

**EXHIBIT N**



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** P06-0040, Miller 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:** Roger Miller, 5101 Miners Valley Road, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

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

**Project Location:** East side of Miners Valley Road 0.25 mile east of the intersection with Salmon Falls Road in the Salmon Falls area.

**Assessors Parcel No(s):** 104-500-11      **Parcel Size:** 20.18 acres

**Zoning:** Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10)    **Section:** 19 & 30    **T:** 11N    **R:** 9E

**General Plan Designation:** Rural Residential (RR)

**Description of Project:** Tentative parcel map creating two (2) parcels ranging in size from 10.0 acres to 10.18 acres.

**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:	RE-10	RR	Vacant
East:	RE-10	RR	Vacant
South:	RE-10	RR	Vacant
West:	RE-10	RR	Vacant

**Briefly Describe the environmental setting:** The site elevation ranges between 900 and 1,100 feet on a lot that tapers from the high point near the northeast corner of the to a low point is near the Miners Valley Road easement on the west. About 27 percent of this property comprises of slopes 30 percent and steeper. The entire property is within an Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay and the Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1. Most of the property comprises of gabbro soils. Oak woodland tree canopy covers less than one-percent of the property with only one valley and one interior live oak located on site. The site is mostly covered with open oak grasslands.

A dammed pond is located mostly off-site but touches a corner of the northwest property near Miners Valley Road. The pond is part of and is within Peacock Ravine. Two intermittent wetlands exist on this property. One is a formal drainage channel and enters the property midway on the eastern property line flowing in a westerly direction off site. This drainage passes under an existing culvert located beneath the driveway serving the existing residence. The second drainage is less significant and is classified as a swale located near the south property line flowing in a similar east to west direction off site.

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

El Dorado County: Department of Transportation, El Dorado County Fire Prevention District, Environmental Management/Health, Air Quality Management District, and County Surveyor. El Dorado Irrigation District.

**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: April 11, 2007

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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 11, 2007

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**

<b>I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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 by keeping the scenic areas of the property intact.
- 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 this project. The ‘Aesthetics’ category is not impacted and environmental effects will not result in this category with this project.

<b>II. AGRICULTURE 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?			✓
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
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> <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 within an area that is largely designated for estate residential development..
- b) This project will not reduce available agricultural lands and will continue to promote the 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 are no other changes that could affect an agricultural designation for non-agricultural use.

**FINDING:** This project will have no impact on agricultural lands and will not impact properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding properties are mostly vacant with some developed with single-family residences on larger estate lots. For the 'Agriculture' category, the tentative parcel map will have no impact.

<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> <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?			✓
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓

**Discussion:**

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

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) 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<sub>x</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>). County records indicate that this property is not located within the asbestos review area. Activities related to the processing of this tentative parcel map will create a less than significant impact on air quality because project conditions will require grading and construction activities to implement a Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan (FDMP) in order to limit dust emission during construction activities. As a result, this project does not conflict with and does not obstruct the implementation of the County’s air quality plan.
- b/c) The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of standard AQMD measures, the project would have a less than significant impact on air quality. As part of the conditions for project approval, an application for a Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan (FDMP) must be submitted to the AQMD prior to the issuance of any grading or construction permits. As a result, there will be a less than significant impact in these categories.
- d) The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and identified that no sensitive receptors exist in the area. No such receptors will 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. As a result, this two-parcel split will create a less than significant impact onto the environment from odors.

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

<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
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			✓	

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

<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
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 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. The project comprises of gabbro soils and is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1. The Biological Resources Evaluation Report prepared by Ruth Willson in June 2006 identifies no rare plants on the property and the report along with the project exhibits were sent to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G) who provided a January 2, 2007 response letter identifying that they agreed with the results of that evaluation. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G) identified that the payment of in-lieu fees for impacts within Mitigation Area 1 is adequate for the project. Such payments shall be assessed during the review of building permits and based on the County fee policies and schedule for any future residential development. The biological evaluation also provided additional information about the sites potential of comprising five state and/or federally listed species within nearby wetlands adjacent to the pond and/or potentially the drainage channel. The species that may exist near these wetland areas include the California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, Little willow flycatcher, Stebbin’s morning glory, and Layne’s butterweed. However, because development remains outside of the recommended 125-foot pond and

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

60-foot drainage channel buffer identified on the site plan and recommended by the biologist, there is no chance that any potential habitat will be impacted by this project. The biologist’s evaluation and follow-up statement letters also identified that the required improvements of 18 feet plus 4 feet of shoulder for the off-site section of road over the dam section and a portion of the on-site section extending from the dam just past the existing utility vault, will not have the potential to impact habitat or sensitive resources. The biologist’s conclusions identify no impacts even though the improvements for this section of road occur within the recommended buffer areas. As a result, there will be a less than significant impact within this category.

- b) The project proposes a less than significant impact 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 (CDF&G) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The site consists of a small portion of the pond that is located along Peacock Ravine and two drainages. As noted in item #a above, habitat for certain species exists near the wetland areas. However, the buffers established for development on parcel A and/or B, and the evaluation provided for this project by Mr. Ruth Willson have determined that no impacts will occur to such wetlands, riparian habitat, or sensitive natural communities described in this category with the approval of this project. This includes any impacts from on- and off-site road improvements that will be required for the project, particularly the 18-foot plus 4-feet of shoulder for the off-site section of road over the dam section and a portion of the on-site section extending from the dam just past the existing utility vault. In addition, any future grading and/or construction plans for this project must include in the design of a project Best Management Practices (BMPs) in order to limit run-off and erosion during pre- and post- construction activities away from any areas identified as sensitive by the project. As a result, there will be a less than significant impact based on the elements of this project to any items listed in this category.
  
- c) The project does not propose 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. As noted in section #a and #b in this category above, the only waters of the US is the pond and Peacock Ravine that contributes water to the pond and beyond. The Supreme Court judgment in the case of Rapanos v. United States (June 2006) made that classification binding. However, that decision did not include the two drainage channels in the classification. The project was forwarded to the US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) for comments about the remaining two on-site drainage channels and the project as they relate to jurisdictional wetlands. The US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) did not respond. Regardless, the biologist recommends the implementation of a 125-foot buffer from the pond and 60-foot buffer from the drainage channel in order to maintain the level of impact within this category below a level of significance even with the road improvements that are required within the established wetland buffers. The biologist did not recommend any buffers for the minor drainage along the southern part of the property; however, since no development is included in that area, there is no reason to include any buffers for that drainage for this project. Consultations and/or permits from the US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) may be necessary should dam improvements be required based on the tests required to ensure dam stability. As a result, there will be a less than significant impact within this category.
  
- d) The project is located in the Salmon Falls area and consists of an Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay. The biological evaluation prepared for this project does not identify a specific migration corridor for animals or birds and does not identify any associated sensitive resources as being impacted by this project. As such, the parcel map and subsequent development of one additional unit will not impede the pattern of migration for any such animal or bird species, or impact any highly sensitive species or oak tress within Important Biological Corridor (IBC) designated land. Since a large proportion of both parcels A and B will continue to remain undeveloped and unencumbered by structures, the property will promote the free range that currently exists for migrating animals and/or birds in the area should any exist. As recommended by the biological evaluation, a condition is added to the project permit that would limit the type of fencing proposed for any future residential development to fence types that are open and those that will allow the free



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

migration of animals or birds in this area without hindering their path of travel. As a result, there will be a less than significant impact in this category with this project.

- e) The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the oak tree and oak woodland canopy preservation policy or ordinance. The two on-site oak trees shall be retained in place and there will be no impacts on such canopy as a result of any improvements required for this project. Although no rare plant species were found on the property, in-lieu fees for development within Mitigation Area 1 will be assessed during the building permit review phase in order to address County policies for development within this mitigation area. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G) also supported this payment option via a January 2, 2007 letter received about the issue. There will be a less than significant impact in this category.
- e) The project does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The County’s Habitat Conservation Plan is currently being developed; however, this project meets the goals of the interim guidelines that have been established for various sensitive elements anticipated for the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). These include elements of the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay, oak woodland preservation, rare plants and special-status species, and wetland preservation with the goal to preserve and protect sensitive natural resources within the County. No sensitive resources within the IBC being are being affected by this project. The two oak trees that exist on the property will be kept in place and will not be removed. The Mitigation Area 1 in-lieu fees address Rare Plant issues, although the biological evaluation identified that no such plants exist on the property. Finally, in conjunction with pre- and post-construction BMPs, the buffers established for the pond and channelized drainage provide adequate separation between development and improvements so that no impacts would occur within sensitive wetland areas with site and/or road improvements. The biological evaluation, additional biological information, and project specific design identify an appropriate level of evaluation and sensitivities in order to consider potential impacts. Within this category, there will be a less than significant level of impact for this project.

**FINDING:** There will be a less than significant impact to listed local, state, or federal biological resources with this project because none exists and/or wetland buffers are established to protect such resources from future development. There will be a less than significant impact to recognized or defined jurisdictional waters of the US, wetlands, or watercourses because the project establishes appropriate buffers and setbacks from such areas. The analysis and statements made by the project biologist and the design of the project provides adequate information that illustrate how this project does not impact sensitive site resources such as those within the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay, oak woodlands, rare plants, and/or wetland areas. Future development must incorporate proper pre- and post- construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) in the design of grading and/or construction plans that will further reduce the level of run-off into any of the sensitive wetland areas. As a result, there will be a less than significant level of impact within the ‘Biological Resources’ category with this project.

<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> <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?				✓

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

<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>			
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:

- 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 a ‘Cultural Resources Study for APN 104-500-11, North of Salmon Falls’ dated June 2006 for this project. The study provides an overview of the property and assesses the likelihood of findings subsurface archaeological and/or paleontological resources. Although the study identified an earthen mining ditch that has been recorded with the Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation of the State of California, the historian identified that the level of significance of the resource does not constitute any further action or protection of the ditch. In addition, the information provided identifies that although there have been discoveries made off site around the property, near Peacock Ravine, and between the property and a distance of one-half a mile away that no such discoveries were made on-site and that there is a less than likely chance that any such cultural resources exist on the property. As such, the potential for discovery any cultural, archaeological and/or paleontological resources is unlikely based on the recommendations included in the study. Based on these findings, no additional subsurface studies will be necessary and typical project conditions have been added to the project permit to address accidental 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 and the limited area on which improvements will occur for grading and/or construction activities for a new residential structure and driveway on the new parcel 2 and road improvements, it is unlikely that an accidental discovery of human remains would occur on this site. This property is not within an area that has been found to have a dedicated cemetery. Future grading, improvement, and/or construction activities will need to observe the required accidental subsurface discoveries procedures that have been established for this project.

**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. By implementing typical discovery procedures as conditions in the project permit, any chance of an accidental discovery will be accounted for during grading and/or improvement activities and impacts to the ‘Cultural Resources’ category will remain at a level that is less than significant for this project.

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

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> <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 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*

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

*Maximum Credible Earthquakes in California* (CDMG, 1992), this project is not located within an active fault buffer of a nearby fault line that is identified by the Earthquake Fault Zone (Special Study Zones). Impacts and disturbance from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure are not likely to occur at this property should such activity occur. Any potential impact that may arise will be offset because all future structures must be designed to meet the Uniform Building Code’s Seismic IV standards for earthquakes as it relates to fault lines and/or fault ruptures. Because of the Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes (AxD) soil type on which the future residence is proposed on parcel A, impacts from liquefaction are somewhat likely because the erosion factor is slow to moderate. By implementing County grading design practices and standards into the overall design of the project, there will be a less than significant impact from liquefaction for this project. The project site consists of areas where slopes in excess of 30-percent grade exist; however, these are isolated incidents and the average slope of the property is in the 20-percent category. Overall, impacts within this category will remain at a level that is less than significant because of proper site design.

- b) Minor project grading will be required for the road and driveway improvements and for improving the pad area for the new residential structure on parcel A. Each of the new parcels will comprise of 10-acres in area so run-off and erosion of any portion of the property will be less than significant based on parcel size alone. The location of the new home on parcel A will direct residential buildings to the more stable Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes (AxD) soil which consists of a slow to moderate surface run-off factor. There is a less than significant likelihood of erosion from run-off on this soil based on constructing the new home and related improvements. In addition, because future grading and/or improvement activities must comply with the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* to include the implementation of pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) all grading and development activities associated to this project will have a less than significant level of impact within this category.
- c) The mapped soil on the area of the property where future residential development will occur mostly consists of Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes (AxD) and Rescue very stony sandy loam, 30 to 50 percent slopes (RfE). Only about 5 percent of AxD soil exists and future residential development anticipates development to occur on this more stable soil type. The septic areas expect to drain onto the adjacent RfE and the driveway will be partially graded into the RfE classification that covers about 30 percent of the property. The RfE is appropriate for both of these required improvements. The remainder of the driveway leading to Miners Valley Road will occur mostly on the Rescue sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes (ReD) which covers about 60 percent of the property. Less than 5 percent of the site is classified as Auburn silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes (AwD) which is located near the pond. The AxD is classified as gently to moderately steep with outcrops of bedrock. The permeability of this soil is moderate and the potential of surface run-off is slow to moderate and is the preferred location for future residential structures. The RfE soil type where septic disposal and a portion of the driveway will occur is suitable for these types of improvements because this classification has a slow to very rapid run-off capability, and erosion hazard is slight to very high. The remainder of the driveway and road improvements will occur on the ReD soil, which has medium to rapid surface run-off where the erosion hazard is high. (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). Because the project directs development to the more appropriate soils and by requiring a future construction activities to implement the requirements established by the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*, this project will have a less than significant impact based on soil erosion and related elements identified in this category.
- d) According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*, erosion hazard of soils at the property is slight to high. However, there are no expansive soils identified on the property and development directs future residential development to the most stable soils on-site, while the soils that have the potential higher erosion hazard will be developed with septic and/or road improvements. Based on this information, impacts from expansive soils is considered to be less than significant for this project and future buildings will be constructed to meet UBC Seismic IV standards on the more stable AxD soil in order to reduce impacts within this category to a less than significant level.

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

- e) All septic areas proposed for future residential development must submit additional septic and percolation test data to the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, however, this department reviewed and accepted a Wastewater Disposal Study for this project and determined that there is adequate soils for septic areas on the property. The Environmental Management Health Division will review final septic disposal information during the building permit review phase to ensure that the septic design meets County standards for residential development on the new parcel A.

**FINDING:** Based on the review of information about the on-site soil conditions, a less than significant level of impact will result from any geological or seismic conditions that could have the potential to affect this property. The correct type of improvement for permanent structures, septic disposal area, and road improvements will occur on the appropriate soil types, as outlined above. In addition, future reviews of grading, building, and/or construction plans will include grading design and shall implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Uniform Building Code (UBC) Seismic IV construction standards in order to reduce potential impacts in the ‘Geology and Soils’ category to a level that is less than significant for this project.

<b>VII. 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?			✓	
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?			✓	

**Discussion:**

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

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

- 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*. Related future development to include road and the driveway and residence on parcel A is not expected to include hazardous materials in preparing the site for development or in the construction of buildings and related structures. There is a less than significant level of impact within this category.
  - 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. There is a less than significant level of impact within this category.
  - 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. There are no impacts within this category.
  - 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. There are no impacts within this category.
  - 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 Sherriff'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 and found 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. New residential development on either property will require installation of a sprinkler system with a 3,000-gallon water storage tank in order to provide protection from potential fire hazards.

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 because a fire sprinkler system shall be installed to protect any future and new residential structures built on parcels A or B. For the ‘Hazards and Hazardous Materials’ category, any potential impacts experienced by this project will remain below a level of significance.

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
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:

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

- 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) Any grading or improvement plans submitted for review prior to commencement for this project will be reviewed by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation engineering staff, Planning Services, and Building Services to ensure that such plans are prepared in conformance with the 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 plans will be prepared to address stormwater and sediment control methods and must be prepared to meet the County’s *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, that also consider Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards. Such plans will include grading design elements required for pre- and post- construction BMPs in order to address run-off, erosion control and siltation. As a result, there will be a less than significant impact in this category.
- b) The County Environmental Management reviewed the Well Production Data report and an update letter to that report dated November 27, 2006 that was submitted by Carlton Engineering. The information was reviewed and accepted as sufficient by the County’s Environmental Management Department. That information provided specifics about the adequacy of the groundwater supply to serve the site based on the intent of the policies of the General Plan and the ‘Interim Guidelines for (septic and water wells) for Tentative Parcel Maps and Subdivisions’ dated September 7, 2006. The guidelines require that a test well provide at least 5-gallons of water per minute for a period of 24-hours in order to satisfy the requirement. The information provide by Carlton Engineering identified that the existing well on the property reported a yield of 60-gallons per minute at the time the well was originally drilled and that seven other wells have adequate water capability to support existing development. The letter and report concluded that there is sufficient water in the area to supply the new parcel A, including the water required for the fire sprinkler system and the 3000-gallon water storage tank. A project condition will require that a well be installed on parcel A prior to the recording of the final parcel map and the effects of this project in this category will remain below a level of significance for this project.
- c) There is no evidence that grading or ground disturbance that will 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 and there is a condition added to the project that will require that all construction activities meet County grading standards, to include implementation of pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the project.
- d/e) Compliance with the standards and requirements contained within *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* considers the requirements established by the RWQCB and will limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site. As such, there will be limited erosion and siltation resulting from this project, and the level of impact within this category remains below a level of significance for this project.
- f) The project will not result in a substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity. Adequate buffers from the drainage channel and the ponds are established on each of the newly created parcels A and B. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be implemented into grading and/or improvement design and activities. These methods as well as those



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

standards established by the County to limit run-off considers Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements and shall be implemented into the design of plans and during construction activities. This will address pre- and post-construction run-off of any future development on the property and may include the design and implementation of facilities such as permanent storm and/or drainage facilities and erosion control measures that will be required when future development is proposed for this project. Impacts within this category will be less than significant.

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 property is located in the Rural Region north of El Dorado Hills near the Salmon Falls area. Construction of the new home on parcel A is directed to a much higher elevation than any watercourse and there are no dams or levees above this property that would have the potential to affect new development on the property. A project conditions included in permit will require the applicant to survey the existing dam to ensure that the structural integrity of the dam where road improvements will occur is intact and/or make appropriate improvements so that the integrity meets County design standards. This will reduce the likelihood that this dam located just northwest of the property will fail to a level that is less than significant. Regardless, the dam and the existing pond do not supply enough water to create any flood hazards for properties downstream or for the proposed development on parcel A. As such, the impacts within this category will remain below a level of significance for this project.

j) There is a less than significant potential for impacts from seiche or tsunami, or from mudflow at this site.

**FINDING:** For the ‘Hydrology and Water Quality’ category, the tentative parcel map will not have a significant impact on any of the categories listed in this section and impacts associated to this project will remain below a level of significance.

<b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
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

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

- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a) The project will not result in the physical division of an established community. The request for a tentative parcel map is consistent with the policies established by the General Plan and is consistent with the established land use pattern of the neighboring area.
  - b) As proposed, the project is consistent with specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted 2004 General Plan. The creation of two parcels where only one exists considers the required development standards of the existing RE-10 zone and the RR land use designation by providing a minimum parcel size of 10-acres for each parcel A and B. There are no deviations from development standards of the zone or goals of the plan proposed or required for this project. Any future residential development on either of the two new parcels shall be designed to meet the requirements of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and local subdivision policies. All related setbacks and septic disposal areas are designed to meet County requirements and adequate buffers have been implemented in the design of the project to protect sensitive site resources in order to meet County policies and standards. This project meets the land use objectives established for this property and impacts within this category remain below a level of significance.
  - c) As discussed in Section IV ‘Biological Resources’, this project will have a less than significant impact on 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, project related impacts associated to the tentative parcel map application will remain at a level that is less than significant.

<b>X. 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?				✓
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?				✓

**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

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

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 the 'Mineral Resources' category will not be affected.

<b>XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:</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. 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?				✓

**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.

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 during development. There will be no such noise when

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

the project is completed. The temporary noise during construction activities will cease once the project improvements have been made.

- 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 (CLUP). 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 will be a less than significant level of noise impacts associated to this project.

<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> <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:

- 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 because of the creation of two parcels where only one exists. All future residential development associated to this project must meet established County development standards and must pay project related impacts fees to address the added residential development on parcel A. These include traffic related impacts fees, park and public facilities impacts fees, school impact fees, and other fees, as required by the County’s Building Services and affected County agencies. Any future development must meet comprehensive County policies and regulations before grading and/or building permits can be issued. The project does not include any school or large-scale employment centers and will not induce growth typically associated to these two factors.
- b) No existing housing stock will be removed with this project and no replacement housing will be necessary with the approval of the tentative parcel map.
- c) No persons will be displaced by approving the tentative parcel map and the development of replacement housing will not be required for or as a result of this project.

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

**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 within the ‘Population and Housing’ category.

<b>XIII. 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?			✓	
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
  - Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.
- a) **Fire Protection:** The El Dorado County Fire Protection District operates 13 fire stations and covers a service area of 281 square mile protecting a population of about 46,100 residents. The district provides fire protection and suppression, as well as emergency medical services for a variety of rural and higher density housing, public/private schools and businesses, senior housing, mobile home parks, and convalescent hospitals. The district has agreements with some of the regional fire districts, as well as the California Department of Forestry and the US Forest Service to provide additional fire protection service when necessary. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services with fire protection provided by the Pilot Hill Station #73 located about 3 miles north of the property. In addition, the installation of a fire sprinkler system and a 3000-gallon water storage tank for any new residential development will add to the level of available fire protection for the project. Building Services and Fire District staff will review any future requests for building permits to ensure that proper Fire Safe Standards for access and fire safety are included in the design of residential single-family and/or accessory structures on the property.

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

- 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 Sheriff’s response times to the project area.
- c) **Schools:** The Black Oak Mine Unified School District provides public high school services for area residents. 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 project 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 on parcel A.
- 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, a condition has been added to the permit that requires in-lieu payment for Quimby fees, which is consistent with the policies of the General Plan and County Subdivision Section 16.12.090 to assist with the acquisition of parklands within the County.
- 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.

<b>XIV. 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. 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:

- 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.

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

- a) By creating two 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 this project. 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. Quimby fees for the acquisition of parklands will be assessed during the process of the final parcel map.

**FINDING:** There is a less than significant impact to recreation or open space as a result from the project. For the 'Recreation' category, there will be a less than significant impact.

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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
- 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 project would result in the creation of two parcels allowing for

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

density of a main unit and a potential secondary unit on each newly created parcel. Each parcel shall provide for fire safe access and shall be accessible from Miners Valley Road. Road improvements and dedications are included and have been considered with this Initial Study. Because of wetland and topographic constraints along the pond feature and the sloping hillside on both sides of the road easement on a portion of new parcel A adjustments to road standards will be required. The road sections can only be improved to 18-feet plus 4-feet of shoulder to 101C standards along the dam section and just past the on-site utility vault. Full road improvements to 24-feet plus 4-feet of shoulder to 101C standards will be required. These improvements will help with the flow any anticipated traffic from the creation of one new parcel and there will be a less than significant impact in this category with this project.

- b) Approval of the tentative parcel map in order to create two new parcels will accommodate the allowed density established by the zone and General Plan policies for each newly created parcel. The proposed density will not have a significant traffic and/or circulation impact to Miners Valley Road, Salmon Falls Road, or the surrounding road circulation system.
- 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 varying lot sizes and mostly estate residential lots consisting of lower densities that are appropriate within this Rural Region. The properties in the immediate area range in size between 4.63 and 160-acres in size and many remain vacant. This property is an interior lot, and the roads that are to be improved with this project will not increase hazards due to design features. Any future road improvements over the dam section will require that the property owner provide a test that identifies the structural adequacy of the dam section. Should the test find that improvements are necessary to the dam, the property owner make such improvements over and across the dam, and must coordinate with the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) for required permits and improvements. The existing roads on Miners Valley Road are gravel and Salmon Falls Road is improved with asphalt. Standards for Department of Transportation (DOT) and Fire District will be implemented for this project during the grading and/or building permit review phase. As such, the impacts within this category will remain below a level of significance.
- 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, Fire District, and/ Department of Transportation (DOT) staff to ensure that adequate access onto parcel A is provided from Miners Valley Road. The adjacent road and driveway leading to any new residence on parcel A shall be designed to meet minimum Fire Safe and Department of Transportation (DOT) with slope, materials and design, as well as turnouts in order to provide adequate fire safety access for the property.
- 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 shall identify 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.

**FINDING:** For the ‘Transportation/Traffic’ category, processing the two-parcel map will have a less than significant impact within this category.



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

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
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 this project. Any future residential development on parcel A shall be designed to meet the County standards to include Best Management Practices (BMPs) for pre- and post construction development for run-off and to meet proper septic design features required by the County's Environmental Management Department. The combined requirements adequately address wastewater discharge and surface run-off in order to maintain impacts within this category at a less than significant level.
- b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed and none are required as a result of this project.

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

- c) On-site stormwater drainage facilities may be required on the property in order to reduce runoff to appropriate discharge levels. Any future request for a grading, improvement, or building permits will be required to show how site discharge and/or run-off will not exceed the levels that prior to any new development based on BMPs and storm water management plans. All required drainage facilities required for this project shall be constructed in conformance with the standards contained in the *County of El Dorado Grading and Drainage Manual*.
- d) A Well Data Production report and update letter was provided by Carlton Engineering which identified adequate groundwater resources are available in the general area. The County’s Environmental Management staff reviewed the information and acknowledged the high likelihood of groundwater to be available on the new parcel A. The property owner will be required to install a well on parcel A prior to the County’s approval of the final parcel map. Parcel B has an on-site well that provides adequate water for the existing residence. Any well installed for parcel A shall provide the water necessary for the 3000-gallon water storage tank that will make water available for the fire sprinkler system.
- e) Soils and percolation information was provided by Carlton Engineering for this project. The County’s Environmental Management staff reviewed the information and found that this site has adequate soils in order to address septic disposal for new development on parcel A. Parcel B also has an existing and adequate area for septic disposal. All septic areas shall be located outside of the 125-foot buffer established for the pond and shall observe a 60-foot buffer away from the drainage channel located on the property. Future residential development shall be reviewed by Building Services and Environmental Management during the building permit review phase to ensure that septic areas are designed to meet 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:** Impacts within the ‘Utilities and Service Systems’ category will remain at a less than significant level based on the requirements and the design elements included for this tentative parcel map.

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

<b>XVII. 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?			✓
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:**

- a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the project record that would indicate that this project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. This tentative parcel map has a less than significant 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. Project design and the permit conditions that have been prepared for this project will reduce the likelihood of impacts within this category to a level that is less than significant for 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 the studies that have been provided for this project and the design objectives included with the exhibits, this project will pose a less than significant impact based on the factors of cumulative impacts identified within this category.
- c) As outlined and discussed in this document, this project proposes a less than significant potential of having project-related environmental effects which will 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.)

US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Services 1994 National Wetland Inventory for the Pilot Hill, California Quad.

Biological Resources Evaluation for APN 104-500-11, June 2006. Prepared by Ruth A. Willson, Consulting Biologist.

Letter Update to Biological Resources Evaluation for APN 104-500-11, November 16, 2006. Prepared by Ruth A. Willson, Consulting Biologist.

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

Wetland Delineation Report for APN 104-500-11, June 2006. Prepared by Ruth A. Willson, Consulting Biologist.

Letter Update to Wetland Delineation Report for APN 104-500-11, February 1, 2007. Prepared by Ruth A. Willson, Consulting Biologist.

Letter Update to Wetland Delineation Report for APN 104-500-11, March 12, 2007. Prepared by Ruth A. Willson, Consulting Biologist.

Cultural Resources Study of APN 104-500-11, North of Salmon Falls, 5101 Miners Valley Road, Pilot Hill, El Dorado County, CA 95664, June 2006. Prepared by Historic Resource Associates.

E-mail Update to Cultural Resources Study for APN 104-500-11, North of Salmon Falls, 5101 Miners Valley Road, Pilot Hill, El Dorado County, CA 95664, March 13, 2007. Prepared by Historic Resource Associates/Dana Supernowicz.

Waterwater Disposal Study on APN 104-500-11, September 11, 2006. Prepared by Michael A. Vander Dussen, R.G., C.E.G No. 2047, Carlton Engineering.

Letter Update for Well Production Data on APN 104-500-11, November 27, 2006. Prepared by Michael A. Vander Dussen, R.G., C.E.G No. 2047, Carlton Engineering.