

EXHIBIT L



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: P06-0038, Saenz-Bianchi 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: Augusto Bianchi, 5317 Bantry Place, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Carlton Engineering, c/o Ted Woessner
3883 Ponderosa Road, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Location: West side of Deer Valley Road 0.8 miles north of the intersection with Green Valley Road in the Rescue area.

Assessors Parcel No(s): 102-200-01 **Parcel Size:** 41.81 acres

Zoning: Estate Residential Ten-Acre (RE-10) **Section:** 2 & 3 **T:** 9N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: Rural Residential (RR)

Description of Project: Tentative parcel map creating four (4) lots ranging in size from 10.0 acres to 11.8 acres. Design waiver has been requested for a reduction for the on-site road and public utility easement from 60 feet to 50 feet.

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-5	LDR	Single-Family Residence
East:	RE-5	LDR	Single-Family Residence
South:	RE-10	RR	Single-Family Residence
West:	RE-10	RR	Single-Family Residence

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is located adjacent to but outside of the southeast boundary of the Martel Creek Unit of the Pine Hill Preserve. Several knolls exist on the property, the highest of which is located midway along the western property line and peaks at an elevation of 1190 feet. The property ranges between 1040 and 1190 feet in elevation, with the highest points near the Martel Creek Unit which transitions to lower elevations along the south property line and east toward Deer Valley Road. Chamise vegetation communities and rare plant habitat are found along the northwest portion of the site, with the central and southern portions of the property mostly covered with oak woodland grasslands. The entire property is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1 and is entirely comprised of gabbro soils. Oak woodland tree canopy covers about 14.5-acres of the property and there are isolated occurrence of slopes 30 percent and steeper on site. Several wetlands exist on the property. The range of classifications of wetlands include jurisdictional, swale, intermittent, and ephemeral. Most of the wetlands flow from off site sources along the northern boundary onto this property and drain into Sweetwater Creek, which is located south and off site.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado County: Department of Transportation, Rescue Fire Protection District, Environmental Management, Air Quality Management District, County Surveyor. Resource Conservation District, California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G) and US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS).

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. The environmental factors checked below contain mitigation measures which reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: November 13, 2007

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

Signature: _____ Date: November 13, 2007

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a) No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highways will be affected by this project.
- b) Based on the location, 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.
- 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 four-lot 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 with this project. The ‘Aesthetics’ category will not be impacted.

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?			✓

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

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 potential to impact agricultural productivity with this project. The project is located within an area that is largely designated for estate residential development and there will be a less than significant level of impact with this project.
- b) This project will not reduce available agricultural lands. 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 proposed that could affect an agricultural designation or to change such a designation to allow non-agricultural uses.

FINDING: This project will have no impact on agricultural lands and will not affect properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding properties are mostly developed with single-family residences on tracts that are five acres in size and larger. A small percentage of the surrounding properties remain vacant. There will be no impacts in the ‘Agriculture’ category with this 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:

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

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). County records indicate that this property is located within the asbestos review area. Activities related to the processing of the proposed tentative parcel map will create a less than significant impact on air quality because project conditions will require grading and construction activities to implement an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) in order to limit dust emission during construction activities. As a result, this project does not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the County’s air quality plan and impacts in this section will remain below a significant level.
- 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 an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) 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, there will be no impacts within this category with the proposed tentative parcel map.

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.

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) The project may have an impact on species identified as 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 is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1 and is comprised of gabbro soils; however, it is not located within the County’s adopted Ecological Preserve or within the USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries but just outside and southeast of the Martel Creek Unit Preserve boundary. A biological study prepared for the project used site surveys conducted between May and June 2006 to assess special status plant species during the bloom period, including Pine Hill Endemics. Of the eight endemics, only the El Dorado mule ears (*Wyethia reticulata*) was found during site reconnaissance. Because the El Dorado mule ears exist on a limited basis, on about 2.0 acres of the property along the northeastern and northern property lines, impacts to this species would not be required with this project. The location of the species relative to areas that would be developed with roads, driveways, buildings and accessory structures would not necessitate impacting this species. No other listed special status plant species, including the blue elderberry, were found on the property. Rare Plan Mitigation Area 1 in lieu fees and avoidance in the form of the mitigation outlined at the end of this section will reduce impacts below a level of significant.
- b) Road and driveway improvements would impact 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 project is located in the Clarksville Quad referenced on the 1994 US Department of Interior National Wetlands Inventory Maps. The biological study prepared for this project found that 1.09 acres of

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

wetland features on the site, of which .92 acres were more ecologically critical habitat, which included jurisdictional wetlands in the form of a swale community receiving subsurface and surface drainage near the northeast corner of the property, as well as intermittent streams. These intermittent streams and other lesser biologically sensitive ephemeral streams flow primarily in a north-south direction and ultimately draining into Sweetwater Creek and further downstream into Folsom Lake Reservoir located south and west of this site. The types of riparian flora and habitat that exists within the bed and/or bank of such wetlands include iris-leaf rush (*Junucus xiphiodes*), deer grass (*Muhlenbergia rigens*), and Gairdner’s Yumpah (*Perideridia gairdneri*), none of which are identified as an endangered species by local, state or federal agencies. In addition, as required by the Interim Guidelines of the General Plan’s for Wetland Preservation *Policy 7.3.3.4*, the biological evaluation identifies that although a maximum of .05 acres of impacts to jurisdictional wetlands would occur with this project, such impacts would be the least necessary to develop the project and with additional input from a biologist during the design of grading and improvement plans. In addition, a Streambed Alteration Permit would be required for improvements within or impacts to jurisdictional wetlands. As such, implementation of mitigation measures noted at the end of this section would reduce impacts in this category below a level of significant.

- c) The project would impact a maximum of .05 acres of 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 discussed in section b above, such impacts will be the least necessary in order to develop the project for roads and/or driveways, and based on the policies of the General Plan. Mitigation has been prepared to address the issues. Impacts would be reduced below a level of significant.
- d) The project is not located within an Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay, County’s adopted Ecological Preserve, or within the USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries, and is specifically not located within a unit of the Pine Hill Preserve. The biological assessment developed and submitted for this project identified only one migratory species (mule deer) that uses this and adjacent properties. Since there are no specific design standards required for such issues by the County’s adopted General Plan or by ordinance for a project located outside of an IBC overlay, no specific mitigation would be required for this project within this category. Also, because of the large property sizes proposed that would create four lots each with a minimum 10 acre in site area, added mitigations would not be necessary because such large lots would not hinder the free movement of species that use this site’s resources or those that migrate over and across the proposed new 10 plus acre lots. This includes free migration of the mule deer, which was identified by the biological study as a species that travels from the dense vegetation along the eastern part of the project and Martel Unit of the Pine Hill Preserve south across this property to Sweetwater Creek. Although not specified, bird species would also be free to use the property and the project would not hinder their migration pattern or use of the site’s resources. Please refer to sections a thru d above for project specific mitigation to preserve and design the project in a sensitive manner so as not to negatively impact plant or wetland resources that would continue to exist and thrive on the project site. As such, no mitigation is required in this category, and the project would continue to support the movement of and use by natural habitat in the area. Impacts within this category would remain below a level of significance 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. Oak woodland tree canopy covers about 35 percent, or 14.5-acres, of the property and the improvements for the road would impact oak woodland canopy, but would not exceed the required retention standards of the County. For this site, 85 percent, or 12.33 acres of the 14.5 acre of oak canopy would be required to be retained. Based on this retention standard, the removal of affected canopy must be replaced based on the oak replacement policies that are in effect. Mitigation has been developed to ensure that the project impacts to oak woodlands are replaced, maintained and monitored to ensure the survival of replaced oaks. Combined with the mitigation established for the El Dorado mule ears for item a) above, the mitigation to be implemented for this section would be reduced below a level of significant.

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

- f) 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 in the form of an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) 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 INRMP. These include elements of 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 conflicts with an anticipated INRMP or goals developed to date for the protection of sensitive resources would be affected with this project and based on the mitigation outlined for the entire Biological Resources category. Removed and replaced oaks will be accounted for with follow-up site specific development plan and care programs, Mitigation Area 1 in-lieu fees will address Rare Plant issues, and wetlands will be protected to the greatest degree practical. Although the biological evaluation identified that no special status plants would need to be affected with the project, there is a mitigation measure included for section a) above that requires protection of the El Dorado mule ears. Finally, in conjunction with grading and improvement plan review, to include pre- and post- construction BMPs to be developed, such improvements shall be designed with input of a biologist for riparian habitat and wetlands to implement design elements that would reduce or eliminate impacts to such resources because of necessary road, bridges and/or bridge work. The applicant must obtain a Streambed Alteration Permit from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G) prior to the County approving grading and improvement plans for this project where impacts to jurisdictional wetlands would occur. As a result, the impacts within this category would remain below a level of significance with this project.

Mitigation Measures for Biological Resources [1 – 6]

MM Bio-1: The applicant shall pay the Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1 in-lieu fee for Lots 1 thru 4. The in-lieu fee shall be based on the fee that is in place at the time of building permit issuance and shall be made to offset impacts within these mitigation areas based on adopted County policies.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning

MM Bio-2: The applicant shall identify a 20 foot ‘non-building buffer’ around areas where El Dorado mule ears are present as identified on the Biological Study prepared for the project. Impacts to El Dorado mule ears shall not be allowed for this project.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of final map, grading, and building permits

Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning

MM Bio-3: The applicant shall identify a 50 foot buffer around all wetlands as illustrated on the tentative parcel map and exhibits. All of the on-site wetlands have been classified as ephemeral and/or intermittent, including the following:

- a. No development activity shall be allowed within the 50 foot buffers, unless the applicant submits a letter prepared by a qualified biologist that states no impacts would occur to riparian habitat and/or wetlands based on the specified encroachment.

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

- b. There would be a maximum .05 acres of impact to intermittent stream that are classified as jurisdictional wetlands. All grading activities affecting such areas shall be prepared in consultation with a qualified biologist. The biologist shall provide specific recommendations about the improvements and grading design affecting the wetlands, including those necessary for pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). Refer to MM Bio-4 for related mitigation.
- b. On Lot 1, an access road exists and any new driveway shall be improved over and across the existing access road.

Timing/Implementation: *Prior to issuance of final map, grading, improvement, and/or building plans*

Enforcement/Monitoring: *El Dorado County Planning*

MM Bio-4:

The applicant shall consult with and obtain approval of a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G) pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code, for each stream crossing and any other activities affecting the bed, bank, or associated riparian vegetation of any stream on the site. A copy of the CDF&G agreement to correspond to the proposed improvements shall be provided to the County and included in the project file for reference.

Timing/Implementation: *Prior to approval of grading permits*

Enforcement/Monitoring: *El Dorado County Planning*

MM Bio-5:

The applicant shall retain the services of a qualified professional that shall prepare a ‘Master Oak Woodland Preservation Plan’ for this project. The plan shall: 1) identifies the 14.5 acres of oak woodland canopy in plan view illustrating development envelop, 2) calculates the amount of canopy to be impacts, in plan view that limits the total removal of the canopy to no less than 12.33 acres of cumulative impacts, 3) assess such impacts in a cumulative manner during permit processing for grading, as well as for lot-by-lot development, 4) identify the exact location of replanting within suitable areas based on each permit processed, and 5) provide information about the exact types of oaks to be replanted and the saplings or oaks required for the replanting.

The tree replacement plan showing the replacement of trees shall conform to the El Dorado County Policy 7.4.4.4, Option A and the Interim Guidelines. In the event that Policy 7.4.4.4 Option B is available, the replacement plan shall be prepared in accordance with Option B and/or the Interim Guidelines available for that option.

Timing/Implementation: *Prior to approvals of grading, improvement, and building permits*

Monitoring/Enforcement: *El Dorado County Planning*

MM Bio-6:

Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CCRs) shall be established and recorded for this project that would, in part, ensure the survival of replanted oaks by requiring that each property owner share equally in the responsibility in the long term monitoring and maintenance of replanted oaks.

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

The CCRs shall require that the property owners coordinate a one year, three years, five years, and ten year monitoring survey report to be prepared by a qualified professional for both oak and saplings that would be replaced, as well as a similar fifteen year survey update for acorns. The survey report shall be submitted to Planning Services to be placed in the project file. In the event that the re-planted saplings or acorns not survive, they shall be replaced (at the sole and equally shared cost of each property owner) based on County adopted policies and standards, and based on the input of a qualified professional.

Timing/Implementation: *Prior to issuance of building permits, occupancy permits, and on-going*

Monitoring/Enforcement: *El Dorado County Planning*

FINDING: There will be a less than significant impact within the above listed categories with the implementation of project specific mitigation during grading and improvements in preparing the property with road access and for custom lot development. The project protects, to the greatest degree practical, sensitive site resources including special-status plant species, wetlands, oak woodlands, and the project, as designed and permitted, would provide large 10-acre lots where adequate site areas exist without needing to impact such areas excessively, or beyond that which is allowed by the County’s adopted General Plan. The applicant will be required to consult with and obtain Streambed Alteration Permits from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G) prior to the approval of County issued permits proposing such impacts. A biologist must provide design-specific input and such input shall be implemented into the design of grading, improvement, and/or custom lot development to consider the wetlands and buffers. El Dorado mule ears will be protected. The biologist must also provide input about Best Management Practices (BMPs) in order to reduce and/or eliminate impacts to wetlands or riparian habitat during the processing of any County issued permits that will request such impacts. Oaks canopy impacts will be cumulatively reviewed and replaced with the input of a qualified biologist for the road and public utility easement, as well as for individual custom lot development on each of the four newly created lots. As a result, there will be a less than significant level of impact within the ‘Biological Resources’ category with this project.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

a/b) The applicant submitted a Cultural Resources Study for this project. The study provides an overview of the property and assesses the likelihood of findings cultural as well as subsurface archaeological and/or paleontological resources. The results of the study concluded that the potential to discover such resources on the site as very unlikely. 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 during grading and/or construction activities associated to roads, driveways, and new residential and accessory structures, 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 which are included as project permit conditions.

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.

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?			✓	

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?			✓
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			✓

Discussion:

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
 - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) According to the *Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas* (Jennings, 1994) and the *Peak Acceleration from Maximum Credible Earthquakes in California* (CDMG, 1992), 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 standards for earthquakes as it relates to a project outside of a fault or buffer, or those that are near fault lines, ruptures, or buffers. By implementing County grading standards into the overall design of the project, there will be a less than significant impact because of liquefaction for this project. Because 7.3 percent of the site is comprised of slopes in excess of 30-percent grade while the remaining 92.4 percent of the site is below the 30-percent grade threshold, the project has a large percentage of land area where impacts to such slopes would not be required and/or allowed for residential or accessory structures. As such, a large proportion of each new lot providing minimum 10 acres in lot area can be developed without impacting protected steep slopes. A minimal amount of such slopes will be impacted for improvements necessary for the on-site road and public utility easement, and potentially for driveway to access each home site on Lots 1 thru 4. This is considered appropriate based on current County policies should all design standards of the County be adhered to and with minimizing such impacts. Protected slopes 30 percent and steeper cannot be impacted with residential structures, accessory structures, and/or septic disposal areas. Overall, impacts within this category will remain at a level that is less than significant because of project design and by implementation to County building and grading standards.

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

- b) Minor project grading will be required for improvements associated to road, driveway, and general access improvements and for improving the pad areas for the new residential and/or accessory structures on the newly created Lots 1 thru 4. Each of the new lots will be minimum 10-acres in size and run-off or erosion is not likely to have a significant impact on this project based on property size alone. The Rescue extremely stony sandy loam 3-50 percent slopes (RgE2) exists mostly on the northwestern half of the property. This soil has a medium to rapid surface runoff rate with a moderate to high erosion hazard. Rescue very stony sandy loam (RfC) soil exists on the southeastern half of the property and is a more stable soil with slow to medium surface runoff and a slight to moderate erosion hazard. By implementing County grading, drainage, and building standards in the development of such plans, the project soil types have been considered and are appropriate for the types of improvements and development that is typical for residential single-family and accessory structures. As a result, the project will have a less than significant level of impact within this category.
- c) 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) to reduce and eliminate run-off, there will be a less than significant impact within this category. The soil types that exist on this property can adequately support the type of development that would be required for this project for immediate road improvements and for future custom lot residential development on Lots 1 thru 4.
- d) The mapped soils on the property are Rescue extremely stony sandy loam 3-50 percent slopes (RgE2) located on the northwestern half of the property and Rescue very stony sandy loam (RfC) on the southeastern half (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). The site does not comprise of expansive soils and is suitable for estate single-family residential development. Because the project would require all future construction activities to implement the requirements established by the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* with building design to implement UBC Seismic construction standards, this project will have a less than significant impact within this category.
- 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 the initial percolation information provided for this project. That information identified that adequate areas with proper soil permeability exist on the project site and on each of the newly created lots. 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. There will be a less than significant impact within this category.

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. All future improvements for grading and design of residential and accessory structures shall be reviewed by the County and must conform to County and state standards (*UBC*). There is adequate soils permeability for septic disposal areas. Enough land area exists for each new lot to allow septic areas to not impact wetland buffers and protected slopes 30 percent or steeper. Future review of grading, improvement, and/or building plans will require the applicant design such plans to County standards. As such, potential impacts within the ‘Geology and Soils’ category will be reduced below a level of significance with this 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			✓

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

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

- 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, driveways, and residences on Lots 1 thru 4 is not expected to include the use of 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.

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

- 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 a quarter mile radius of this property.
- 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 property. 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 although the project is located within 2 miles of the Cameron Park Airport Influence area identified at the noise and safety zones, it is not physically 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 is a less than significant level of impact 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. As designed, the project would provide proper access onto the site and for each newly created lot with improved roads and driveways that would meet County design standards, including those required by the Department of Transportation and Fire District. In addition, individual lots would provide well water, fire sprinklers, and water storage for fire suppression in case of emergency. 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. There would be a less than significant impact within this category.
- h) The Rescue 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. There will be a less than significant impact within this category.

FINDING: The proposed project will not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials. The project will also not expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires because fire sprinkler systems with water storage tanks shall be installed to protect any future and new residential structures built on all newly created lots. There will be adequate roads connections made for this project to allow for the movement of emergency vehicles onto the project site to serve each of the newly created lots, and to allow further penetration into wildland areas. For the ‘Hazards and Hazardous Materials’ category, potential impacts will remain below a level of significance for this project.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- 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

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

- 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 implement 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 staff reviewed well production data that identified a well test was drilled and on September 5, 2007 produced an average estimated yield of 27 gallons per minute (gpm) during a 24-hour draw. The test was performed with a pump installed. The test exceeds the General Plan policy that requires test wells to provide at least 5-gallons of water per minute for a period of 24-hours. For this project, wells must be installed and the applicant must show adequate water yield for each individual lot prior to the recordation of the final map and based on the initial assessment provided for review. Well water will be used for potable and for fire suppression storage in the new 3000-gallon water storage tanks. Impacts within this category will be less than significant.
 - c) The improvements that will be required for road improvements, including box culverts, culverts, wetland overpass/structures within wetland areas and buffers, will be designed with input from a biologist in order to minimize impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers. State issued Streambed Alteration Agreement permits must approve for improvements affecting jurisdictional wetlands, however, it is not expected that such wetlands or patterns will be altered with this project. State issued permits must be submitted to County Planning Services prior to County approvals or permits allow the disturbance of such wetlands, and with input from a qualified biologist. Mitigation measures in the Biological Resources section identified earlier in this assessment identifies the requirements associated to this project, to include overall design to meet County adopted grading and drainage standards (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590), and to limit overall impacts based on design and implemented Best Management Practices (BMPs) pre- and post-construction. As a result, there will be a less than significant level of impact within this category for this project.
 - d/e) There will be no substantial change in the pattern of drainage on or off the property with this project. Compliance with the standards and requirements contained within the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* considers the requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and will limit any potential impacts to drainage ways on or adjacent to the project site. In addition, any improvements within the wetland buffers would require that a biologist provide comments and input for design that would further limit such impacts. Such input would also need to specify proper and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) in order to reduce potential impacts associated to this project. Refer to the mitigation measures developed for the Biological Resources section, as noted earlier. As such, there will be limited erosion and siltation resulting from this project, and the level of impact within these categories will remain 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. Although this project will impact wetland areas and drainages, there is adequate mitigation placed on the project in the Biological Section that would limit such impacts. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be implemented into grading and/or improvement design and activities. By implementing these methods, obtaining proper recommendations and input of a biologist during design phases for grading and improvements, project related run-off would be reduced and will meet Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards. Impacts within this category will be less than significant.

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

- 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. There will be a less than significant level of impact within these categories.
- i) The property is located in the Rural Region north of the El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park area about three miles east of Folsom Lake Reservoir. There are no dams or levees in the vicinity that have the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death in case of failure of such facilities. 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. There will be no substantial alternation of on- or off-site drainage patterns. There will be minor improvements to wetlands and wetland areas resulting with this project, and specific state permits would be necessary in order to proceed with such impacts. Water quality and run-off will be considered as development proceeds with County reviews to be made during grading, improvement, and building permit phases. The County will review and require such plans be developed to provide specific information as it relates to site hydrology and drainage, including the development and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) pre- and post-construction that will reduce and/or eliminate drainage created by this project. All related impacts will be the least necessary in order to develop the project, as allowed by policies of the 2004 adopted General Plan. By implementing the mitigation in the Biological Section and by implementing County design standards related to grading and drainage during improvement phases necessary to build out the project, impacts within this category will remain below a level of significance for this 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

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 four-lot 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 four new lots in that each provides minimum 10-acres considers the required development standards of the existing RE-10 zone and the RR land use designation. 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 any of the four new lots shall be designed to meet the requirements of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and local subdivision policies. 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 Biological Resources Section, this project will have a less than significant impact on biological resources with implementation of certain mitigation measures. In general, this project meets all of the policies and interim guidelines for the preservation of biological, wetland, and sensitive resources, and does not conflict with applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans.

FINDING: For the 'Land Use Planning' category, project related impacts associated to the tentative parcel map will remain below a level of significant with this project.

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 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. However, the property is not within any mineral resource overlay zones established by the General Plan and there were no mines found on the Mineral Land Classification (MLC) plates for this property based on the 'Soils and Geology' information provided by Carlton Engineering. As such, this project can be subdivided and the potential for such resources would continue to exist on the property. Any future extraction activities of such resources would require the property owner to obtain a use permit. As such, this project would have a less than significant level of impact within this category because there would be no loss of such resources.

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

b) The western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property may contain mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value. As such, future County issued use permits would need to be obtained before extraction of such resources could occur on any of the four new lots. Based on the policies of the General Plan and attributes of the property, a subdivision of land and residential estate single-family development can occur on the property. As such, there is a less than significant level of impact within this category.

FINDING: Although mineral resources may exist on the property, the action of a tentative parcel map and subsequent residential development on large lots would have a less than significant level of impact to such resources. The property is not located within a mineral overly and no mines are known on the MLC plates to indicate that there are such mines on the property. Within the ‘Mineral Resources’ category impacts will remain below a level of significance for this project.

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

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.

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

- a/c) The project will not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels for the neighborhood and vicinity. The creation of four lots 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. There will be a less than significant level of impact within these categories.
- 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 the project is completed. The temporary noise during construction activities will cease once the project improvements have been made. Impacts within these categories will remain below a level of significance with this project.
- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards established by an adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). There will be a less than significant level of impact for this project based on excessive noise generated 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. There will no impacts within this category.

FINDING: For the ‘Noise’ category, there will be a less than significant level of noise impacts associated to 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.
- a) The proposed project has been determined to have a minimal growth-inducing impact because of the creation of four estate residential lots where only one large 41.81-acre parcel currently exists. All future residential development associated to this project must meet established County development and improvement standards. They must also pay project related impacts fees to address the added residential development for each of the new lots during the building permit review phase. These include traffic related impact fees, park and public facilities impact 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

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

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.

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 four-lot subdivision of land. There will be a less than significant impact within the ‘Population and Housing’ category.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a) **Fire Protection:** The Rescue Fire Protection District operates two fire stations in its service area. The district provides fire protection and suppression, as well as emergency medical services for a variety of rural areas, public/private schools and businesses, and various housing types. 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

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

necessary. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services with fire protection provided by the fire department. In addition, the installation of a fire sprinkler system with a 3000 gallon water storage tank any new residential development on Lots 1 thru 4 will add to the level of available resources necessary for fire protection for this project. In addition, by developing roads and access driveways to meet County design standards, there will be better fire protection penetration with fire vehicles available for the surrounding area. 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.

- 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 four lots where one currently exists will not significantly impact current Sheriff’s response times to the project area.
- c) Schools: The Rescue Union School District provides public school services for area residents, with high school services provided at Ponderosa High School. 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 development.
- 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 four lots where one currently exists. There will be a less than significant level of impact in the ‘Public Services’ category.

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

Discussion:

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

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) By creating four lots where one currently exists, no significant increase or effects in the use of area wide neighborhood or regional parks will be experienced with this four-lot subdivision of land. 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 level of impact with this project.

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;

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

- 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 County Department of Transportation (DOT) 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 four lots allowing for density of a main unit and a potential secondary unit on each newly created lot would not significantly contribute to or substantially increase the number of trips, volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections with the approval of this project. Each lot shall provide for fire safe access and shall be accessible from Deer Valley Road with an on-site and improved road easement with cul-de-sac. There improvements, public utility easement dedications, and other site improvements have been fully considered in this assessment. Because of wetland and topographic constraints, there is mitigation included in the Biological Section that addresses such impacts and would reduce the potential for such impacts based on required road improvements. There are slopes on the property that exceed 30 percent grade and minimal impact for such slopes may be required for the project because of the necessary road and potential driveway improvements. Such improvements would be minimal and are allowed by the General Plan and Interim Guidelines for slope preservation as long as all of the design standards for such roads are met and impacts are minimized. This project would be required to meet those standards during the grading permit review phase. For this category, adequate road facilities will be developed, and there would be a less than significant impact with the creation of the four lots and based on the necessary improvements that will be required for the project.
 - b) Approval of the tentative parcel map to create four lots with a minimum of 10-acres in land area each would allow for one residence and one secondary unit on each lot. This density is allowed by the established zone and General Plan policies on each newly created lot. The proposed density will not have a significant traffic and/or circulation impact to Deer Valley Road, Green Valley 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 lots that vary in size, most of which are estate residential lots consisting of lower densities that are considered appropriate within this Rural Region. The properties in the immediate area north and east of this property range in size between 5 and 10 acres and there are some larger lots exceeding 40 acres to the south and west of this site. Most of the adjacent properties have been built with single-family residential development. In order to gain access to the four new lots on the project site, there will be one on site road easement that would be required to be improved to Standard Plan 101C. This will require an 18-foot wide road section and two 1-foot wide shoulders. A cul-de-sac with a 50 foot wide radius would be improved to Standard Plan 114. Driveway encroachments would also be required for the private drives to be designed to Standard Plan 103A-1 standards, and the encroachment connecting the road easement to Deer Valley Road would be improved with a Standard Plan 103C design. Other than the road encroachment and on-site road easement, there would be no other driveway connections allowed to be made onto Deer Valley Road. Deer Valley Road is improved with asphalt and no improvements would be required on Deer Valley Road with this four-lot map. 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, there are no design features that would create a hazard as a result of this project. 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 each new lot is provided leading from Deer Valley Road onto the road easement and connecting to each lot with driveways. There is adequate area on each new lot that will allow future, proper and safe

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

access into the subdivision. The on-site road easement and driveways leading to any new residences on all lots 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 subdivision.

- 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: There would be no substantial traffic issues as a result of this project. Transportation facilities, such as roads and related improvements, shall be designed to conform to County standards, including those for access improvements on protected slopes. The roads will provide a better source of access for fire safety vehicles into areas that are near and those that surrounding this property. There have also been specific mitigation identified for impacts that the road improvements would pose on this project in the Biological Resources category identified in this assessment. Within the 'Transportation/Traffic' category, this four-lot tentative parcel map will have a less than significant level of impact.

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

Discussion:

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

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) No significant wastewater discharge or surface run-off will result from this project. There is adequate septic capability on the newly create lots that each provide a minimum of 10 acres in lot area so as not to create a substantial issues of wastewater discharge or surface run-off of such discharge. The applicant provided adequate information for the permeability of soils and percolation data that would allow the proper filtration of wastewater for each of the new four home sites proposed for this project. There will be a less than significant level of impact within this category.
- b) No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed and none are required as a result of this project. There would four new septic disposal systems installed for the four new lots when future residential development occurs. There is adequate site area to allow for such disposal areas based on the percolation information provided for the project and the site area available on each new lot. For water, well data was provided and accepted for this project that addresses adequate, safe and available water source. All wells must be in place before the approval of the final map. As a result, there will be a less than significant level of impact within this category.
- c) On-site stormwater drainage facilities may be required for the project 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. In addition, specific mitigation has been developed for the Biological Resources section of this assessment that will require input of a biologist during the development of grading and improvement plans in order to reduce impacts to such resources with the approval of this project. All required drainage facilities necessary for this project will be constructed to conformance with the standards contained in the *County of El Dorado Grading and Drainage Manual*. There will be a less than significant level of impact within this category.
- d) Well production information 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 that would meet and exceed to County water production requirement. A test well was assessed between September 5 and 6, 2007 (depth and static level unknown) and was found to produce an average estimated yield of 27 gallons per minute when a draw was completed for a 24 hour period. The applicant will be required to install a well on each lot prior to the County’s approval of the final parcel map. Any well installed for any new lot shall provide potable, as well as water necessary for the fire sprinkler system and water storage tanks for each new lot. There will be a less than significant level of impact in this category.
- 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 all lots. All septic areas shall be located outside of wetland buffers and shall not be allowed to be located on slopes that are 30 percent grade or steeper. There is adequate site area to allow septic systems on each of the new 10 plus acre lots. Building Services and Environmental Management shall review future residential

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

development plans and information during the building permit review phase to ensure that septic areas are designed to meet County design standards. There will be a less than significant level of impact in this category.

- 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 and the County provides recycling to its ongoing goals to reduce disposal and increase recycling based on AB939.

FINDING: Impacts within the 'Utilities and Service Systems' category will remain at a less than significant level based on the design elements included for this tentative parcel map and because County grading and improvement standards will be implemented during the grading, improvement, and/or building permit review phase. There would be no additional impact on existing public water or wastewater facilities, and no such new facilities would be required as a result of this project. This project would provide independent wells and septic disposal areas for each newly developed single-family residence and/or accessory structures. Information and data was provided by the applicant that identified an adequate water and percolation for septic disposal areas because of the soil type and the large areas available to install such systems without the need to impact sensitive resources.

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

Discussion:

- 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. By implementing Mitigation Measures for Biological Resources in section IV

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

above, impacts within this category will remain below a level of significance. Please refer to that section for specific project mitigation. There would not be any substantial reduction in 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.

- 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, as well as the project specific mitigation and conditions that have been developed for the project, impacts within this category will remain below a level of significance with this project.
- 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 Clarksville, California Quad.

Land Capability Report prepared for the 'Deer Valley Road – Bianchi' project by Carlton Engineering received March 15, 2006 by Planning Services.

Biological Study of Bianchi Property West of Deer Valley Road, February 16, 2007. Prepared by Michael F. Baad, PhD, Department of Biological Sciences, California State University, Sacramento.

El Dorado County Resource Conservation District dates July 30, 2007, prepared by Mark Egbert, District Manager.

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

Cultural Resources Study of APN 102-200-01, 2461 Deer Valley Road, El Dorado County, CA 95664, June 2006. Prepared by Historic Resource Associates.

Preliminary Stormwater Drainage Study, Deer Valley Road, Prepared for Augusto Bianchi, dated January 2007.

Report of Well Production, APN 102-200-01 for Augusto Bianchi prepared by Gary C. Tanko Well Drilling, Inc., conducted September 5-6, 2007.