.** All required drainage facilities for future development would need to be built in conformance with the standards contained in the "*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*," as determined by the Department of Transportation. No impacts would occur as no development is proposed at this time.
- d) **Sufficient Water Supply.** As discussed above, public water service would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District as stated in a Facility Improvement Letter dated October 6, 2009. (*Facility Improvement Letter (FIL), Pierce Rezone & GPA Assessor's Parcel No. 327-140-07 (Diamond Springs), El Dorado Irrigation District, October 6, 2009*) As of January 1, 2007, there were 2,426 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) available in the Western/Eastern Water Supply Region. The proposed project would require four EDUs of water supply. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) **Adequate Capacity.** A District six-inch gravity sewer line located in Missouri Flat Road has adequate capacity at this time to serve future development at the subject site. In order to receive service from this line, an extension of facilities of adequate size would need to be constructed. Impacts from the required facility upgrades and construction would be less than significant.
- f) **Solid Waste Disposal.** In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

After July of 2006, El Dorado Disposal began distributing municipal solid waste to Forward Landfill in Stockton and Kiefer Landfill in Sacramento. Pursuant to El Dorado County Environmental Management Solid Waste Division staff,

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

both facilities have sufficient capacity to serve the County. Recyclable materials are distributed to a facility in Benicia and green wastes are sent to a processing facility in Sacramento. Impacts would be less than significant.

- g) **Solid Waste Requirements.** County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the subject site would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space would be available at the site for solid waste collection. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

**Discussion:**

- a) No construction or grading is proposed at this time so impacts would be less than significant. Further CEQA review would occur at time of development plan application submittal. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as "two or more individual effects, which when considered together, would be considerable or which would compound or increase other environmental impacts." Based on the analysis in this study, it has been determined that the project would have a less than significant impact based on the issue of cumulative impacts.
- c) No construction or grading is proposed at this time so impacts would be less than significant. Further CEQA review would occur at time of development plan application submittal. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Development Services Department, Planning Services in Placerville:

2004 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.

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 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, 4719)

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

### **PROJECT SPECIFIC REPORTS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

*Cultural Resources Study of the Pierce Trust Project Assessor's Parcel No. 327-140-07 6800 Greenleaf Drive, Placerville, El Dorado County, California 95667.* Historic Resource Associates, August 2009.

*Custom Soil Resource Report for El Dorado Area, California.* United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), April 17, 2009.

*Facility Improvement Letter (FIL), Pierce Rezone & GPA Assessor's Parcel No. 327-140-07 (Diamond Springs).* El Dorado Irrigation District, October 6, 2009.