



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: P06-0005-R. David Young

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

Contact Person: Michael C. Baron

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: R. David Young, 308 St. Boswells Place, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Lebeck & Young Engineering, 3430 Robin Lane.,
Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Location: On the East side of Excalibar Road 1,100 feet South of the intersection with Forni Road in the Placerville area, Supervisor District 3.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 325-290-13

Zoning: One Acre Residential (R1A)

Section: 30 **T:** 10 **N R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Description of Project: Proposed split of a 4.08 acre parcel into four parcels ranging in size from 1 acre to 1.07 acres. Off-site road improvements from Forni Road extending along Cribbs Road to Excalibur where minimum County Road Standards are not met.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	R1A	MDR	Unimproved Residential
North:	R1A	MDR	Improved Residential
East:	R1A	MDR	Improved Residential
South:	R1A	MDR	Improved Residential
West:	R1A	MDR	Improved Residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site lies at an approximate elevation of 1,900 feet above mean sea level. The soil type is Diamond Springs Series (DfC) which is well drained, surface runoff is medium with moderate erosion hazard. Tree species consist of blue oak and foothill pine. The site can be accessed from Excalibar Road from Forni Road in the Placerville area.

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

El County Department of Transportation
El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management
El Dorado 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.

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Michael C. Baron For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Lawrence W. Appel For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			√
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			√
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character 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&b) No scenic vistas, resources, trees rock outcroppings, historic buildings or designated scenic highways would be affected by this project.

c) The proposed project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

d) There is no lighting proposed as part of this project.

FINDING: For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. No impacts from light and glare are expected and no mitigation is required.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

- 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) El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land Use Overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan Land Use Map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan Land Use Overlay District area adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses because there are no adjacent agriculturally zoned properties.
- b) The proposed project would not conflict with any agricultural use in the project vicinity, and would not adversely impact properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

FINDINGS: It has been determined that the project would not result in any impact to agricultural lands, or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area consists of mainly commercial development. For this “Agricultural” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			√	
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:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, would 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);

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

- Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and NO_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, would 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,b) Site clearing, burning, grading, utility excavation, and movement of construction equipment would create temporary air quality impacts during construction. The construction-related impacts should be insignificant since these aspects of the project would be controlled by Chapter 15.14 of the County Code which sets minimum standards for such activities and El Dorado Air Pollution Control District Rule 223 that controls fugitive dust.
- c) Regarding cumulative air quality impacts, the proposed project does not require a change in existing land use designation or exceed the project alone significance criteria. Based on the project information provided, the proposed project would not result in any cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
- d) The proposed project and eventual creation of a single family dwelling is not considered to be a sensitive receptor. There are no existing uses considered to be sensitive receptors located near the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- e) The proposed parcels and eventual construction of a single family dwelling is not a use that commonly produces odors. It has been determined that the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

FINDINGS: It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project because it would not ; obstruct implementations of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan; violate any air quality standard; result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			√
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			√

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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) After Reviewing County resource materials for sensitive and protected species, it has been determined that the project would not affect locally designated natural communities, disturb wetlands, or affect migration corridors.
- b,c) The U.S. Department of Interior National Wetlands Inventory Maps were reviewed and subsequent site visit was done to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project site. This review indicates that there are no wetlands. There is a seasonal drainage on the property as a result of storm events, which would require a culvert as a result of the access road and would be required to be consistent with the County’s Grading Ordinance.
- d) Review of the Planning Division GIS *Deer Ranges Map* (January 2002) indicates that there are no mapped deer migration corridors on the project site. The project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.
- e) The project would result in the future development of potentially two single family dwellings on each parcel and driveway encroachment as well as offsite road improvements that may result in some tree removal. However, any ministerial building permit would be required to retain a percentage of the tree canopy as required under General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. Any tree removal associated with off-site road improvements would be calculated into the canopy retention required onsite.

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

- f) The project area is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-Legged Frog (*Rana Aurora Draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to the Draft Recovery/Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

FINDING: It has been determined that all potential biological resource impacts as a result of the proposed project are less than significant. Therefore, the established thresholds for significance in the “Biological Resources” category would not be exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- 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 supplied a Record Search completed by North Central Information Center. This Record Search indicated a low possibility of identifying Native American Artifacts and a low possibility of identifying historic-period cultural resources in the project area. Based on the Record Search results, it was determined that no further archival or field study is required.
- c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological site or known fossil locales.
- d) Due to the scope of the project, there is not a high potential to discover human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery. However, in the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery would be subject to the mitigation measures required under the County’s Grading Ordinance.

FINDINGS: Based on the Archeological Record Search, the project does not have the potential to create significant impacts to sub-surface cultural or historic resources, or disturb human remains located outside of a designated cemetery and the

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

incorporation of conditions noted in the El Dorado County Grading and Drainage Ordinance ensures that any potential impacts have been reduced to a less than significant level. Established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category.

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

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

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) As shown in the Division of Mines and Geology’s publication *Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California*, there are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones mapped for El Dorado County. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating buildings in the project area would be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.
- b) All grading activities shall comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance, which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- c) The soil on the project site is classified as Diamond Springs Series (DfC) (*soil Survey of El Dorado County Area, 1974*). According to the soil survey, this land type is “well drained,” surface runoff is medium with moderate erosion hazard. All future grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
- d) The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has mapped soils on the site as Serpentine Rock Land (SaF). Review of the *Soil Survey of the El Dorado County Area* indicates that the mapped soil types for the proposed project have a thin mantle of soil 24 to 50 inches in depth. Based upon this review, the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.
- e) The applicant provided a Report of Percolation Test prepared by Patterson Development to show the potential for a septic system on the proposed parcel.

FINDINGS: No significant impacts would result from geological or seismological anomalies on the project site. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that would result in significant impacts. For the “Geology and Soils” category, established thresholds would not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			√	
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			√	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			√	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			√	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has				√

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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:

- 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 utilized at the project site shall comply with the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*.
 - b) No significant amounts of hazardous materials would be utilized for the project. The project would not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
 - c) As proposed, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
 - d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there would be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.
 - e, f) As shown on the El Dorado County Zoning Map, the project is not located within an Airport Safety (AA) District overlay. There would be no immediate hazard for people residing or working in the project area or safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft over-flights in the vicinity of the project site.

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

- g) The proposed project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County.
- h) The degree of hazard in wild-land areas depends on weather variables like temperature, wind, and moisture, the amount of dryness and arrangement of vegetation, slope steepness, and accessibility to human activities, accessibility of firefighting equipment, and fuel clearance around structures. To reduce impacts to a less than significant level, the project shall be required to comply with the “Fire Safe” requirements.

FINDINGS: The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wild-land fires. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed project.

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

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			√

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - 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) At the building permit stage, the applicant would be required to submit a preliminary drainage plan and erosion control plan, which is reviewed by the Department of Transportation. Compliance with the Erosion Control Plan would limit water runoff and discharge that would violate water quality standards or discharge requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Permit applicants are required to prepare and retain on the construction site, a Storm-water Pollution Prevention Plan that describes the site, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste control, implementation of local plans required by the Resource Conservation District, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control, and non storm-water management controls.
- b) There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The applicant has provided a well production report for the proposed project.
- c) There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. *The Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* contain specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards would apply to this project when a building permit request is submitted to the County.
- d,e) In this case, the project would not include any grading. However, at the time a building permit request is submitted to the County an erosion control plan would be required to reduce erosion and sediment discharge off the site to a less than significant level.
- f) The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All storm-water and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site.
- g,h) The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0750 B, 10/18/83) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

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

- i) The subject property within the Placerville area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters.
- j) The potential for a siege or tsunami is considered less than significant. Potential for a mudflow is also considered to be less than significant.

FINDINGS: As discussed above, no other additional significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and therefore no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a) The project would not result in the physical division of an established community.
- b) The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the 1996 General Plan, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.
- c) The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red Legged Frog (*Rana Aurora Draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to Draft Recovery/Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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

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

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			√
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource 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 El Dorado County Mineral Resources Zone Map, General Plan Exhibit V-7-4 indicates that the project is not in a mineral resource zone. Based on the review of this map, there are no significant mineral deposits on the project site.

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a,c) The proposed project is not considered a noise sensitive land use and would not significantly contribute to an increase in the ambient noise.

b,d) Persons adjacent to the project vicinity would not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of the project.

e) County airports include a comprehensive Land use Plan, which contains building restrictions due to airport noise. In this case, the project site is not located within the defined noise contour of a county owned/operated airport facility.

f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to intermittent noise levels considered excessive.

FINDINGS: As discussed above, for this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. No significant noise impacts would occur as a result of this project.

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

Discussion:

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

- 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.

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

- a) The proposed project has been determined to have minimal growth-inducing impact as the project does not include any proposal to extend, or expand infrastructure or roads, and does not include any school or large scale employment opportunities that lead to indirect growth.
- b) No existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project.
- c) No people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a) **Fire Protection:** The El Dorado County Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Fire Department from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District has conditioned the project to enter into a deed restriction for a residential

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

sprinkler system and supply 3,000 gallons of water storage tanks for each proposed parcel to ensure compliance with fire standards including, but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii within parking areas, fire sprinklers within buildings, and building identification.

- b) **Police Protection:** The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The addition of a residential parcels and the related development would not significantly impact the achievement of this goal, or significantly impact the current response times to the project area.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Placerville Union School District. Impact to the affected school district from the proposed development would be less than significant.
- d) **Parks:** The proposed development would not substantially increase the local population necessitating the 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. Provisions to provide parkland or the payment of an in-lieu fee are included as the project is residential in nature.
- e) No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the development of the subject parcel either directly or indirectly. No significant public service impacts are expected. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
 - Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- a) The proposed project would not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur because this project is not expected to increase population in the region.

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

- b) The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing recreation facilities.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
 - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
 - 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) The addition of four residential parcels, ranging in size from 1 to 1.07 acres, would not result in a significant increase in vehicle trips or result in traffic congestion.
- b) No improvements required as a result of the proposed land division would result in any safety hazards from design features.

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

- c) The project would 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 proposed project does not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards.
- e) The project would not result in inadequate emergency access to any of the current or future structures. While Excalibur road is considered a dead end road, off-site road improvements to widen both Excalibur and Cribbs road to minimum Fire Safe standards would create better access for emergency vehicles than what already exists.. The on-site roadway would be designed and constructed to minimum Fire Safe Regulations.
- f) Single family residences are required to provide two parking spaces that are not in tandem. The proposed parcels would provide adequate space to comply with all parking requirements.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan Policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

FINDING: No significant impacts to transportation/traffic are expected. For this “Transportation/ Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- 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,b) The proposed parcels would provide public water and septic system. There are no anticipated wastewater treatment or facility impacts.
- c) On-site drainage facilities are required as needed on-site so as to reduce runoff to discharge levels, which do not exceed site discharge levels, which existed prior to development of the site. All drainage facilities should be designed in conformance with the standards contained in the “County of El Dorado Drainage Manual.”
- d) As referenced above, the proposed project would provide for public water and septic systems for each proposed parcel.
- e) The project would not affect the capacity of the sanitary districts ability to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the sanitary districts existing commitments.
- 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 yr 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.

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

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

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

Discussion:

- a) There is no substantial evidence contained in the record that the project would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project would be less than significant due to existing standards and requirements imposed in the conditioning of the project.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as "two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project would not result in cumulative impacts.
- c) Based upon discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project would not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

El Dorado County 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.)

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento (Honorable Cecily Bond)

Ruling of Submitted Matter (February 5, 1999)

El Dorado County Taxpayers for Quality Growth, et al. Petitioners v. El Dorado County Board of Supervisors, Respondents.

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento (Honorable Cecily Bond)

Final Writ of Mandate (July 19, 1999)

El Dorado County Taxpayers for Quality Growth, et al. Petitioners v. El Dorado County Board of Supervisors, Respondents.

Patterson Development, Percolation Rate Test Results, April 8, 2003.