

**ELDORADO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
STAFF REPORT**



**Agenda of:** November 13, 2008  
**Item No.:** 10.b  
**Staff:** Jonathan Fong

**REZONE/PARCEL MAP**

**FILE NUMBER:** Z07-0034/ P07-0033

**APPLICANT:** Cemo Family Properties, LLC

**ENGINEER:** RSC Engineering

**REQUEST:** Rezone and Parcel Map. The Rezone would amend the parcel zoning from Two-acre Residential (R2A) to Commercial- Planned Development (C-PD). The Parcel Map would create three parcels ranging in size from 1.43-acres to 4.27-acres.

**LOCATION:** The property is located on the south side of Green Valley Road at the intersection with Sophia Parkway in the El Dorado Hills area, Supervisorial District I (Exhibit A).

**APN:** 124-300-98

**ACREAGE:** 8.10 acres

**GENERAL PLAN:** Commercial (C) (Exhibit B)

**ZONING:** Two-acre Residential (R2A)

**ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:** Negative Declaration

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend approval

**BACKGROUND:** The project was initially submitted on July 6, 2007 with a Rezone request from R2A to C and a three lot Parcel Map. The initial request included 21,480 square feet of retail space located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway. The

submitted Site Plan proposed a future gas station at the southeast corner of the intersection of Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway and future residential development on the southern portions of the site (Exhibit H).

At the September 4, 2007 TAC meeting Planning Services staff recommended the inclusion of the PD zoning overlay to allow for flexibility in the Development Standards of the C Zone District and to accommodate the future residential uses on the site. A re-design was submitted on June 23, 2008 which proposed four lots ranging in size from 0.74-acres to 3.59-acres. The re-submittal removed the request for the 21,480 square feet of retail space and did not include the PD zoning overlay as part of the Rezone (Exhibit I).

Planning Services staff deemed the project incomplete on July 14, 2008 due to the proposed lotting configuration and the request for additional environmental justification to prepare an adequate CEQA analysis of the project. A redesign was submitted on July 22, 2008 which included the current lot configuration and a Rezone request to include the PD zoning overlay.

The requested Rezone would amend the parcel zoning in order to conform to the existing Commercial (C) land use designation. The project site is currently bisected by Sophia Parkway (Exhibit A). The proposed Parcel Map would create two parcels on the west side of Sophia Parkway and include the remaining portion of the site on the east side of Sophia Parkway as the third parcel. The proposed parcels and inclusion of the Planned Development (PD) zoning overlay would allow for future commercial development of the site. All potential impacts of development consistent within the C Zone District would be analyzed through subsequent Planned Development applications.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:** Staff has reviewed the project for compliance with County regulations. Staff's analysis of the zone change request for the Planning Commission to consider is as follows:

**Project Description:** The project request would include a Rezone and Parcel Map. The Rezone would amend the parcel zoning from Two-Acre Residential (R2A) to Commercial- Planned Development (C-PD). The proposed Rezone would bring the parcel zoning into consistency with the existing Commercial (C) land use designation. No development would occur as part of the rezone. All future development would be subject to review and approval of subsequent Planned Development applications. The Parcel Map would create three parcels ranging in size from 2.12-acres to 3.59-acres.

**Road Improvements/ Utilities:** The Department of Transportation has required road improvements along Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway including additional striping, sidewalk improvements, and additional turning lanes. The project would be required to connect to EID for public water and wastewater services.

**Site Description:** The project site is an undeveloped parcel in the El Dorado Hills Community Region. The site is bisected by Sophia Parkway which separates the site into a 5.98-acre portion on the west side of the road and 2.12-acres to the east. Riparian features on the site include an

intermittent drainage which begins on the eastern portion of the site and exits along the western property boundary. Multiple seasonal wetlands occur throughout the site along the drainage channel. Vegetation on-site is comprised of mixed native trees and plants and various riparian vegetation along the drainage channel. The site has been previously disturbed as a part of road improvements on Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway. Construction activities have resulted in large deposits of fill material on both the east and west portions of the site.

**Adjacent Land Uses:**

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
<b>Site</b>	R2A	C	Undeveloped
<b>North</b>	RF	OS	Folsom Lake Recreational Area
<b>South</b>	R2A	MDR	Single family residential
<b>East</b>	C-DC/R2A	C/MDR	Commercial/ Residential
<b>West</b>	C-PD	C	Undeveloped Commercial

As shown in Exhibit E, the parcel is located in the vicinity of commercial and residential designated parcels. The application of the PD zoning overlay would require subsequent review of any development application by the Planning Commission. The PD application would be required to address the surrounding land uses and provide for adequate buffering between residential and non-residential land uses. Analysis and potential mitigation would be required in order to ensure that future development of the site would not significantly impact the surrounding parcels.

**General Plan:** The General Plan designates the subject site as Commercial (C). The proposed Rezone from R1A to C-PD would bring the project into conformance with the C land use designation.

No development would occur as part of the Rezone and Parcel Map. All future development would be reviewed through the Planned Development process which would be required to demonstrate compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

**Zoning:** The proposed Rezone would amend the parcel zoning from R2A to C-PD consistent with the Commercial General Plan Land Use Designation. The Commercial Zone District establishes a minimum parcel size of 5,000 square feet (0.114-acres). The proposed Parcel Map would create three parcels ranging in size from 1.43-acres to 4.27-acres which would be consistent within the C land use designation.

The project site is currently zoned R2A which would allow residential development of the site. However, as discussed above the site is within the Commercial General Plan Land Use Designation. The proposed Rezone would to Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD) would be consistent with

the General Plan. All future development would be processed through the Planned Development application which would be required to demonstrate consistency with applicable zoning policies.

**Planned Development:** No development would be proposed as part of the project. All future development of the site would be evaluated as part of the Planned Development application and would be reviewed for consistency with the Development Standards of the C Zone District and applicable Zoning Ordinance provisions. Section 17.04.030 B of the Zoning Ordinance requires Planned Development Findings of Approval which must be made by the Planning Commission prior to approval of any Development Plan:

1. *That the PD zone request is consistent with the general plan;*
2. *That the proposed development is so designed to provide a desirable environment within its own boundaries;*
3. *That any exceptions to the standard requirements of the zone regulations are justified by the design or existing topography;*
4. *That the site is physically suited for the proposed uses;*
5. *That adequate services are available for the proposed uses, including, but not limited to, water supply, sewage disposal, roads and utilities;*
6. *That the proposed uses do not significantly detract from the natural land and scenic values of the site. (Ord. 3806 §6, 1988; Ord. 3213 §2(part), 1981; prior code §9390.3(2)(b))*

The project would amend the parcel zoning from R2A to C-PD to bring the zoning into conformance with the General Plan. The Parcel Map would create parcels which are consistent within the C Zone District; therefore staff finds the project would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

**Public/ Agency Comments:** The following agencies have provided comment on the application:

**El Dorado Hills Community Services District (CSD):** The District would review and approve landscaping and streetscaping to ensure compliance with the Streetscape Master Plan.

**El Dorado County Department of Transportation:** DOT would require road improvements along Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway. Conditions of approval have been included in Attachment 1 of the Staff Report.

**Air Quality Management District:** AQMD has determined the construction activities would have a significant impact on air quality. Conditions of approval have been included in Attachment 1 of the Staff Report.

**El Dorado Hills Fire Department:** The Department has required fire sprinklering of proposed buildings and additional hydrants to provide emergency services to the project. Conditions of Approval have been included in Attachment 1 of the Staff Report.

El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee: APAC at its scheduled meeting on August 13, 2007 requested that Parcel 3 be rezoned to Limited Multifamily Residential (R2) to allow for multifamily development. APAC also made a motion to prohibit any gas stations from being approved on Parcel 2. As stated in the staff report above, the proposed Rezone to Commercial would be consistent with the Commercial General Plan Land Use Designation.

The Rezone would add the Planned Development Zoning Overlay which would require Planning Commission review prior to approval of any development on the proposed parcels.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**

Staff has prepared an Initial Study (Environmental Checklist with Discussion attached) to determine if the project has a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, staff finds that there is no substantial evidence that the project could have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration has been prepared.

**NOTE:** This project is located within or adjacent to an area which has wildlife resources (riparian lands, wetlands, watercourse, native plant life, rare plants, threatened and endangered plants or animals, etc.), and was referred to the California Department of Fish and Game. In accordance with State Legislation (California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4), the project is subject to a fee of \$1,876.75 after approval, but prior to the County filing the Notice of Determination on the project. This fee, plus a \$50.00 recording fee, is to be submitted to Planning Services and must be made payable to El Dorado County. The fee is forwarded to the State Department of Fish and Game and is used to help defray the cost of managing and protecting the States fish and wildlife resources.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Planning Services staff recommends the Planning Commission forward the following recommendation to the Board of Supervisors:

1. Adopt the Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff; and
2. Recommend approval of Z07-0034/ P07-0033 subject to the Conditions of Approval in Attachment 1 and based on the Findings of Approval in Attachment 2.

**SUPPORT INFORMATION**


**Attachments to Staff Report:**

Attachment 1.....	Conditions of Approval
Attachment 2.....	Findings of Approval
Exhibit A.....	Vicinity Map
Exhibit B.....	General Plan Land Use Map
Exhibit C.....	Zoning Map
Exhibit D.....	Assessor's Map
Exhibit E.....	Commercially Designated Parcels in Project Area
Exhibit F.....	Design Control (DC) and Planned Development (PD) Zoning Overlay in Project Area
Exhibit G.....	Tentative Parcel Map
Exhibit H.....	Initial Submittal 7-6-2007
Exhibit I.....	Second Submittal 6-23-2008
Exhibit J.....	Initial Study



# General Plan Land Use Map


## Cemo Parcel Map Z07-0034/ P07-0033





# Zoning Map

## Cemo Parcel Map Z07-0034/ P07-0033



POR. SECS. 21 & 28, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.

124:30

**PARCEL NOTES**

- 66 - PM 10/1/1
- 67 - PM 10/1/2
- 68 - PM 14/14S/1, 0.19 A
- 69 - PM 14/14S/2, 0.32 A
- 70 - PM 14/14S/3
- 71 - PM 14/129/A, 0.23 A
- 72 - PM 14/129/B, 0.199 A
- 73 - PM 14/129/C, 0.23 A
- 74 - PM 14/128/1, 0.48 A
- 75 - PM 3/08/A
- 76 - NA, 0.11 A
- 77 - NA, 0.031 A
- 78 - PM 6/05
- 79 - NA, 0.102 A
- 80 - NA, 0.018 A
- 81 - PPM 46/65Z
- 82 - NA, 0.001 A
- 83 - PPM 46/65/3
- 84 - NA, 0.037 A
- 85 - PPM 6/65/B
- 86 - NA, 0.032 A
- 87 - PPM 14/128/2, 0.408 A


**Acresages Are Estimates**

Adjusted Map From State of Calif. Map Assessor's Office in Office of the Assessor, Contra Costa County, CA

Rev. July 12, 2006



Assessor's Map Bk. 124 - Pg. 30  
County of El Dorado, CA

**Exhibit D**



This map is NOT a survey. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's Office. It is not intended to be used as a legal document. It is not intended to be used as a survey. It is not intended to be used as a legal document. It is not intended to be used as a survey.

**General Plan Land Use Designation Commercial (C)  
In Project Vicinity  
Cemo Parcel Map Z07-0034/ P07-0033**





**Net Acreage Summary:**

No.	USE	NET AC.
1	PARCEL 1	2.98
2	PARCEL 2	2.12
3	PARCEL 3	3.58
	Total	8.10

**General/Owner:**  
 Cemo Family Properties, LLC  
 Attn: Sherry Cemo  
 1170 Westmore Blvd, Suite 150  
 San Jose, CA 95128  
 916-533-2500

**Engineer:**  
 RSC Engineering, Inc.  
 Attn: Jeffrey Wilson  
 2250 Deering Blvd., Suite 150  
 San Jose, CA 95131  
 916-788-2881

**Scale:**  
 1" = 50'

**County:** Alameda

**Section:** Township and Range,  
 Section 28, Township 10 North, Range  
 8 East

**Survey:** A Parcel Number:  
 121-500-18

**Current Zoning:**  
 R21 - Single Family Two-Acre  
 Residential

**Proposed Zoning:**  
 C-70 - Commercial (Planned  
 Development)

**Total Area:**  
 8.10± AC. ± 382,848 sq

**Total Exhibit Parcel:**



**Total Tract Parcel:**

**Minimum Parcel:** 1.36 AC.  
 Minimum Parcel: 0.74 AC.


**Utilities:**  
 Sewer - G Dorado Irrigation District  
 Water - G Dorado Irrigation District  
 Gas - Ecker 418 P.D.E.  
 Cable - Comcast  
 Electric District - G Dorado District  
 Fire - G Dorado Fire Department

**Notes:**  
 1. Refer to final parcel map for accurate  
 lot dimensions and configurations. 2. An  
 existing 100' wide easement for the  
 1980's. 3. The 100' wide easement is an area  
 outside the 500' year flood plain.

**LEGEND:**  
 PROPOSED SITE  
 PROPOSED BOUNDARY  
 PROPOSED EASEMENTS  
 PROPOSED STRIKE LINE



Zoning Administrator: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Approved/Grant Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Board of Supervisors: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Approved/Grant Date: \_\_\_\_\_




# EXHIBIT G

<b>TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP</b> <b>GREEN VALLEY &amp; SOPHIA</b> <b>PARKWAY</b>  GREEN VALLEY & SOPHIA PARKWAY IN BORRADO HILLS, CA	<b>RSC ENGINEERING</b> 2250 Deering Blvd., Suite 150 San Jose, CA 95131 Ph: 916.788.2881 Fax: 916.788.4488		SHEET NO. <b>1</b> OF 1 DATE: May 21, 2008	<b>CEMO PROPERTIES</b>
--	---	--	---	------------------------


DATE: 07/10/07  
 SHEET NO. 1 OF 1  
 PROJECT NO. Z07-0034/P07-0033

# EXHIBIT H



Z07-0034/P07-0033

SHEET TITLE UT SHEET NO. 1 OF 1 DATE: 07/10/07	PRELIMINARY UTILITY PLAN GREEN VALLEY & SOPHIA PARKWAY COMMERCIAL CTR. GREEN VALLEY RD. & SOPHIA PARKWAY EL DORADO HILLD, CA	PROJECT NO. Z07-0034 DRAWING BY: RSC/EN CHECKED BY: RSC/EN DESIGNED BY: RSC/EN	<p><b>RSC ENGINEERING</b>          2280 Douglas Blvd. Suite 150          Roseville, CA 95681          Ph: 916.766.2884 Fax: 916.766.4408</p>		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>NO.</th> <th>DESCRIPTION</th> <th>DATE</th> <th>BY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY													CEMO PROPERTIES
NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY																			



Z 07-0034/P07-0033







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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** Z07-0034/ P07-0033 Cemo Parcel Map

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

**Contact Person:** Jonathan Fong, Planning Services

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

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Cemo Family Properties, LLC. 1107 Investment Blvd. Ste 150. El Dorado Hills CA, 95762.

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** Cemo Family Properties, LLC. 1107 Investment Blvd. Ste 150. El Dorado Hills CA, 95762.

**Project Agent's Name and Address:** RSC Engineering. 2250 Douglas Blvd. Ste 150. Roseville CA, 95661.

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:** RSC Engineering. 2250 Douglas Blvd. Ste 150. Roseville CA, 95661.

**Project Location:** The property is located on the south side of Green Valley Road, at the intersection with Sophia Parkway in the El Dorado Hills area.

**Assessor's Parcel No:** 124-300-98

**Zoning:** Two-Acre Residential (R2A)

**Section:** 21      **T:** 10N **R:** 8E

**General Plan Designation:** Commercial (C)

**Description of Project:** The project would involve a Rezone and Parcel Map. The Rezone would amend the parcel zoning from Two-Acre Residential (R2A) to Commercial- Planned Development (C-PD). The Parcel Map would create three parcels ranging in size from 1.43-acres to 4.27-acres. No development would occur as part of the project. All future development would be evaluated through the Planned Development process.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)</u>
Site:	R2A	C	Undeveloped
North:	RF	OS	Folsom Lake Recreational Area
East:	C-DC/R2A	C/ MDR	Commercial/ Residential
South:	R2A	MDR	Single family residence
West:	C-PD	C	Undeveloped

**Briefly Describe the environmental setting:** The project site is an undeveloped parcel in the El Dorado Hills Community Region. Riparian features on the site include an intermittent drainage which begins on the eastern portion of the site and exits along the western property boundary. Multiple seasonal wetlands occur throughout the site along the drainage channel. Vegetation onsite is comprised of mixed native trees and plants and various riparian vegetation along the drainage channel. The site has been previously disturbed as a part of road improvements on Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway. Road construction activities have resulted in large deposits of fill material on both the east and west portions of the site.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**


The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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


**DETERMINATION**

**On the basis of this initial evaluation:**

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

Signature:  Date: September 17, 2008

Printed Name: Jonathan Fong For: El Dorado County

Signature:  Date: September 17, 2008

Printed Name: Gina Hunter For: El Dorado County

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **Introduction**

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. The project would allow the rezoning of the parcel to Commercial- Planned Development (C-PD). The Parcel Map would create three parcels ranging in size from 2.12-acres to 3.59-acres. No development would be proposed as part of this application. All future development of the site would be reviewed as part of the Planned Development application.

### **Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses**

The project is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway in the El Dorado Hills area. The project is surrounded by residential and public facility land uses. The project is bounded to the north by the Folsom Lake State Park. To the south are residential land uses. To the east and west are commercially designated parcels.

### **Project Characteristics**

The project would amend the parcel zoning from Two-Acre Residential (R2A) to Commercial- Planned Development (C-PD). Three parcels would be created ranging in size from 2.12-acres to 3.59-acres. No development would occur as part of the project. All future development would require review and approval of a Planned Development application.

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

The parcel is accessible from Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway. No development would occur in conjunction with the project. At such time development is proposed, a Planned Development application would be required which would address access and circulation issues.

#### **2. Utilities and Infrastructure**

No utilities or services would be extended to the parcel in conjunction with the project. Public water and sewer services would be required for future development of the site.

#### **3. Population**

The project would allow commercial development of the site. No development is proposed in conjunction with the project and would not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

#### **4. Construction Considerations**

No construction is proposed with the project. Future development of the site would require submittal of a Planned Development application which would address construction considerations.

### **Project Schedule and Approvals**

This Initial Study is being circulated for public and agency review for a 30-day period. Written comments on the Initial Study should be submitted to the project planner indicated in the Summary section, above.

Following the close of the written comment period, the Initial Study would be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and would be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency would also determine whether to approve the project.

## **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 would 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 offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**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. The surrounding land uses are predominantly residential.

- a. **Scenic Vista.** The project site is located at the intersection of Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway Lane. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.<sup>6</sup> There would be no impact.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is not adjacent or visible from a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site.<sup>7</sup> There would be no impact.
- c. **Visual Character.** The project would allow for future development consistent with the Commercial (C) zone district and Commercial (C) land use designation. Future development would be subject to the Planned Development process which would analyze potential visual impacts. This would be accomplished by application of the Planned Development zoning overlay to the project site through the project process. There would be no impact.
- d. **Light and Glare.** The project would allow for future commercial development. New sources of light and glare would result from commercial development of the parcel. The potential lighting sources would be consistent with the existing conditions in the area. Prior to approval of any development of the site, Planning Services would review the proposed lighting plan to determine any future outdoor lighting sources comply with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the impacts of existing light and glare created by the project would be less than significant.

**Finding**

<sup>6</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1.

<sup>7</sup> California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>).

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

No impacts to aesthetics are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Aesthetics" category, the impacts would be less than significant.

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

**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. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not within an Agricultural zone or Agricultural overlay. There would be no impact.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The property is not located within a Williamson Act Contract and the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. There would be no impact.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The project site is not located within an agriculture-zoned area nor is the site zoned for agriculture use. There would be no impact

**Finding**

For this "Agriculture" category, there would be no impact.

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

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub> will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of 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-c.

**Air Quality Plan and Standards.** No construction would occur as part of the project. Future development would be required to comply with Air Quality Management District (AQMD) rules during project construction. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for onsite and offsite improvements, a Fugitive Dust Plan would be required. Adherence to District rules during project construction would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

d-e.

**Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors.** No development would be proposed in conjunction with the project. Future commercial development would be required to comply with District rules during project construction. Compliance with District rules would reduce short term potential impacts to a less than significant level. Potential long term impacts would be addressed through the Planned Development application process. Potential uses would be required to be consistent with the C zone district. Approval of future uses through the Planned Development process would ensure the potential long term impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding**

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

As discussed above, the proposed project would not impact air quality. For this "Air Quality" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;
- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
- 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-f Biological Resources.** The initial Biological Resources Evaluation prepared for the project identified drainage channels and wetlands on the project site. No development is proposed as part of the project. All future commercial development of the site would be processed through the Planned Development process. As part of the application review, biological resources studies would be required which would include project specific impacts and potential mitigation measures. . These studies would include an arborist report, drainage studies, and biological resource assessments. These reports would identify



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

any significant resources and provide appropriate mitigation. Adherence to the recommendations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**Finding**

For this "Biological" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-d. **Cultural Resources:** The cultural resources record search completed for the project site indicated that there would be a moderate possibility of cultural resources in the project vicinity. Future development of the site would require submittal of a cultural resources study to evaluate the presence of cultural resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding**

For this "Cultural Resources" category, impacts would be less than significant.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist			X	

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as ground shaking, 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. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.<sup>8</sup> No other active or

<sup>8</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, p.5.9-29.

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

potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.<sup>9</sup> There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are two known faults within the project vicinity; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is located within the West Bear Mountain Faults Zone. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.<sup>10</sup>

Earthquake activity on the closest active could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey.<sup>11</sup> While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located be no risk of landslide.<sup>12</sup>

There would be no significant impacts that could not be mitigated through proper building design, as enforced through the County building permit process, which requires compliance with the Uniform Building Code, as modified for California seismic conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** No grading would occur as part of the project. The project would only change the parcel zoning to allow for commercial development. Any future development would be required to receive a grading permit prior to project construction. The proposed grading would be required to adhere to the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance*. Adhere to the County Grading Ordinance would reduce the potential impacts to less than significant.
- d. **Expansive soils** No development is proposed as part of the project. No impacts would occur. Future development of the site would result in soil disturbance as part of commercial development. All future development would be required to comply with the County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Septic Systems.** The project would be served by public water and sewer. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Geology and Soils" category, impacts would be less than significant.

<sup>9</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*  
<sup>10</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, p.5.9-5.*  
<sup>11</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002. (http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha)*  
<sup>12</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, pages. 5.9-6 to 5.9-9.*

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former onsite mining operations.

a-b. **Hazardous Substances.** No development would occur as part of the project. Future development may include the temporary storage of fuel onsite for the construction of buildings and required onsite and offsite improvements.

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

Future storage of any hazardous substances would require submittal of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan which would be subject to review and approval by the Department of Environmental Health. There would be no impact.

- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The project would not generate any hazardous emissions. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>13</sup> There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There is no private airstrip(s) in the immediate vicinity that is identified on a U.S. Geological Survey Topography Map. There would be no impact.
- g. **Emergency Response Plan.** No development is proposed as part of the project. Future development would be subject to review by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department. The Department would review the proposal and recommend conditions of approval to comply with Fire Safe Regulations and to reduce potential impacts to any response plan. There would be no impact.
- h. **Fire Hazards.** The project site located in an area classified as having a moderate fire hazard.<sup>14</sup> The El Dorado Hills Fire Department would review future development plans to recommend conditions to reduce the impacts to fire hazards. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, there would be no impact.

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

<sup>13</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), [http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese\\_List](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List), accessed September 23, 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004.

<sup>14</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.8-4.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical storm water pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

a & f. **Water Quality Standards.** The project would be required to connect to public water. The public water service has reviewed the project and has determined that there is adequate water to service the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Groundwater.** The project would be served by public water and sewer. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Erosion Control Plan.** No development is proposed as part of the project. Prior to approval of any future development, the Department of Transportation would review the proposed project and would require a Grading

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

Plan for any proposed road improvements. The Grading Plan would be required to be in conformance with the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*. Adherence to the standards of the Ordinance would reduce potential erosion impacts to a less than significant level.

- d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** No development is proposed as part of the project. Future development would require a drainage, erosion control and plan for the required road improvements and any onsite grading. Adherence to the plan would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. **Storm Water Run-off.** Based on the soil types, surface runoff has been characterized as being slow to moderate. Erosion control plans would be required for any future road improvements. Adherence to the erosion plans would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

g, h, & i.

**Flooding.** The project is outside of mapped flood plains, impacts would be less than significant.

**FIRM.** The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0700 D, last updated December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

- j. **Seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.** The potential impacts due to a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow are remote. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding**

No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Hydrology" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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



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

- Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
  - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
  - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a. **Established Community.** The project site is surrounded by residential uses and is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Region. The project would not physically divide an established community. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Land Use Plan.** The El Dorado County General Plan designates the project site as Commercial (C) which allows a range of commercial and retail uses. The parcel is currently zoned Two-Acre Residential (R2A) which allows single family residential development. The project would change the zoning from R2A to Commercial- Planned Development (C-PD) to be consistent with the (C) land use designation. The (C) zone district would allow a range of commercial and retail land uses consistent with the (C) land use designation. The project site is adjacent to existing residential-zoned land uses. The Rezone would include the Planned Development zoning overlay which would require future development to be reviewed through the PD planning process which would evaluate all proposed uses to determine compatibility with the surrounding land uses. The proposed project would be consistent within the General Plan Designation and the El Dorado Hills Community Region. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), prior to development of the site, the applicant would be required to submit biological studies to identify any natural resources located on the site. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding**

The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan policies for residential uses. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property. No significant impacts are expected. For this "Land Use" category, impacts would be less than significant.

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
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>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>

**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.



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

a & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present.<sup>15</sup> The project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.<sup>16</sup> There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect existing uses. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this "Mineral Resources" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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?			X	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?				X
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?				X

**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.

<sup>15</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.

<sup>16</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.

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

a-d. **Noise Standards.** No development is proposed as part of the project. Future development of the site may include the use of heavy equipment for onsite and offsite improvements. The onsite and offsite road improvements may generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment, trucks, bulldozer) at a potentially significant level (greater than 60 dB  $L_{eq}$  and 70 dB  $L_{max}$  between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 GP table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in rural regions-construction noise). Construction operations for road improvements would require adherence to construction hours as required by General Plan Policy 6.5.11. Construction activities would be limited to 7a.m. to 7p.m. during weekdays and 8a.m. to 5p.m. on weekends and federally recognized holidays. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant. The long-term noise impacts would be related to future noise generated by the site. Prior to development of the site, an acoustical analysis would be required to determine the long term impacts on the surrounding residential land uses.. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

e & f. **Airport Noise.** The project site is not within the airport land use plan. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

Potential short and long term noise sources would be required to comply with established noise standards and policies. For this "Noise" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth.** The project site is in an area zoned for residential use and is designated as Commercial land use under the 2004 General Plan. The proposed project would allow for commercial land uses which is consistent with both the General Plan and General Plan EIR. No further land division would occur without both a General Plan and Zoning amendment. Utility services are available at the project site. No housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Finding**

The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this "Population and Housing" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a. **Fire Protection.** The El Dorado Hills Fire Department currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. Prior to development of the site the Fire Department would review the plans to determine the adequacy of fire protection services in the area. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Police Protection.** The proposed project would allow for commercial development of the site. Impacts to police protection services would be less than significant.

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

c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** The proposed project is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Service District. The project would allow for commercial development of the site. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding**

As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services either directly or indirectly. For this "Public Services" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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?			X	
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?			X	

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-b. **Parks and Recreation.** The proposed project would not increase population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. Park facilities are maintained by the El Dorado Hills Community Services District. The El Dorado Hills Community Services District charges park impact fees in conjunction with building permits. There would be a less than significant impact.

**Finding**

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected either directly or indirectly. For this "Recreation" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** The Department of Transportation would require a traffic study prior to any development of the site. The study would determine if the project would worsen the Level of Service of any roads serving the project. The study would recommend mitigation measures for any increase in traffic in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.

d. **Hazards.** No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access.** The project site receives access off Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway. Road improvements may be required to increase the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to fire safe

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

regulations and may be placed as conditions of approval for future development. Based upon the required road improvements there would be no disruption of emergency access to and from the existing residence or those in surrounding parcels. There would be no impact.

- f. **Parking.** Prior to development of the site, the applicant would be required to submit site plans demonstrating compliance with the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. There would be no impact.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** Prior to development of the site, the El Dorado Transit Authority would be distributed the project and would determine if additional alternative transportation improvements are necessary. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this "Transportation/Traffic" category, impacts would be less than significant.

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>			
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X
h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.			X

**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 onsite 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 onsite wastewater system; or
- Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.

- a. **Wastewater.** The project would require connection to a public wastewater system. Storm water runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). Impacts would be less than significant.
- b., d., e. **New Facilities** The project would require connections to public water and sewer. The utilities provider has reviewed the application and has determined that adequate services exist to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Storm Water Drainage.** Any drainage facilities for the project would be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f & g. **Solid Waste.** No anticipated increases of solid waste generated from the future development would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.
- h. **Power.** Power and telephone facilities are currently in place and utilized at the project site. No further expansion of power anticipated from project. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding**

No significant utility and service system impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

**Discussion**

- a. As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be a less than significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV). No development would occur as part of the project. All future development would be reviewed through the Planned Development process which would require full analysis of potential impacts associated with the project.
- b. No development is proposed as part of the project. Prior to development of the site, additional reports and studies would be necessary to determine the potential impacts to the project site and to the neighborhood. There would be no significant impacts related to 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, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant.
- c. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly. No development would occur as part of the project. All potential impacts would be address through future Planned Development applications. No development is proposed as part of the project therefore impacts would be less than significant.



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

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 - County Code)

County of El Dorado Drainage Manual (Resolution No. 67-97, Adopted March 14, 1995)

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170)

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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