

EXHIBIT I



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: P 06-0015/Nelson Parcel Map

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

Contact Person: Roman Anissi, Senior Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Project Owner's Name and Address: Willis Nelson, 3251 Diablo Trail, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Jim Willson, Carlton Engineering,
3883 Ponderosa Road., Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Location: The property is located on the south side of Brandon Road and east of the intersection with South Shingle Road in the Latrobe area.

Assessors Parcel No(s): 087-021-52

Parcel Size: 108-acres

Zoning: Exclusive Agricultural (AE)

Section: 2 & 3 **T:** 8

R: 9

General Plan Designation: Rural Residential (RR)

Description of Project: Request for a tentative parcel map to split a 108-acre lot into a 48-acre and 60-acre parcel.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
North:	AE/RE-10	AL	Grazing Land/Single-family Residences
East:	RA-40	RR	Grazing Land/Single-family Residence
South:	AE	RR	Grazing Land/Vacant
West:	AE	RR/AL	Grazing Land/Single-family Residence

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The elevation of the site ranges between 990 and 1200 feet with gently rolling topography and scattered rock outcroppings. Wetlands account for about 2.68-acres of the site and include a stock pond and intermittent channels. Predominant vegetation on the site includes a mix of grasslands with widely scattered blue, interior, and valley live oaks.

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

El Dorado County: Department of Transportation, Environmental Management and Surveyor

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. The environmental factors checked below contain mitigation measures which reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: November 28, 2006

Printed Name: Roman Anissi, Senior Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: November 28, 2006

Printed Name: Peter Maurer, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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) No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway will be affected by this project.
- b) The project is not located along a defined State Scenic Highway corridor and will not impact scenic resources in such corridors including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources based on the location of the project.
- c) The proposed project will not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The property will continue to provide the natural visual character and quality that currently exists at the site by establishing two large parcels that each exceed 40-acres in lot area.
- d) This two parcel division of land does not propose development that will create substantial light or glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area.

FINDING: No impacts are proposed to aesthetic or visual resources as part of the request for the parcel map. The 'Aesthetics' category is not impacted and adverse environmental effects will not result with the parcel map.

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

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

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			

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) There is no conversion of choice agricultural to nonagricultural lands and there is no impairment of agricultural productivity of agricultural lands. The project is located on a site that has historically been used and is suitable for agricultural grazing. A policy of the General Plan requires that such lands not be reduced below a minimum parcel size of 40-acres. This parcel map meets the minimum 40-acre parcel size.
- b) The parcel map will not reduce available agricultural lands and will continue to provide adequate acreage available for agricultural grazing and similar uses. There is no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) There will be no conversion of existing agricultural farmlands to non-agricultural uses and there is no other changes that could affect the agricultural designation for non-agricultural use. Because this site is classified as historic grazing lands, the reduction of parcels below the 40-acres is not being proposed for this project. This project provides lots that are 48 and 60-acres.

FINDING: This parcel map will have a less than significant impact on agricultural lands and will not impact properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is typical of agricultural uses and large lot single-family residential development. This project will continue to provide adequate grazing lands on parcels that are, at a minimum, 40-acres in size. For the ‘Agriculture’ category, this parcel map will have a less than significant impact.

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

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

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). Activities related to the processing of this parcel map shall create a less than significant impact for air quality. Items are included in the conditions for project approval that require grading and construction activities to implement specific measures such as a Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan and reduction of air pollutants from vehicles and equipment in order to reduce the likelihood of defined particulate in this category.
- b/c) The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of five standard County measures, the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality. As part of the measures, a Fugitive Dust Mitigation plan application must be prepared and submitted to the AQMD prior to the issuance of any grading or construction permit. There are measures are included as conditions of project approval that will maintain any impacts in this category to a level of less than significant.
- d) The El Dorado County AQMD reviewed the project and identified that no sensitive receptors exist in the area and will not be affected by this project.
- e) Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide. The proposed agricultural/residential subdivision will not result in significant impacts resulting from odors.

FINDING: Standard County conditions of approval have been included as part of the project permit to maintain to a less than significant level any impacts for the ‘Air Quality’ category.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			✓
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?		✓	
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?		✓	
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?			✓
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		✓	
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?			✓

Discussion:

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

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

- a) The project proposes no impacts to 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.
- b) 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. The site includes areas that are classified as ponds, intermittent streams and wetlands. The tentative parcel map provides the required 100-foot buffer for the pond and a 50-foot buffer for intermittent streams and wetlands that exist on the

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

property. Any future development must observe these buffer areas or request relief under the provisions of established County policies as adopted by the General Plan.

- c) The project does not proposes impacts to 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. The project site consists of a pond, intermittent steams and wetlands. These areas have been identified on the tentative parcel map, and future development must observe these buffers during any development activity.
- d) The project does not interfere 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?
- e) The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. In the event that a minor amount of qualifying oak tree canopy is affected during road improvements, the applicant must comply with the oak tree canopy protection and replacement requirements of the General Plan. This project is not located within or adjacent to important biological corridors or within any County ecological preserve areas, and any impacts and replacement to oak woodland during road improvements will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources.
- f) The project does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

FINDING: No impacts to potential or listed local, state, or federal biological resources are proposed under the request for a tentative parcel map. In the event that road improvements require removal of any qualifying oak canopy, then a replacement and maintenance plan will be required and must meet the provisions of the adopted General Plan. In addition, the property contains areas classified as pond, intermittent streams and wetlands. Buffers have been established for these areas according to the policies of the General Plan. As such, the impacts in the ‘Biological Resources’ category will remain at a level of less than significant.

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

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:

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

- 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) The applicant submitted an “Archaeological Survey Report for Brandon Station Near the Intersection of South Shingle and Brandon Road APN 087:020:50 and 51 El Dorado County, CA” prepared by Historic Resource Associates in November July 1998. This was prepared for the Certificate of Compliance which legalized the existing lot that is now referenced as APN 087-021-52. The report provides an accurate cultural assessment of the project site. According to the study there were no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, or historic buildings, structures or objects found on the property. The report recommends no additional archaeological work be conducted for this site. Based on the findings, mitigation measures are not require or included and general conditions for project approval are included for accidental subsurface discoveries.

c) 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 known fossil strata/locales.

d) Due to the size of the project area, there is a small likelihood to make an accidental discover of human remains on this site since it is located outside of a dedicated cemetery. Should grading and/or improvements be required and in the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of human remains for this project, conditions for project approval have been added to address necessary procedures for such a discovery. Mitigation measures are not required for this tentative parcel map.

FINDING: This site is located outside of a designated cemetery and the potential to find historic, archaeological, prehistoric, and/or human remains is not likely for this project. By implementing typical discovery procedures as conditions of project approval, any chance of an accidental discovery will be accounted for during grading and improvement activities and impacts to the ‘Cultural Resources’ category will remain at a less than significant level.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			✓
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			✓
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			✓
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			✓
iv) Landslides?			✓
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✓
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			✓

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			
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?		✓	
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?		✓	

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) 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 on the property. Any potential impact that may arise because of future construction of residential or agricultural structures will be offset by compliance with the Uniform Building Code’s seismic and earthquake standards during the building permit review phase. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope and the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant for this project.
- b) Minor project grading may be required. Any future grading activities must comply with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* which will reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- c) Mapped soils in the study area include the Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes; Auburn silt loam 2 to 30 percent slopes; and Sobrante silt loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes. Approximately 95 percent of the study area is mapped as Auburn very rocky silt loam has a moderate permeability, with slow to medium surface runoff and a slight to moderate chance for erosion hazard. This soil is suitable for range type used and has a water holding capacity of 2 to 4 inches. Sobrante silt loam and Auburn silt loam are very limited mapped in the far western corner of the property. The Sobrante silt loam provides moderate soil permeability with a slow to medium surface runoff and a slight to moderate erosion hazard. The water holding capacity is 4 to 7 inches and is typically suitable as range. The Auburn silt loam has similar

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

characteristics as the Auburn very rocky silt loam and is also suitable for range uses. (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). Any project related grading or improvement activity site must comply with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* which will reduce any impacts based on soil erosion or loss of topsoil to a level of less than significant.

- d) According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*, erosion hazard of soils at the subject site is slight to moderate. No expansive soils have been identified on the property. Based on this information, impacts from expansive soils is considered to be less than significant on the property.
- e) All septic areas proposed for future residential development must submit addition septic and percolation testing data to the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division for review and approval.

FINDING: Based on the review of information about the on-site soil conditions, a less than significant level of impact will result from on-site geological or seismological conditions. The site does not contain expansive soils. Impacts in the ‘Geology and Soils’ category will remain at a less than significant level.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			✓
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?			✓
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, 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?			✓
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?			✓
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?			✓
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓
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?		✓	

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

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) Any hazardous materials used at the project site shall comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*.
 - b) No significant amount of hazardous materials will be used for the project. The project will not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
 - c) As proposed, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. There are no schools located within the quarter mile radius.
 - d) The project site is not identified on any list that has been compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 which identifies hazardous material sites near this project site. There will be no impact from hazardous material at this location.
 - e) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the property is not located within two miles of a public airport. The project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan and there are no impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations that includes continued over-flight of aircraft near the site.
 - f) *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.
 - g) The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. This is based on the location of the nearest fire station, availability of multiple access points to the project site, availability of water for fire suppression and provisions within the County emergency response plan. The County emergency response plan is overseen by the County Sheriff's Department and they are located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.
 - h) The El Dorado County Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and concluded that the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area.

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

FINDING: The proposed project will not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and/or will not expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires. For the ‘Hazards and Hazardous Materials’ category, the impacts will remain at a level of less than significant for this project.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			✓	
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)?			✓	
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?				✓
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?				✓
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?				✓
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				✓
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?				✓
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓
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?				✓
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓

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;

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

- 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) Any grading or improvement plans that may be required by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation shall be prepared to conform to County of El Dorado *Design and Improvement Standards Manual*, the *Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, the *Drainage Manual*, and the *Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance*. All stormwater and sediment control methods must meet the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* during all grading and improvement activities, including but not limited to implementation of permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures that may be required for this project.
- b) There is no evidence that the project will substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. El Dorado County Environmental Management reviewed and approved the hydrogeologic study for this project which identifies a safe and reliable domestic water source for the 48-acre and 60-acre parcel to be created by the tentative parcel map.
- c) There is no evidence that grading or ground disturbance that may be required for this project will substantially alter the existing drainage patterns either on- or off- the project site. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to the drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). These standards apply to this project.
- d/e) Compliance with the standards and requirements contained within *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* will limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site, and will limit erosion and siltation to a less than significant level.
- f) The project will not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all grading and/or improvement activities, and shall be implemented with the development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures should they be required for this project.
- g/h) The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0725C, December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain.
- i) The subject property in the Latrobe 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.
- j) There is no potential for impacts from seiche or tsunami, or from mudflow at this site.

FINDING: For the ‘Hydrology and Water Quality’ category, the parcel map will not have a significant impact on any of the categories of listed in this section and the level of impact will remain at a less than significant level.

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

IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Physically divide an established community?				✓
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?				✓
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓

Discussion:

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

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

- a) The project will not result in the physical division of an established community.
- b) As proposed, the project is consistent with specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use goals, objectives, and policies of the 2004 General Plan. The parcel map is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and local subdivision policies. Future development must meet the standards established by the Exclusive Agricultural (AE) zone district including special agricultural protection setbacks pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 17.06.150 and General Plan policies. In addition, 100-foot buffers for wetlands and 50-foot buffers for intermittent streams are included on the tentative parcel map and are referenced in the staff report. Future development must remain outside of these buffers. This project meets the land use objectives established for the property.
- c) As discussed in Section IV ‘Biological Resources’, the request for a parcel map will not affect any biological resources, and the proposal will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

FINDING: For the ‘Land Use Planning’ category, approval of the tentative parcel map will have a less than significant impacts.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				✓
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource				✓

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

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			

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) 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.
 - b) 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.

FINDING: No impacts to any known mineral resources will occur as a result of the project and no mitigation is required. The 'Mineral Resources' category will not be affected and no impacts are proposed by the project.

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		✓	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		✓	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓	
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?			✓
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?			✓

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL;
- 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) The project will not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels for the project vicinity. The creation of two parcels where one exists will not generate noise levels that exceed the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 of the General Plan. The 200-foot special agricultural setback along South Shingle Road addresses the recommended 100-foot vehicular noise setback that is identified within the Land Capability Report. Existing development does not encroach within any 200-foot agricultural protection setbacks and any future development must also observe these setbacks. Noise is addressed by the tentative parcel map and will not be a factor for this project.

b/d) Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of minor grading and improvement activities or upon completion of the project.

f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards established by an adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan. No such impacts will result based on excessive noise from a public airport.

g) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport.

FINDING: For the ‘Noise’ category, there are no significant effects that are created with the approval of the tentative parcel map and the impacts within this category will remain at a less than significant level.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

- a) The proposed project has been determined to have a minimal growth-inducing impact as the project includes the creation of two parcels where one currently exists. No residential development is proposed with the parcel map and all existing development and future development meet or will be required to meet established County development standards. Any future development must meet comprehensive County policies and regulations before building permits can be issued. The project does not include any school or large scale employment centers that will lead to indirect growth.
- b) No existing housing stock will be displaced by the proposed project.
- c) No persons will be displaced by approving the tentative parcel map and construction of replacement housing will not be required for this project.

FINDING: The project will not displace any individuals and will not remove existing housing. The project will not directly or indirectly induce a substantial growth in population by process of a two parcel subdivision of land. There will be a less than significant impact to the ‘Population and Housing’ category.

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

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

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

- Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.
- a) **Fire Protection:** The Latrobe Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Latrobe Fire District from meeting its response times for the project or the designated Latrobe service area. Building Services shall review any future request for building permits to ensure that proper Fire Safe Standards for access and fire safety are included for future residential single-family or accessory structures.
 - b) **Police Protection:** The project site will 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 ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The creation of two parcels where one currently exists will not significantly impact current response times to the project area.
 - c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Latrobe School District. The tentative parcel map was sent to the affected school district for review and comment. No specific comments or mitigation measures were received or included for this tentative parcel map that creates an incremental increase in student body. School impact fees will be assessed and collected during the building permit review phase for any future single-family residential unit.
 - d) **Parks:** The proposed project adds an incremental amount to the existing population and does not propose any substantial increase in the local population requiring development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. For this project, the parcel map includes a condition of approval that requires in-lieu payment for park fees consistent with the procedures outlined within Section 16.12.090.
 - e) No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the project.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project and there is no potential for a significant direct or indirect impact due to the creation of two parcels where one currently exists. There is a less than significant level of impact in the ‘Public Services’ category.

XIV. RECREATION.			
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓
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?			✓

Discussion:

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

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 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) By creating two large parcels where one currently exists, no significant increase or effects in the use of area wide neighborhood or regional parks will be experienced by approving the tentative parcel map. There is no potential for a substantial physical deterioration of neighboring or regional recreational facilities.
- b) The project does not propose any on-site recreation facilities and is not required to construct any new facilities or expand any existing recreation facilities with the scope of this project.

FINDING: No impacts to recreation or open space will result from the project. For the 'Recreation' category, there will be a less than significant impact.

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

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

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

- 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) County Department of Transportation has determined that the project will not generate a significant level of trips to require a traffic study or mitigation. Approval of the proposed parcel map would result in the creation of two parcels allowing for a maximum density of a main and a secondary unit per parcel. Each parcel shall provide for fire safe access and shall be accessible along the Brandon Road frontage. All access rights on South Shingle Road shall be waived with the recording of the final parcel map. Road improvements and dedications are included and have been assessed under with the Initial Study. Road improvements of 32-feet of road and 8-feet of shoulder improvements on South Shingle Road and 12-feet of road and 4-feet of shoulder improvements on Brandon Road are recommended by the Department of Transportation. Any anticipated impacts to oak woodland canopy is accounted for an will meet the provisions of the General Plan for oak woodland protection during the processing of any required grading or improvement plan. A condition addressing this issue has been added to the project permit.
 - b) Approval of this tentative parcel map and the creation of the each new parcel will accommodate potential residential density of one main and one secondary unit per parcel. The proposed density will not have a significant traffic and/or circulation impact to either South Shingle or Brandon Roads.
 - c) The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity.
 - d) The area is typical of low-density residential in a rural/agricultural setting. Large lots exist and are currently used for low density residential supporting agricultural activities. Under the current request, this project will require that the access right along the South Shingle Road frontage be waived. Full improvements on both the South Shingle Road and Brandon Road frontages are also required to meet the County design standards. Based on the required standards, this project does not and will not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, and will not include incompatible uses by the process of this tentative parcel map.
 - e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access to any potential residential structure. Any future residential project shall be reviewed by Building Services and shall be required to provide adequate access onto each new parcel from Brandon Road that will be designed to County Fire Safe and/or Department of Transportation standards.
 - f) Future development shall be required to meet on-site parking identified by use and Zoning Ordinance. Section 17.18.060 regulates the parking provisions and all on-site uses shall include and identified required parking at all times pursuant to the policies established by ordinance. Future requests for building permits shall be reviewed for conformance with parking during the review process. Parking requirements for conventional single-family detached homes are two spaces not in tandem.
 - g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The parcel map includes a 100-foot easement to be dedicated from the centerline of the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor with the process of this parcel map. The dedication meets the requirements established by the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor Master Plan and shall provide continued opportunities for future rail (or similar) transportation extensions into the area along this corridor.

FINDING: For the ‘Transportation/Traffic’ category, processing a two parcel map have been found to create no major impacts. The impacts within this category will remain at a level of less than significant for the project.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a) No significant wastewater discharge or surface run-off will result from the proposed parcel map.
- b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed and none are required because of this project.
- c) On-site stormwater drainage facilities may be required on-site to reduce runoff to discharge levels. Any future request for a residential single-family unit, grading, or improvement plans will be required to show illustrate how the discharge levels of the site will not exceed the discharge levels that existed prior to development activities. All required drainage facilities shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the *County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*.

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

- d) The applicant proposes to supply water to the two new parcels with on-site wells. A land capability report and a hydrogeologic study was prepared and submitted for review. Environmental Management staff identified that the report provided adequate information and that a safe and reliable water source by drilling wells on the project site is feasible and available for both parcels. Any future residential development shall be reviewed by the Building Services and appropriate reviewing disciplines to ensure that the well designs meet established County design standards.
- e) A land capability report was reviewed and accepted by Environmental Management. The two parcels are able to provide adequate areas for on-site septic treatment and disposal. Future residential development shall be reviewed by Building Services during the building permit review phase to ensure that septic areas are established to County design standards.
- f) 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. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.
- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the proposed lots will be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space is available at the site for solid waste collection.

FINDING: A less than significant impact to utility and service systems from existing or anticipated development is proposed and for the “Utilities and Service Systems” category, the impacts will remain at a level of less than significant for the tentative parcel map.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:			
a. Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			✓
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)?			✓
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			✓

Discussion:

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

- a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the whole record that the project will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project does not have the potential to 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 California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project will be less than significant due to existing standards and requirements imposed in the conditioning of this project.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as “two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Based on the analysis in this initial study, it has been determined that the project will not result in cumulative impacts.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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

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)

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.)

Archaeological Survey Report for Brandon Station near the Intersection of South Shingle and Brandon Road APN 087:020:50 and 51 El Dorado County, CA, July 1998. Historic Resource Associates.