27
10/11

RESOLUTION NO. 163-2016

OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO

CERTIFYING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE

SARATOGA ESTATES PROJECT

(EL DORADO COUNTY FILE NOS. Z14-0007/PD14-0006/TM14-1520/DA15-0001)

WHEREAS, an application for the Saratoga Estates project to subdivide approximately 121.28 acres of property situated north of Highway 50 in the El Dorado Hills Community Region into 317 residential lots was submitted to the County on September 12, 2014 as Rezone (Z14-0007), Planned Development (PD14-0006), Tentative Map (TM14-1520), and Development Agreement (DA15-0001); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.), the County of El Dorado (the "County") has prepared an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") (SCH#2015032058) for the Saratoga Estates Project (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, On March 25, 2015 the County commenced the environmental review process with issuance of a CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP) soliciting written comments regarding the scope of the EIR during a 30-day comment period beginning March 26, 2015 and closing April 27, 2015; and

WHEREAS, a public scoping meeting was held on April 9, 2015, from 6:00 pm to 7:30 pm in the El Dorado Hills Fire Department Conference Room located at 1050 Wilson Boulevard, El Dorado Hills, CA to solicit written comments on the scope of the EIR analysis; and

WHEREAS, the NOP and related materials were also posted on the County's project-dedicated website, e-mail notices were sent out to the subscriber lists, and pursuant to El Dorado County Resolution No. 241-2014 mailed notices were sent to all landowners within a 1-mile radius of the site; and

WHEREAS, comments received by the County on the NOP were taken into account during preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the DEIR was released for public review on March 23, 2016 for a 45-day comment period beginning March 24, 2016 and closing May 7, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Notice of Availability (NOA), the requisite number of copies of the Draft EIR, and related materials were delivered to the State Clearinghouse and mailed to affected public agencies, organizations, and interested parties,

WHEREAS, copies of the NOA and the DEIR were also posted on the County's project-dedicated website, e-mail notices were sent out to the subscriber lists, and pursuant to El Dorado County Resolution No. 241-2014 mailed notices were sent to all landowners within a 1-mile radius of the site, individuals beyond the 1-mile radius who specifically requested notification, and hard copies were made available for public review at the Community Development Agency in Placerville, California, and the El Dorado County Main Library in Placerville, and West Slope Branches in Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR identified potentially significant impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality, Biological Resources, Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Public Services, and Cultural Resources that may result from implementation of the Project and mitigation measures proposed to mitigate those impacts to less-than-significant levels; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR identified potentially significant noise impacts, that, even with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures proposed in the EIR, cannot be reduced to less-than-significant levels, or there are no known mitigation measures to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels; and

WHEREAS, written comments were submitted during the public comment period by public agencies and members of the public, and after consideration thereof, written responses were prepared for said comments by the consultant, with input from County staff, and which were reviewed by County staff; and

WHEREAS, the EIR Response to Comments document released August 15, 2016 contains responses to all written comments received during the 45-day comment period on the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, following the public review period, a Final Environmental Impact Report on the Saratoga Estates Project (SCH#2015032058) has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) to include the DEIR, the appendices thereto, copies of public comments and the County's responses to comments pertaining to the environmental analysis presented in the Draft EIR, and the written Responses to said Comments, and certain errata to the DEIR, of which all documents constitute and shall be collectively referred to herein as the "Final EIR"; and

WHEREAS, on or about August 8, 2016, a notice was mailed and published announcing the Final EIR, which included written responses to the public and agency comments, was available. Upon request, this document was sent by mail to the commenting public agencies and the member(s) of the public in a manner such that public agencies and members of the public received it at least ten (10) days before the action was taken on this date with respect to the Final EIR and the Project; and

WHEREAS, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), attached hereto as Exhibit "A", and CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations, attached hereto as Exhibit "B", are proposed for adoption; and

WHEREAS, on August 25, 2016, the El Dorado County Planning Commission ("Commission") held a public hearing noticed and published in accordance with State law and local ordinance to consider the Project and the Commission received verbal presentations and a written Staff Report and Exhibits related to the Project and the Final EIR from County staff and other interested parties, and said documents were independently reviewed and considered by the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Commission, after considering all of the evidence presented and based upon substantial evidence, and on the basis of the whole record before it, recommended that the Board of Supervisors certify the Final EIR, adopt CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations, adopt the MMRP, and approve the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Commission recommended preparation of Resolution No. 163-2016 documenting its action; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with State law and local ordinance, County staff has given due notice of the Board of Supervisor's public hearing regarding the Project and the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, on September 13, 2016, the Board of Supervisors held its public hearing to consider the Project and received verbal presentation and a written Staff Report and Exhibits, from County staff and other interested parties, and said documents were independently reviewed and considered by the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board reviewed and considered the information presented in the Final EIR and other relevant evidence to determine compliance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the County's procedures for implementing CEQA, and the Board, prior to taking action on the Project, independently reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and other relevant evidence; and

WHEREAS, based on the Board's exercise of its independent judgment when reviewing and considering the information in the Final EIR and other relevant evidence presented thereto, the Board finds that the Final EIR prepared for the Saratoga Estates Project is adequate, and said Final EIR has been prepared and completed in compliance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the County's procedures for implementing CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the Board after considering all of the evidence presented and based on substantial evidence in the record, finds and declares that the foregoing recitals (made a part hereof) are true, and makes further findings concerning the environmental impacts relating to the Project, as described in the Final EIR. These findings, along with the Statement of Overriding Considerations, are set forth more specifically in attached Exhibit "A," which is incorporated herein by reference. The CEQA Findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations, which are based on substantial evidence, were reviewed by the Board. The CEQA Findings reflect that except for certain effects relating to noise, all potentially significant environmental effects will be reduced to a level of less than significant through the adoption and implementation of all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and set forth in the MMRP, which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference. The CEQA Findings and the Statement of Overriding Consideration reflect that the benefits of the Project outweigh its significant and unavoidable effects; and

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors finds as follows:

1. Pursuant to Section 15090 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that: a) the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; b) the Final EIR was presented to the Board of Supervisors, and the Board reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to taking action on the Project; and c) the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the County of El Dorado.

2. The Board of Supervisors finds that the EIR shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information and provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the project in contemplation of its environmental consequences.

3. The Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Plan and Reporting Program attached as Exhibit "A" (Mitigation Monitoring Plan) to ensure implementation of feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR. The Board of Supervisors finds that these mitigation measures are adequate, fully enforceable as policies and/or implementation measures of the Project, and shall be binding upon the County and affected parties.

4. The Board further finds that mitigation measures have been required which feasibly mitigate and substantially lessen all significant effects on the environment, except as noted in the Final EIR. However, despite these mitigation measures, there are still significant and unavoidable environmental impacts from this project relating to noise cannot be mitigated fully, substantially lessened, or avoided. Accordingly, after considering such impacts and balancing specific economic, social, environmental, legal,

technological, and other factors, the Board adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is based on substantial evidence, and is set forth in attached Exhibit "B".

5. The Clerk of the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors, located at 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, California, is the custodian of the documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Board's decision is based.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado at a regular meeting of said Board, held the 13th day of September, 2016, by the following vote of said Board:

Ayes: Veerkamp, Ranalli, Mikulaco, Frentzen, Novasel
Noes: None
Absent: None

Attest:
James S. Mitrisin
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: _____
Deputy Clerk

_____
Ron Mikulaco, Chair, Board of Supervisors

Exhibits Attached:

A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
B: CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

(AS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2016)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.2 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

In compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines §15097 (a), when significant effects are identified in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or negative declaration, the Lead Agency is required to adopt a program for reporting or monitoring mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of approval for the proposed project. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) has been developed for the Saratoga Estates Project, consistent with the requirements of §15097. The intent of the MMRP is to prescribe and enforce a means for properly and successfully implementing the mitigation measures identified within the EIR for this project. Unless otherwise noted, the applicant shall be responsible for complying with and paying for all mitigation measures identified herein.

1.2.1 COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

The intent of the MMRP is to ensure the effective implementation and enforcement of adopted mitigation measures and permit conditions. The MMRP is intended to be used by El Dorado County staff and mitigation monitoring personnel to ensure compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation. Mitigation measures identified in this MMRP were developed in the EIR prepared for the proposed project. The MMRP will provide for monitoring of construction activities as necessary and in-the-field identification and resolution of environmental concerns.

Monitoring and documenting the implementation of mitigation measures will be coordinated by El Dorado County. The table attached to this report identifies the mitigation measure, the responsible agency for the monitoring action, and timing of the monitoring action. The applicant will be responsible for fully understanding and effectively implementing the mitigation measures contained within the MMRP and for ensuring compliance.

1.2.2 MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

The following table indicates the mitigation measure number, the mitigation measure text, the monitoring agency, implementation timing, and an area to record monitoring compliance.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Mitigation Monitoring Plan				
Mitigation Measure	Measure Description	Monitoring Agency	Implementation Schedule	Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Mitigation Measure 4.3-1: Prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan.	The applicant shall prepare and implement a SWPPP that complies with the SWRCB Statewide Construction General Permit. The SWPPP must identify BMPs that will protect water quality from polluted stormwater runoff.	El Dorado County	Prior to issuance of grading permit and during construction.	
Mitigation Measure 4.3-2: Complete final drainage plan and provide adequate onsite storm drainage facilities.	The applicant shall prepare a Final Drainage Analysis conforming to the County's Drainage Manual and the County's West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan requirements~~Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP)~~ with each final map (phase) of the project. The Final Drainage Analysis shall be submitted to the County along with the Improvement Plans for each phase. The Final Drainage Analysis shall identify project drainage facilities and design features that ensure runoff from the project site will not exceed pre-development levels. The identified drainage facilities and design features shall be included in the Improvement Plans for each phase. At a minimum, the necessary drainage facilities and design features constructed with each phase of development shall be sufficient to mitigate post-development runoff to pre-development levels for each phase. Drainage facilities and design features for later phases of the project may be constructed with earlier phases of the project. The Final Drainage Analysis for each phase shall include evaluation of the final design for the 85th percentile storm (water quality storm), the tenth percentile storm (10-year storm) and the one percentile storm (100-year) storm. The Final Drainage Analysis for each phase shall include a discussion of that phase set in the context of the overall project, considering prior and future phase drainage facilities and design features and the West Slope Development and	El Dorado County	Prior to recordation of first final map.	

	Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan requirements. Maintenance of the project drainage facilities and design features shall be the responsibility of the Home Owner's Association (HOA). A provision for maintenance and management of the drainage facilities and design features shall be included in the Codes, Covenants and Restrictions for the project. A separate Maintenance Program shall be developed for LID and water quality features in accordance with the County's West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan requirements ~~SWMP~~ to guide the long term maintenance and management of the systems by the HOA. The Maintenance Program shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to recordation of the first final map.		
Biological Resources			
Mitigation Measure 4.4-1a: Avoid or minimize effects to valley elderberry longhorn beetle.	If rough grading and/or removal of onsite elderberry shrubs do not occur by May 2016, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys for VELB according to the USFWS protocol outlined in USFWS' *Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle* (1999) (or other USFWS conservation guidelines in effect at the time these activities are implemented) before any ground disturbing construction activities. The biologist shall, at a minimum, identify and map all elderberry shrubs with stems measuring 1 inch or greater in diameter at ground level on and within 100 feet of the project site, take stem counts, and document any exit holes. If no exit holes are found, no additional mitigation is required. If exit holes are identified during the survey, the applicant shall implement all take avoidance measures identified by the USFWS, including, but not limited to the following measures (as updated or amended by USFWS at the time the above-described construction activities are implemented): ▲ Impacts to VELB will be avoided and minimized by following the Conservation Guidelines for cases where elderberry shrubs can be retained and protected within 100 feet of the project footprint. ▲ If elderberry shrubs are 100 feet or more from project activities, no	El Dorado County (and USFWS if necessary)	Prior to ground disturbing construction activities

direct or indirect impacts are expected. Shrubs will be protected during construction by establishing and maintaining a high visibility fence at least 100 feet from the drip line of each elderberry shrub with stems 1 inch in diameter or greater.

- If elderberry shrubs can be retained within the project footprint, project activities may occur up to 20 feet from the dripline of elderberry shrubs if precautions are implemented to minimize the potential for indirect impacts. Specifically, these minimization measures include:

- A minimum setback of at least 20 feet from the dripline of each elderberry plant with stems greater than 1-inch diameter at ground level will be maintained to avoid direct impacts. The buffer area will be fenced with high visibility construction fencing before commencement of ground-disturbing activities and will be maintained for the duration of construction activities. The project applicant will ensure that ground-disturbing activities on the project site do not alter the hydrology of the site or otherwise affect the likelihood of vigor or survival of elderberry shrubs.
- The project proponent will ensure that project activities, such as truck traffic or other use of machinery, do not create excessive dust on the project site, such that the growth or vigor of elderberry shrubs is adversely affected. Enforcement of a speed-limit and watering dirt roadways are potential methods to ensure that excessive dust is not created.
- Areas that are disturbed temporarily will be restored to pre-disturbance conditions. Erosion control measures will be implemented to restore areas disturbed within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs.
- No insecticides, herbicides, fertilizers, or other chemicals will be used within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs. Herbaceous vegetation may be mowed or removed using hand tools within 100 feet, but not within 20 feet of the elderberry shrubs.
- If new permanent development is to occur within the 100-foot buffer (but outside the 20-foot buffer), the potential for indirect effects will be evaluated by a qualified biologist. If indirect effects are likely to occur, the project applicant will consult with USFWS to determine the appropriate conservation measures. If indirect effects are not likely to occur, then no additional minimization measures would be required.

  - For elderberry shrubs that cannot be avoided by at least 20 feet or

	impacts to the beetle minimized through the measures listed above, consultation with USFWS in compliance with the ESA will be carried out to seek incidental take authorization. ◢ No elderberry shrub will be removed or transplanted without prior coordination with USFWS and assurance that the project proponent has abided by all pertinent conditions of any applicable incidental take authorization. Conservation and minimization measures are likely to include preparation of supporting documentation that describes methods for relocation of existing shrubs and maintaining existing shrubs and other vegetation in a conservation area. ◢ Relocation of existing elderberry shrubs and planting of new elderberry seedlings and associated riparian species and/or the purchase of mitigation credits at an approved mitigation bank will be implemented according to the Conservation Guidelines (USFWS 1999) or other applicable USFWS conservation guidelines in effect at the time of construction implementation. The current Conservation Guidelines use stem count data, presence or absence of exit holes, and whether the affected elderberry shrubs are located in riparian habitat to determine the number of elderberry seedlings or cuttings and associated riparian vegetation that would need to be planted as compensatory mitigation for affected VELB habitat. Compensatory mitigation may include planting replacement elderberry seedlings or cuttings and associated native plants within suitable areas of the project site, planting replacement elderberry seedlings or cuttings and associated native plants at a suitable offsite location, purchasing credits at an approved mitigation bank, or a combination thereof. Relocated and replacement shrubs and associated native plantings will be placed in the on- or offsite conservation areas providing a minimum of 1,800 square feet per transplanted shrub. These conservation areas will be preserved in perpetuity as habitat for VELB. The final VELB mitigation plan, including transplanting procedures, long-term protection, management of the mitigation areas, and monitoring procedures will be consistent with the *Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle* (USFWS 1999), or other USFWS guidelines in effect at the time the construction activities are implemented.		
Mitigation Measure 4.4-1b: Avoid or minimize effects to western pond turtle.	◢ Within 24 hours before beginning construction activities within 200 feet of suitable aquatic habitat for western pond turtle, a qualified biologist will inspect areas of anticipated disturbance for the presence of western pond turtle. The construction area will be re-inspected whenever a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or more has occurred. The monitoring	El Dorado County	Prior to construction within 200 feet of suitable aquatic habitat for western pond turtle.

	biologist will be available thereafter; if a turtle is encountered during construction activities, the monitoring biologist will have the authority to stop construction activities until a qualified biologist can relocate the western pond turtle to the nearest suitable aquatic habitat outside the area of disturbance.		
Mitigation Measure 4.4-1c: Avoid or minimize the loss of special-status bird nests.	The project applicant will implement the following measures to avoid or minimize the loss of nests of golden eagle, white-tailed kite, and other raptors and special status birds: ▲ To the extent feasible, vegetation (including tree) removal, grading, and other ground disturbing activities will be carried out during the nonbreeding season (September 1 through February 14) for migratory birds. ▲ If construction activity is scheduled to occur during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31), the project applicant shall utilize a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for all potential special-status bird species (golden eagle, white-tailed kite, burrowing owl, and tricolored blackbird) and suitable habitat onsite and within 500 feet of the project site to identify active nests that could be affected by project construction. The surveys shall be conducted before the approval of grading and/or improvement plans (as applicable) and no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction in a particular area. If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required. ▲ If active nests are found, impacts on nesting birds, including golden eagle, white-tailed kite, burrowing owl, and other raptors, as well as tricolored blackbirds shall be avoided by establishment of appropriate buffers around the nests. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that any young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. A 500-foot buffer around raptor nests, burrows, and/or colonies are generally adequate to protect them from disturbance, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW depending on site-specific conditions. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities will be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest.	El Dorado County (and CDFW if necessary)	Prior to approval of grading and/or improvement plans for and no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to ground disturbing activities scheduled to occur during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31)
Mitigation Measure 4.4-1d: Avoid or minimize loss of protected bat species.	Prior to construction, suitable roosting habitat (assumed to be trees on the project site) for roosting bats on the project site will be surveyed by a qualified biologist. Surveys will consist of	El Dorado County (and CDFW if necessary)	Prior to construction

	a daytime pedestrian survey looking for evidence of bat use (e.g., guano) and may also include an evening emergence survey to note the presence or absence of bats, if warranted. The type of survey will depend on the condition of the potential roosting trees. If no bat roosts are found, then no further study is required. If evidence of bat use is observed, the number and species of bats using the roost will be determined. Bat detectors may be used to supplement survey efforts, but are not required. If roosts of pallid or silver-haired bats are determined to be present and must be removed, the bats will be excluded from the roosting site before the tree is removed. A program addressing compensation, exclusion methods, and roost removal procedures will be developed in consultation with CDFW before implementation. Exclusion methods may include use of one-way doors at roost entrances (bats may leave but not reenter), or sealing roost entrances when the site can be confirmed to contain no bats. Exclusion efforts may be restricted during periods of sensitive activity (e.g., during hibernation or while females in maternity colonies are nursing young). The loss of each roost (if any) will be replaced in consultation with CDFW and may require construction and installation of bat boxes suitable to the bat species and colony size excluded from the original roosting site. If determined necessary during consultation with CDFW, replacement roosts will be implemented before bats are excluded from the original roost sites. Once the replacement roosts are constructed and it is confirmed that bats are not present in the original roost site, the roost trees may be removed.		
Mitigation Measure 4.4-1e: Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (biological resources element).	Prior to any ground disturbing activities that would affect riparian or aquatic habitats, a qualified biologist shall conduct an education program for all persons employed or otherwise working on the project. The program shall consist of a presentation from the biologist that includes a discussion of the biology of the habitats and species potentially affected by project development. The biologist shall also include as part of the education program information about the distribution and	El Dorado County	Prior to ground disturbing construction activities that would affect riparian or aquatic habitats

	habitat needs of any special-status species that may be present, legal protections for those species, penalties for violations, and project-specific protective measures identified by regulatory authorizations. Interpretation shall be provided for non-English speaking workers, and the same instruction shall be provided for any new workers prior to their performing work onsite. The permittee shall prepare and distribute wallet-sized cards or a fact sheet that contains relevant biological data for workers to carry onsite. Upon completion of the education program, employees shall sign a form stating they attended the program and understand all protection measures.		
Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a: Avoid effects to sensitive natural communities by fencing resources.	Before construction activities commence, all sensitive areas will be flagged or fenced with brightly visible construction flagging and/or fencing under the direction of the qualified biologist to ensure that grading, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activities will not occur within these areas. This delineation shall be consistent with and incorporate the USACE-approved preliminary jurisdictional determination or verified jurisdictional determination. Foot traffic by construction personnel will also be limited in these areas to prevent the introduction of invasive or weedy species. Periodic inspections during construction will be conducted by the monitoring biologist to ensure the integrity of exclusion fencing/flagging is maintained throughout the period of construction involving ground disturbance.	El Dorado County	Prior to ground disturbing construction activities
Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b: Obtain all required regulatory authorizations if project development would result in the fill of Waters of the United States.	Prior to any grading or construction activities within waters of the United States., the appropriate Section 404 permit will be obtained for any project-related impacts. Any waters of the United States that would be affected by project development shall be replaced or restored on a "no-net-loss" basis in accordance with USACE mitigation guidelines (or the applicable USACE guidelines in place at the time of construction). In association with the Section 404 permit (if applicable) and prior to the issuance of any grading permit, Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board shall be obtained.	El Dorado County and RWQCB (and USACE if necessary)	Prior to construction activities within waters of the United States

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2c: Obtain all required regulatory authorizations if project development would result in impacts to aquatic or riparian habitats within CDFW jurisdiction.	If it is determined that project development would affect the bed, bank, channel, or associated riparian habitat subject to CDFW jurisdiction under Fish and Game Code Section 1602, a Streambed Alteration Notification shall be submitted to CDFW, pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code. If proposed activities are determined to be subject to CDFW jurisdiction, the project proponent shall abide by the conditions of any executed agreement prior to the issuance of a grading permit by El Dorado County.	El Dorado County and CDFW	Prior to issuance of a grading permit
Mitigation Measure 4.4-3a: Implement additional actions to further reduce impacts to wetland features due to alternate minimum setback during construction.	The following actions shall be implemented during grading and other ground-disturbing construction activities within 100 feet of the onsite wetland features: ◢ A qualified biologist shall be onsite during all initial vegetation clearing and grading activities. ◢ High-visibility orange fencing shall be installed 10 feet from the edge of aquatic features and riparian habitat or at the edge of the grading/construction footprint, whichever is greater. The fencing shall be installed at the edge of the construction footprint around all aquatic features, as directed by the monitoring biologist. The fencing shall be installed prior to ground-disturbing activities and shall remain throughout the duration of construction activities. The fencing shall be checked daily by the superintendent or foreman to ensure that the fencing remains intact. ◢ Excavation and ground disturbance within 100 feet of any aquatic feature (excluding removal of trees) shall be limited to dry periods (generally between April 15 and October 15). ◢ Within identified wetland features, the top 4 inches of topsoil within the temporary disturbance area shall be stripped and stockpiled onsite. Once construction of the lots is complete, the topsoil shall be returned to the permanent buffer areas to maintain an existing seed bank and promote rapid re-establishment of vegetative cover. ◢ If rain is forecasted to occur, all bare soil shall be covered with plastic sheeting, or equivalent, 24 hours prior to an anticipated precipitation event.	El Dorado County	Measures will be shown on grading and improvement plans and will be implemented during construction.
Mitigation Measure 4.4-3b:	◢ The applicant shall hire a qualified biologist to prepare a revegetation plan	El Dorado County	Revegetation and

Provide permanent design features and monitoring to further reduce impacts to wetland features due to alternate minimum setback during operation.	and submit to the County's Community Development Department prior to the start of construction. The plan shall include information on planting, maintenance, monitoring, and adaptive management strategies. For all disturbed areas within 40 feet of aquatic features and riparian habitat, the revegetation plan shall specify revegetation with native plant material, including native shrubs and trees to improve bank stability and habitat values. ▲ To ensure establishment of native habitat, a monitoring plan prepared by a qualified biologist shall be submitted to the County's Community Development Department that includes monitoring of the habitat within the open space buffers for a minimum of five years after the final certificate of occupancy is issued. The plan shall include adaptive management responses to implement if habitat quality is declining. ▲ The Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R) for the development shall discourage residents from using species considered invasive by the California Invasive Plant Council (CAL-IPC) in landscaping throughout the development. This restriction should be enforced by the Home-owners Association for the development. ▲ Informational signs informing residents about impacts that domestic animals can have on wildlife shall be installed in parks and trail corridors.		monitoring plans will be submitted to El Dorado County prior to initiating construction activities. CC&Rs will be submitted prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy. Signage will be installed in parks and trails prior to opening the park or trail.
Cultural Resources			
Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a: Avoid impacts to P-9-822.	Construction activities occurring within the boundaries of P-9-822 shall not include any scarification or excavation activities. Any construction proposed within the boundaries of P-9-822 shall only include covering the site with layer(s) of chemically compatible soil prior to construction of any physical structures or other improvements. A qualified archaeologist shall be onsite continuously to monitor all ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of P-9-822 and all soil capping activities. The qualified archaeologist shall have the authority to stop work if necessary to protect the integrity of the site.	El Dorado County	During construction within 100 feet of P-9-822
Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b: Develop and implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (heritage	The project applicant shall submit to the El Dorado County Planning Department a Worker Environmental Awareness Program, prepared by a qualified archaeologist that will be provided to all construction personnel and supervisors who will	El Dorado County	Prior to ground disturbing construction activities

and cultural resources element).	have the potential to encounter and alter heritage and cultural resources. The topics to be addressed in the Worker Environmental Awareness Program will include, at a minimum: ◢ types of heritage and cultural resources expected in the project area; ◢ types of evidence that indicates heritage or cultural resources might be present (e.g., ceramic shards, trash scatters, lithic scatters); ◢ what to do if a worker encounters a possible resource; ◢ what to do if a worker encounters bones or possible bones; and ◢ penalties for removing or intentionally disturbing heritage and cultural resources, such as those identified in the Archeological Resources Protection Act.		
Mitigation Measure 4.5-1c: Stop work and implement recommendations in the event of an archaeological discovery.	In the event that evidence of any prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities (e.g., ceramic shard, trash scatters, lithic scatters), all ground-disturbing activity in the area of the discovery shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can access the significance of the find. If an archeological site, the appropriate Native American group shall be notified. If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the CRHR standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, and a data recovery plan shall be prepared. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find is determined to constitute either an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist shall work with the project applicant to avoid disturbance to the resources, and if completed avoidance is not possible, follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard DPR Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and	El Dorado County	During construction

	location information to the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System office for the project area (the NCIC).		
Mitigation Measure 4.5-2: Stop work and implement recommendations if human remains are discovered.	If human remains are discovered during any demolition/construction activities, potentially damaging ground-disturbing activities in the area of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the project applicant shall notify the El Dorado County coroner and the NAHC immediately, according to Section 5097.98 of the PRC and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined by the NAHC to be Native American, the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The project applicant shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience to conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant, if any, identified by the NAHC. Following the coroner's and NAHC's findings, the archaeologist, and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in PRC Section 5097.94.	El Dorado County (and NAHC if necessary)	During construction
Transportation and Circulation			
Mitigation Measure4.7-1a: Payment of the ~~Tim Fee~~ project's TIM Fees is considered the project's fair share of the Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange (Phase 1).	The applicant shall pay ~~fair share~~ TIM fees to El Dorado County for the Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange (Phase 1) to address the project's contribution to traffic at the El Dorado Hills Boulevard at Saratoga Way/Park Drive Intersection. Fee amount shall be determined by the County. All fees shall be paid at the time of issuance of building permits. Note that since the release of the Draft EIR, the interchange (Phase 1) has been completed. The technical analysis showed that the opening of the Silva Valley Parkway interchange would restore Level of	El Dorado County	Fees paid at the time of issuance of building permits

	Service to acceptable levels at this intersection. Since the interchange is open, there is no concurrency issue. ~~; t~~Therefore, the physical traffic-related impact of the project on the El Dorado Hills Boulevard at Saratoga Way/Park Drive Intersection ~~is already mitigated.~~ would be less than significant. The TIM ~~Fair share~~ fee contribution is required for reimbursement.		
Mitigation Measure 4.7-1b: Complete a Signal Timing Plan.	The project applicant shall prepare and implement a signal timing plan for the intersections along El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road corridor from Saratoga Way/Park Drive through Town Center Boulevard to provide acceptable LOS in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The plan for signal optimization shall be prepared by a California-licensed civil engineer or traffic engineer obtained by the project applicant, and shall be submitted to the County Transportation Division and Caltrans, as appropriate. Prior to issuance of ~~occupancy certificates~~building permits, the applicant shall ensure the signal timing improvements are completed in coordination with the County Transportation Division and Caltrans.	El Dorado County	Signal timing improvements complete prior to issuance of building permits
Mitigation Measure 4.7-2: Road and intersection improvements.	~~Prior to issuance of occupancy permits~~In accordance with conditions of approval for timing of improvements, the applicant shall coordinate with the County to improve the El Dorado Hills at Saratoga Way/Park Drive intersection by adding a southbound right-turn lane and re-allocating the traffic signal green time, and improve the Latrobe at Town Center Drive intersection by restriping of the westbound Town Center Boulevard approach to include one shared through/left-turn lane and two right-turn lanes, adding a right-turn overlap signal phase for the westbound right-turn, and adding a component of Phase 2B improvements at the adjacent Highway 50 interchange with El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road. ~~As determined by the County's Community Development Agency (CDA), the project applicant shall pay TIM fees to satisfy the~~	El Dorado County	In accordance with conditions of approval for timing of improvements

	~~project's fair share obligation towards these improvements, if they are included in the 10-Year CIP. Alternatively, as determined by the CDA, the project applicant may construct the improvements if they are needed, but not included in future updates to the 10-Year CIP, and~~ The project applicant may be eligible for either reimbursement or fee credit for costs that exceed the project's proportional share.		
Mitigation Measure 4.7-4: Prepare and implement a construction traffic management plan.	The applicant (or designated construction manager) shall prepare a construction Traffic Management Plan (TMP) in consultation with the El Dorado County Transportation Division, as well as all other applicable transportation entities, including Caltrans for state roadway facilities and City of Folsom for city roadway facilities. The TMP will ensure that construction traffic does not result in exceedance of peak-hour LOS at existing affected transportation facilities beyond baseline conditions. The County will ensure implementation of the construction TMP during all applicable construction phases. The TMP would address the following, as needed: ◢ scheduling for oversized material deliveries to the work site and haul routes, including flagging, scheduling off-peak deliveries (recognizing applicable noise standards may limit early morning/evening deliveries); ◢ coordination of construction traffic with other concurrent, major construction projects in the same local transportation network; ◢ other actions to be identified and developed as may be needed by the construction manager/resident engineer to ensure that temporary impacts on transportation facilities are minimized. Such actions could include offering a ride-sharing program for construction workers, offering some flexibility for start- and end-work times, and even restricting peak hour construction trips, if necessary. The TMP would include an up-to-date evaluation of current operational characteristics of the roadways to verify that the plan is successful, or to identify whether additional measures should be added (as described above).	El Dorado County	Prior to initiating construction
Air Quality			

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1a: Use architectural coatings with low-VOC content.	During construction, architectural coatings with an average VOC content of 150 grams per liter or less shall be used.	El Dorado County	During construction
Mitigation Measure 4.8-1b: Apply Rule 403 from SCAQMD, as adopted by EDCAQMD.	During construction, implement SCAQMD's Best Available Fugitive Dust Control Measures and Best Available Fugitive Dust Control Measures for High Wind Conditions as adopted by EDCAQMD.	El Dorado County	During construction
Mitigation Measure 4.8-4a (NOA during construction): Comply with Applicable Recommendations in the Geotechnical Engineering Study.	A professional geologist shall be retained by the project applicant. As determined necessary by the geologist, grading activities shall be observed to identify materials likely to contain NOA. Collection of soil/rock samples for analyses for NOA shall be conducted where recommended by the onsite geologist. An asbestos dust mitigation plan shall be prepared by the applicant and submitted to EDCAQMD that includes: ◢ Provisions for testing of all soils to be exported from the project site during construction. At least one sample per 1,000 tons of material shall be required. ◢ Prohibition of rock crushing where materials may contain asbestos. ◢ Track-out control measures. ◢ Prohibition of fugitive dust that extends beyond the project site. ◢ Specifications for the depth to which NOA-containing materials will be used as fill. NOA shall be used only in deep fills to avoid contact during future excavations (i.e., for pools or maintenance of utilities). ◢ A contingency under which the Buckeye Union School District (which includes William Brooks Elementary School) and the Folsom Cordova Unified School District (which includes Russell Ranch Elementary School) shall be notified if there is a release, or suspected release, of asbestos in fugitive dust that extends beyond the project site. Coordinate with EDCAQMD to determine if air monitoring for NOA is necessary during construction. Following construction, finished lot testing for NOA shall be completed, as recommended by EDCAQMD.	El Dorado County and EDCAQMD	Prior to initiating ground disturbing construction activities
Mitigation Measure 4.8-4b	To reduce diesel PM emissions during construction, limit	El Dorado County	During construction

(diesel PM during construction): Use Tier 3 construction equipment.	construction equipment to those that comply with Tier 3 emission control standards.		
Mitigation Measure 4.8-4c (diesel PM during operation): Implement measures to reduce health risks from Highway 50.	◢ Houses located within 500 feet of Highway 50 shall include air filtration systems that have a minimum efficiency reporting value of 13 and mechanical airflow and ventilation systems that are equipped to handle necessary air flow needs, as determined by a specialist certified by the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air-Conditioning Engineers. (Note: the minimum efficiency reporting value rates the effectiveness of air filters. A rating of 13 indicates that particles between 0.3 and 1 micrometers are removed 75 percent of the time.) ◢ To filter outdoor air and minimize TAC concentrations, the project applicant shall fund the planting of trees in the open space along the southern boundary of the project site. The plantings shall be located on the northern side of Saratoga Way, adjacent to the soundwalls shown on Exhibit 3-3 in Chapter 3, "Project Description." Trees shall consist of evergreen species, so that the potential for particle deposition and filtration is relatively consistent year-round. Two contiguous rows of trees will be planted, with individual plantings not more than 15 feet apart. The plantings in one row shall be staggered relative to the plantings in the other row. All trees shall be planted prior to occupancy of homes within 500 feet of Highway 50. The specific tree species selected for the site shall be suited to the site conditions and constraints. All trees shall be planted in accordance with the planting standards established by the Western Chapter of the International Society of Arboriculture's *Guideline Specifications for Selecting, Planting, and Early Care of Young Trees* (Kempf and Gilman 2011), including standards for root ball management, root pruning, staking, mulching, and irrigation. The trees will be maintained in perpetuity by the EDHCSD, a landscape and lighting district, or by the HOA. As part of the ongoing maintenance, trees lost to disease, age, or other cause shall be replaced with the same tree species to maintain the screening.	El Dorado County	Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy
Climate Change			
Mitigation Measure 4.9-2: Reduce operational GHG emissions	Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy, the project applicant shall incorporate mitigation measures into the project to reduce operational GHG emissions to levels that do not	El Dorado County	Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy

exceed the identified performance standard, that is, the GHG efficiency target. The following measures are recommended given the state of the science today. However, in consideration of new and advanced technologies that may be introduced, other feasible, enforceable measures that result in emissions reductions additional to regulatory requirements and that would also achieve the performance standard may be substituted, with prior approval by El Dorado County.

Transportation

All single family homes shall include adequate electric wiring and infrastructure to support a 240-Volt electric vehicle charger in the garage or off-street parking area to allow for the future installation of electric vehicle chargers. This connection should be separate from the connection provided to power an electric clothes dryer.

Energy

- All houses shall be designed to exceed the 2013 Title 24 standards by a minimum of 25 percent. Title 24 regulates energy uses including space heating and cooling, hot water heating, and ventilation. Therefore, potential options to meet the 25 percent improvement goal could include, but not be limited to, high-efficiency HVAC systems, efficient hot water heaters (e.g., tankless or solar), and insulation requirements that exceed Title 24 standards.
- Energy Star appliances (including clothes washers, dish washers, fans, and refrigerators) shall be installed in all residential units.
- The project shall achieve reductions in onsite electricity and natural gas use through a combination of on-site renewable energy (e.g., solar photovoltaic panels) and elimination of fireplaces in specified number of units. The pathway to achieving this reduction would be flexible, as long as the specified reductions in GHGs are achieved.
  - For example, the project could include solar photovoltaic panels, or an equivalent mode of on-site renewable energy generation, with all houses to offset 30 percent of net annual electricity demand by single family residences. Based on the projected electricity consumption for the project (2.3 million kWh annually), this would amount to a total system size of 500 kilowatts. The total area required for the photovoltaic panels is expected to be approximately 40,000 square feet and the total number

of solar panels required would range from approximately 2,000-2,500 depending upon the panel wattage. The project would have the flexibility to meet this requirement by installing an average number of panels on all homes (example, 6-8 panels on each home) or larger systems on a portion of the homes, as long as the 30 percent net annual electricity demand is met through onsite renewable energy. (Note that the values provided here are preliminary estimates. The actual system size and design would be determined at the project's design stage.)

- Alternatively, the project could include various combinations of solar photovoltaic panels and elimination of fireplaces in the units as follows:

Number of solar panels per unit	Number of units with fireplaces
6-8	317
4-6	269
3-4	254
2-3	238
1-2	222
0	159
Note: The data presented in the section assumes one natural gas fireplace per single family unit in the unmitigated condition.	

- Building design, landscape plans (tree placement), and solar panel installation shall take into account solar orientation to maximize solar exposure.

Area Sources

- Electrical outlets shall be provided on the exterior of project buildings to allow sufficient powering of electric landscaping equipment.

Water Conservation

- The project shall include the following measures related to water conservation:
  - Install low-flow kitchen faucets that comply with CALGreen residential voluntary measures (maximum flow rate not to exceed 1.5 gallons per minute at 60 psi).
  - Install low-flow bathroom faucets that exceed the CALGreen residential

	mandatory requirements (maximum flow rate not to exceed 1.5 gallons per minute at 60 psi) ▼ Install low-flow toilets that exceed the CALGreen residential mandatory requirements (maximum flush volume less not to exceed 1.28 gallons per flush) ▼ Install low-flow showerheads that exceed the CALGreen residential mandatory requirements (maximum flow rate not to exceed 2 gallons per minute at 80 psi) ▼ Install a "Smart" irrigation control system that uses weather, climate, and/or soil moisture data to automatically adjust watering schedules in response to environmental and climate changes, such as changes in temperature or precipitation levels. Appropriate systems that could be installed to comply with this measure include Calsense, ET Water, and EPA-certified WaterSense Irrigation Partners. **Waste Diversion/Recycling** ◢ The project shall comply with the following performance measure related to reducing solid waste disposal: Achieve a 20 percent reduction in the generation of solid waste, relative to baseline waste disposal rates. This performance standard may be achieved through a combination of actions. Strategies to reduce landfill waste include increasing recycling, reuse, and composting. The project can achieve this reduction by providing a recycling collection service and providing separate recycling and waste containers to future residents. The project may also include provisions to divert all green waste from the park and landscape lots and recycle it as mulch. It should be noted that this list of measures is not intended to be all-inclusive. If it can be demonstrated that other measures or technologies achieve an equivalent reduction, these may be implemented with County authorization.		
Noise			
Mitigation Measure 4.10-1: Implement construction-noise reduction measures.	To minimize noise levels during construction activities, construction contractors shall comply with the following measures during construction: ◢ All construction equipment and equipment staging areas shall be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive land uses, and/or located such that existing topography blocks line-of-site from these land uses to the	El Dorado County	Measures will be shown on grading and improvement plans and will be implemented during construction.

staging areas.

- All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.
- Where feasible and consistent with building codes and other applicable laws and regulations, individual operations and techniques shall be replaced with quieter procedures (e.g., using welding instead of riveting, mixing concrete offsite instead of onsite).
- All construction equipment with back-up alarms shall be equipped with either audible self-adjusting backup alarms or alarms that only sound when an object is detected. The self-adjusting backup alarms shall automatically adjust to 5 dBA over the surrounding background levels. All non-self-adjusting backup alarms shall be set to the lowest setting required to be audible above the surrounding noise levels. In addition to the use of backup alarms, the construction contractor shall consider other techniques such as observers and the scheduling of construction activities such that alarm noise is minimized.
- When future noise sensitive uses are within close proximity to prolonged construction noise, noise attenuating buffers such as structures, truck trailers, temporary noise curtains or sound walls, or soil piles shall be located between noise sources and the receptor to shield sensitive receptors from construction noise.
- The applicant or construction contractors shall post visible signs along the perimeter of the construction site that disclose construction times and duration. A contact number for an El Dorado County enforcement officer shall be included where noise complaints can be filed and recorded. The applicant will be informed of any noise complaints and will be responsible for investigating complaints and implementing feasible and appropriate measures to reduce noise at receiving land uses. These may include:
  - Noise-reducing enclosures and techniques shall be used around stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., concrete mixers, generators, compressors).
  - For construction activity that occurs within 855 feet of existing sensitive land uses, install temporary noise curtains that meet the following parameters:
    - temporary noise curtains shall be installed as close as

	possible to the boundary of the construction site within the direct line of sight path of the nearby sensitive receptor(s). ➥ temporary noise curtains shall consist of durable, flexible composite material featuring a noise barrier layer bounded to sound-absorptive material on one side. The noise barrier layer shall consist of rugged, impervious, material with a surface weight of at least 1 pound per square foot.		
Mitigation Measure 4.10-2: Reduce blasting-related vibration.	For any proposed blasting that would occur within 230 feet from any existing occupied structure, alternatives to traditional blasting (silent demolition), such as non-explosive chemical agents, expansive grout, or any other non-explosive technology, shall be used to eliminate vibration and noise from blasting.	El Dorado County	Prior to blasting
Mitigation Measure 4.10-4: Implement building design measures to reduce interior noise levels at proposed residences.	To reduce interior noise levels at all elevated south, east, and west-facing properties located adjacent to Saratoga Way, the following design standard shall be met. Refer to Figure 2 of Appendix D [of the Draft EIR] for properties requiring these design measures. ◢ An exterior-to-interior noise reduction of at least 30 dB shall be achieved. This level of noise reduction can be achieved with incorporation of the following measures: ◤ All windows and doors shall meet a minimum sound transmission class rating of 33; ◤ Air conditioning shall be provided to allow occupants to close doors and windows; and Additional insulation designed specifically for noise reduction shall be used in walls facing Saratoga Way and Highway 50.	El Dorado County	Prior to approval of building plans
Geology and Soils			
Mitigation Measure 4.11-3 Evaluate soil compaction and implement recommendations during grading.	The applicant shall employ a qualified engineer to observe the stripping of deleterious material and over excavation of any unsuitable materials, and provide consultation and supplemental recommendations, as field conditions dictate, to the grading contractor in the field.	El Dorado County	During construction activities involving stripping of deleterious material and/or over excavation of any unsuitable material

	Fill soil compaction shall be evaluated through means of in-place density tests performed during fill placement so that adequacy of soil compaction efforts may be determined. This will likely include the periodic excavation of test pits within the fill materials to observe and document that a uniform over-optimum moisture condition, and absence of large and/or concentrated voids has been achieved before additional fill placement. If large quantities of expansive soils are encountered at the project site, recommendations shall be made by a qualified engineer based on observations at the time of construction and the proper disposition of clays on site shall be observed and documented by a qualified third party monitor.	

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

and

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

OF THE EL DORADO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

for the

SARATOGA ESTATES PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

***********, 2016**

Exhibit B

I. INTRODUCTION

On August 15, 2016, the final environmental impact report (EIR) prepared on behalf of El Dorado County (County) was released. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, the County, acting through its Board of Supervisors, adopts the following findings for the Saratoga Estates Project (the project) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.).

This document is organized as follows:

Section I introduces the findings.

Section II describes the project proposed for approval, and the approval actions to be taken.

Section III describes the environmental review process for the project, including public scoping and review of the project.

Section IV identifies the Record of Proceedings for this matter, including the administrative record upon which the County's approval of the project is based and the location of records.

Section V provides general guidance regarding the County's adoption of these findings.

Section VI includes the County's findings with respect to the project's potentially significant impacts. Attachment A to these findings is a table setting forth findings for each environmental impact evaluated, including specific mitigation measures, to be adopted by the County in connection with its approval of the project. Attachment A includes the full text of each mitigation measure adopted by the County. The mitigation measures that are identified as adopted in Attachment A are hereby adopted by the County. Section VI also addresses mitigation measures and project modifications proposed by commenters, and the County's findings with respect to these proposals.

Section VII adopts and incorporates the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption. A copy of the MMRP is attached to the Staff Report as Exhibit N. In adopting these findings, the County hereby adopts and commits to implement the MMRP. The measures set forth in the MMRP represent binding commitments to which the project applicant must comply.

Section VIII sets forth the County's findings with respect to recirculation of the Draft EIR. Although formal findings are not required with respect to determinations whether to recirculate a draft EIR, the County nevertheless adopts these findings to provide information regarding how the County reached its conclusions with respect to recirculation. These findings are adopted pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5.

Section IX sets forth the County's findings with respect to alternatives to the project. These findings are adopted pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 21002 and 21081, subdivision (a)(3).

Section X sets forth the County's statement of overriding considerations concerning the project. These findings are adopted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (b).

The findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project and the EIR. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as

a whole.

Although the findings below identify specific pages within the Draft EIR and Final EIR documents (which, together, constitute the Final EIR) in support of various conclusions reached below, the Board of Supervisors incorporates by reference and adopts as its own, the reasoning set forth in the Final EIR, and thus relies on that reasoning, even where not specifically mentioned or cited below, in reaching the conclusions set forth below, except where additional evidence is specifically mentioned. The County further intends that if these findings fail to cross-reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, any finding required or permitted to be made by the County with respect to any particular subject matter of the project must be deemed made if it appears in any portion of these findings or findings elsewhere in the record.

These Findings, along with the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth in Section X, the table of findings set forth in Attachment A, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") set forth in Exhibit N of the Staff Report, are made with respect to the project approvals for the project and state the findings of the Board of Supervisors relating to the potentially significant environmental effects of the project in accordance with the project approvals. The following Findings, along with the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are hereby adopted by the Board of Supervisors as required by the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Sections 21002, 21081, 21081.5 and 21081.6, and CEQA Guidelines sections 15091 through 15093.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following text briefly describes the project. See Chapter 3, Description, of the Draft EIR for a complete and detailed description of the project.

A. Project Location

The Saratoga Estates Project is proposed on Assessor's Parcel Number 120-070-02, in the unincorporated community of El Dorado Hills in western El Dorado County (Exhibit 3-1). The property is immediately north of Highway 50, and is generally bounded on the north, east, and west by existing residential development (Exhibit 3-2). South of Highway 50, the land use is also primarily residential. A designated open space area (part of the Promontory Specific Plan) abuts the western boundary of the project site, separating it from the Empire Ranch development in the City of Folsom. The project site is located approximately 23 miles east of downtown Sacramento, and 60 miles southwest of Lake Tahoe. Folsom Lake is located approximately 3.5 miles northwest of the project site.

The project site is in the El Dorado Hills Community Region, as defined in *the El Dorado County General Plan* (El Dorado County 2004). The project site is designated High Density Residential in the *El Dorado County General Plan* and is currently zoned R1 (one-family residential district) and OS (open space district).

There is no development on the project site; although there are dirt roads that are used by hikers, vehicles, and cyclists. The site has been used for grazing in the past, but is not currently used for agricultural activities.

B. Project Overview

The applicant proposes to construct a 317-unit residential development that incorporates approximately 41 acres of open space areas, which would include public parks, a trail system, landscaping, and other

open space areas. The project would also include onsite and offsite infrastructure to serve the development.

The project proposes a Planned Development (PD) combining zone for the property. As such, land use types would be limited to those listed within the basic zones currently established for the property: R1 and OS. However, all other provisions of the basic zones would be superseded by the provisions of the development plan (El Dorado County Code Section 130.04.080). PD districts (which are established in Chapter 130.50 of the El Dorado County Code) permit flexibility and allow for more efficient utilization of land and public services by providing for a combination of different land uses that may not, in all aspects, conform to the existing zoning regulations.

The project proposes minimum setbacks of 10 feet from the edge of existing wetlands during construction and permanent open space buffers of at least 40 feet. These setback distances have been determined to be consistent with Policy 7.3.3.4 of the *El Dorado County General Plan* and the Interim Interpretive Guidelines, which provide for exception to the standard minimum setbacks where the applicant demonstrates that the alternative setback would provide sufficient protection to the affected biological resources and avoid or minimize impacts.

Approximately 27 acres of open space and 8 acres of parks, plus another 6 acres of trail, landscaping, and other open space areas, are included in the proposed project. The open space lots would encompass existing natural and proposed drainage features, as well as areas near the proposed extension of Saratoga Way and land within the Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) right-of-way (associated with the existing 115-kilovolt power line that crosses the northern end of the site).

Wilson Boulevard, Saratoga Way, and Iron Point Road currently terminate at the project site. The project proposes extension of Saratoga Way along the southern boundary of the project site to connect the existing two lane road from just west of the Finders Way intersection to Iron Point Road in the City of Folsom. Wilson Boulevard would extend south through the project site and connect to the new portion of Saratoga Way. Primary access to the site would be provided at the intersection of the Saratoga Way and Wilson Boulevard extensions at the southern end of the project site.

Wilson Boulevard would serve as the primary internal roadway. A secondary, right-in/right-out driveway would also be provided along Saratoga Way, west of Wilson Boulevard. Several smaller roadways and courts would provide access to individual residences. The perennial drainage would be spanned by the Saratoga Way extension and by one additional internal roadway at the northern end of the project site.
Wilson Boulevard would be a two-lane road with a 60-foot right-of-way. An existing cultural resource exists in the vicinity of the proposed Wilson Boulevard alignment. Engineering and construction specifications in the vicinity the resource would implement earthen capping and would avoid any ground-disturbing activities that could otherwise affect the resource. Ground disturbance would be avoided by placing the site into a dedicated open space lot and elevating Wilson Boulevard in the vicinity of the site by placement of fill and a short retaining wall.

To reduce traffic-noise exposure from Highway 50 and Saratoga Way at the new proposed residences, a sound wall would be constructed.

Surface water runoff on the project site contributes to two watershed areas: the western portion of the project site drains west to the City of Folsom and the Humbug-Willow Creek basin, while the eastern portion drains into an unnamed perennial drainage near the center of the site that is tributary to Carson Creek.

Existing onsite drainages would be preserved to the extent practicable. A drainage conveyance system including buried pipelines and open ditches that would generally convey project site drainage to the

existing onsite perennial drainage is proposed. The project includes two water quality retention ponds, a 2.9-acre-foot detention pond near the center of the site, and a 0.5-acre-foot water quality pond adjacent to the drainage and immediately east of Wilson Boulevard. Bio swales would be constructed at the toe of fill slopes throughout the project site to capture and direct stormwater runoff to these basins and to the perennial drainage.

C. Project Objectives

The objectives for the project are as follows:

- Implement the County's general plan by directing growth to areas with moderate topography, located amongst already developed lands, with access to services, schools, and transportation systems.
- Implement the County's general plan by directing higher density residential development to Community Regions and Rural Centers and encouraging the enhancement of residential environments to include access to parks and trails.
- Implement the County's general plan by providing urban/suburban type development within lands designated for urban development to ensure the preservation of large expanses of open space and agricultural lands within the county.
- Create an economically viable project that provides a fair-share contribution of infrastructure to the community through the payment of fees and/or construction of required capital improvements, including transportation improvements in accordance with the County's general plan.
- Provide a broad range of residential product types.
- Offer a range of designs and amenities to meet the needs of the changing demographics of the county, including families, empty nesters, and active adults.
- Protect the highest quality natural features and resources of the site while being sensitive to the character of adjacent land uses.
- Provide a residential community containing open space and a range of passive and active recreational amenities for its residents and the community.
- Provide a comprehensively planned project that is sensitive to environmental issues including wetland and tree preservation.
- Improve emergency access and circulation by providing the connecting segment of Saratoga Way to Iron Point Road and extending Wilson Boulevard.
- Implement the general plan strategies and methods for achieving its vision and goals of sustainable growth and economic development.

(Draft EIR, p. 3-13)

D. Discretionary Approvals

Project approval requires the County, as lead agency under CEQA, as well as certain "responsible

agencies" to take various planning and regulatory actions to approve the overall project. Described below are discretionary actions necessary to carry out the project. (See also Draft EIR Table 1-1.) In addition to the County's certification of the Final EIR and adoption of these Findings and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (CEQA requirements), the following discretionary actions and approvals are anticipated:

Required Permits and Approvals

Agency	Permit/Approval
El Dorado County Community Development Agency	Zone Change Planned Development Tentative Map Design Waivers Construction Drawings and associated permits Final Subdivision Maps Building Permits Grading Permits Encroachment Permits Development Agreement
El Dorado County Air Quality Management District	Fugitive Dust Control Plan Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan
El Dorado Irrigation District	Approval of utility connections/improvements Offsite sewer easements, if applicable
El Dorado Hills Community Service District	Approval of park designs
El Dorado Hills Fire Department	Wildland Fire Safety Plan Approval of Road and Utility Improvements
El Dorado County Resources Conservation District	Erosion Control Plan
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Streambed Alteration Agreement

Source: Data Compiled by Ascent Environmental

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, El Dorado County prepared and distributed an NOP for this EIR on March 25, 2015. The NOP provided a brief description of the project, a map of the project location, and an overview of the environmental review process. The purpose of the NOP was to provide notification that an EIR for the project would be prepared and to solicit guidance on the scope and content of the document. The NOP invited all interested parties to provide comments during a 30-day period. The NOP was mailed to several thousand individuals and organizations, including property owners and/or residents within the vicinity of the project site. The NOP was also filed with the State Clearinghouse and County Recorder-Clerk's Office, and was posted on El Dorado County's website. A public notice announcing NOP availability and scoping meeting was posted in the Mountain Democrat newspaper on March 25, 2015.

The scoping meeting was held on April 9, 2015 from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at El Dorado Hills Fire Department Station 85. Responsible agencies and members of the public were invited to provide input on the scope of the EIR. The comments received on the NOP and at the scoping meeting were addressed, as applicable, in each technical section of the Draft EIR. Appendix A of the Draft EIR contains a copy of the

NOP and comment letters received on the NOP.

The EIR includes an analysis of the following issue areas:

- Land Use Compatibility
- Population, Employment, and Housing
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Aesthetic and Visual Resources
- Transportation and Circulation
- Air Quality
- Climate Change
- Noise
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards
- Public Services
- Utilities and Energy Conservation

On March 24, 2016, the Draft EIR was released for a 45-day public review and comment period that ended on May 7, 2016 (this public review period is consistent with the review period set forth in Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines). The Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, posted on the County's website (http://edcapps.edcgov.us/Planning/ProjectInquiry.asp), and made available at the Community Development Agency and three libraries (Cameron Park, Placerville, and El Dorado Hills). In addition, the Draft EIR was distributed directly to public agencies (including potential responsible and trustee agencies), interested parties, and organizations.

On August 15, 2016, the County released the Final EIR for the project. The Final EIR includes comments on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, revisions to the text of the Draft EIR, and other information required by CEQA. The County distributed copies of the Final EIR to public agencies submitting comments on the Draft EIR, as required by Public Resources Code section 21092.5.

On August 25, 2016, the El Dorado County Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final EIR and the project. After receiving and considering public comment, the Planning Commission recommended the Board of Supervisors approve the Saratoga Estates Project and certify the Final EIR. On 9/13, 2016, the Board of Supervisors held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final EIR and the project. The Board received public comment, and concluded the public hearing. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis presented in the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the comments on the Draft EIR, the evidence and

analysis presented in the Final EIR, the information submitted on the Final EIR, and the reports prepared by the experts who prepared the EIR, the County's planning consultants, and by staff, and after receiving and considering public comment, makes the findings set forth herein.

IV. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e), the record of proceedings for the County's decision on the project includes the following documents:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the project;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;
- The Draft EIR for the project (March 2016) and all appendices;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;
- The Final EIR for the project, including comments received on the Draft EIR, and responses to those comments and appendices (August 1, 2016);
- Documents cited or referenced in the Final EIR;
- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors in connection with the project and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the project prepared by the County, consultants to the County, as well as responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the County's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County's action on the project;
- All documents submitted to the County by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the project, up through the close of the Board's public hearing on 9/13, 2016;
- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the County in connection with the project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the County at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;
- The El Dorado County General Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the General Plan;
- The El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable County Code provisions cited in materials prepared by or submitted to the County;
- Any and all resolutions adopted by the County regarding the project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;

- Matters of common knowledge to the County, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;

- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and

- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The County has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the project, even if not every document was formally presented to the County. Without exception, any documents set forth above not so presented fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions with which the County was aware in approving the project. Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to Planning Department staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the Board of Supervisors. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the County's decisions relating to the adoption of the project.

The record of proceedings does not include documents or other materials subject to the attorney/client privilege, the common-interest doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, or other privileges recognized by statute or common law. Administrative draft documents that were prepared at the County's direction, but were not provided to the public or other agencies, and intra-County communications with respect to such administrative draft documents, are not part of the record of proceedings; rather, such documents reflect the County's deliberative process, and reflect initial drafts of documents that later appeared in final form in the record of proceedings. Because these initial working drafts do not reflect the final evidence and analysis relied upon by the County, they are not part of the record of proceedings. In adopting these findings, the County does not waive its right to assert applicable privileges.

The public hearing transcript, a copy of all letters regarding the Draft EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR, as well as additional materials concerning approval of the project and adoption of these findings are contained in County files, and are available for review by responsible agencies and interested members of the public during normal business hours at El Dorado County. The custodian of these documents is the El Dorado County Development Services Division Director. The documents are located at the El Dorado County Community Development Agency, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. All files have been available to the County and the public for review in considering these findings and whether to approve the project.

V. FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

The California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq. and the regulations implementing that statute, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, §§ 15000 et seq. (the "CEQA Guidelines") (collectively, the act and the CEQA Guidelines are referred to as "CEQA") require public agencies to consider the potential effects of their discretionary activities on the environment and, when feasible, to adopt and implement mitigation measures that avoid or substantially lessen the effects of those activities on the environment. Specifically, Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." Section 21002 goes on to state that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The three possible findings are:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

(2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd (a); see also CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).)

Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (*Goleta II*) (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565.)

The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417 (*City of Del Mar*).) "[F]easibility" under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (Ibid.; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715 (*Sequoyah Hills*); see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 [after weighing "'economic, environmental, social, and technological factors' ... 'an agency may conclude that a mitigation measure or alternative is impracticable or undesirable from a policy standpoint and reject it as infeasible on that ground'"].)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (*Goleta II*, *supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

In making these findings and the determination regarding the project Approvals, the Board of Supervisors recognizes that the project implicates a number of controversial environmental issues and that a range of technical and scientific opinion exists with respect to those issues. The Board of Supervisors has acquired an understanding of the range of this technical and scientific opinion by its review of the EIR, the

comments received on the Draft EIR and the responses to those comments in the Final EIR, as well as testimony, letters and reports regarding the Final EIR and the merits of the project. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis presented in the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the comments on the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR, the information submitted on the Final EIR, and the reports prepared by the experts who prepared the EIR, the County's planning consultants, and by staff, addressing these comments. In particular, the Board of Supervisors has considered the alternatives presented in the EIR, as well as the proposed comments submitted by various commenters and the responses of the EIR preparers and staff to those comments. The Board of Supervisors has gained a comprehensive and well-rounded understanding of the environmental issues presented by the project. In turn, that understanding has enabled the Board of Supervisors to make its decisions after weighing and considering the various viewpoints on these important issues. Accordingly, the Board of Supervisors certifies that its findings are based on a full appraisal of all of the evidence contained in the Final EIR, as well as the evidence and other information in the record addressing the Final EIR.

These findings constitute the Board of Supervisors' best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These findings are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that come into effect with the County's approval of the project. In particular, in adopting these findings, the County commits itself to ensure the implementation of the mitigation measures approved in these findings.

The Board of Supervisors is adopting these findings for the entirety of the actions described in these findings and in the Final EIR. Although the findings below identify specific pages within the Draft and Final EIR in support of various conclusions reached below, the Board of Supervisors incorporates by reference and adopts as its own, the reasoning set forth in both environmental documents, and thus relies on that reasoning, even where not specifically mentioned or cited below, in reaching the conclusions set forth below, except where additional evidence is specifically mentioned.

As noted, the Final EIR is incorporated into these findings in its entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of Mitigation Measures, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, the comparative analysis of alternatives, and the reasons for approving the project in spite of the potential for associated significant and unavoidable adverse impacts. In the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted below, such a mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in Section VI does not accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the Final EIR shall control, unless the language of the policies and implementation measures has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings. Where the language of such measures differs between the Final EIR and these findings, the more stringent language shall control. The Board of Supervisors provides this direction in order to ensure that any such discrepancy shall be regarded as inadvertent, and shall not be regarded as an effort by the Board of Supervisors to undermine its commitment to adopt mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects of the project.

More generally, to the extent there are any inconsistencies in the mitigation measures identified in these findings, in Attachment A, or in the MMRP, any such inconsistencies are inadvertent and unintentional. The County intends that, in the event of such inconsistencies, such inconsistency shall be reconciled in the manner that affords the greatest possible protection to the environment, in a manner consistent with the specific terms of the mitigation measures as adopted. In the event there are any future uncertainties or disputes regarding the nature, scope or feasibility of the adopted mitigation measures, the Board of Supervisors directs staff to return to the Board of Supervisors, at a properly noticed public hearing, to consider any such uncertainties or disputes. The Board of Supervisors intends that, in the event such a

hearing is necessary, the public and other agencies will have an opportunity to review and comment on the manner in which such measures are implemented, and the Board of Supervisor's resolution of such issues occurs in a manner that allows the public to understand the basis for the Board of Supervisor's decision.

These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Board of Supervisors regarding the environmental impacts of the project and the mitigation measures included as part of the Final EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors as part of the project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Board of Supervisors agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final EIR, these findings will not always repeat the analysis and conclusions in the Final EIR, but instead incorporates them by reference herein and relied upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors has considered the opinions of other agencies and members of the public. The Board of Supervisors finds that the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the Board of Supervisors; the significance thresholds used in the EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the EIR preparers and County staff; and the significance thresholds used in the EIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the project. Thus, although, as a legal matter, the Board of Supervisors is not bound by the significance determinations in the EIR (see Pub. Resources Code, § 21082.2, subd. (e)), except as expressly set forth in these findings, the Board of Supervisors finds these significance thresholds persuasive and hereby adopts them as its own.

Section VI of these findings summarizes the environmental determinations of the Final EIR and project's potentially significant impacts before and after mitigation. Section VI does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, Section VI provides a summary description of each impact, sets forth the mitigation measures identified to reduce or avoid the impact, and states the Board of Supervisors' findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted provisions and the recommended mitigation measures for the Saratoga Estates Project. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the Final EIR's determination regarding the project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

Because the EIR identified significant effects that may occur as a result of the project, and in accordance with the provisions of the CEQA presented above, the County hereby adopts these findings as part of the approval of the Saratoga Estates Project. These findings constitute the County's best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that come into effect with the County's approval of the project.

VI. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The EIR identified a number of significant and potentially significant environmental effects (or impacts) that the project will cause or contribute to. These significant effects can be avoided or substantially lessened through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. The Board of Supervisors' findings with respect to the project's significant effects and mitigation measures are set forth in the table appearing at Attachment A to these findings. The findings set forth in the table are adopted and incorporated by reference.

The table at Attachment A does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, the table provides a summary description of each impact, describes the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors, and states the Board of Supervisors' findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found the Draft EIR and Final EIR, or elsewhere in the record of proceedings, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding the project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analysis and explanation in the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, or elsewhere in the record, and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Draft EIR and Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

The Board of Supervisors has adopted all of the mitigation measures identified in the table. Some of the measures identified in the table are also within the jurisdiction and control of other agencies. To the extent any of the mitigation measures are within the jurisdiction of other agencies, the Board of Supervisors finds those agencies can and should implement those measures within their jurisdiction and control.

Some of the comments on the Draft EIR suggested additional mitigation measures and/or modifications to the measures recommended in the Draft EIR. In considering specific recommendations from commenters, the County has been cognizant of its legal obligation under CEQA to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects to the extent feasible. The County recognizes, moreover, that comments frequently offer thoughtful suggestions regarding how a commenter believes that a particular mitigation measure can be modified, or perhaps changed significantly, in order to more effectively, in the commenter's view, reduce the severity of environmental effects. The County is also cognizant, however, that the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR represent the professional judgment and experience of the County's expert staff and environmental consultants. The County therefore believes that these recommendations should not be lightly altered. Thus, in considering commenters' suggested changes or additions to the mitigation measures as set forth in the Draft EIR, the County, in determining whether to accept such suggestions, either in whole or in part, has considered the following factors, among others: (i) whether the suggestion relates to a significant and unavoidable environmental effect of the project, or instead relates to an effect that can already be mitigated to less than significant levels by proposed mitigation measures in the Draft EIR; (ii) whether the proposed language represents a clear improvement, from an environmental standpoint, over the draft language that a commenter seeks to replace; (iii) whether the proposed language is sufficiently clear as to be easily understood by those who will implement the mitigation as finally adopted; (iv) whether the language might be too inflexible to allow for pragmatic implementation; (v) whether the suggestions are feasible from an economic, technical, legal, or other standpoint; (vi) whether the proposed language is consistent with the project objectives; and (vii) whether the suggestions may result in other impacts that are more severe than the impacts that the suggestions are designed to address, such that on the whole the suggestions do not reflect an improvement over those measures identified in the EIR.

As is evident from the specific responses given to specific suggestions, County staff and consultants spent significant time carefully considering and weighing proposed mitigation language. In no instance did the County fail to take seriously a suggestion made by a commenter or fail to appreciate the sincere effort that went into the formulation of suggestions.

For this project, the following impacts were identified as significant and unavoidable. That is, these impacts remain significant, despite the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid these impacts:

Noise, Impacts 4.10-1 and 4.10-3: Noise impacts to existing residents from project construction and roadway operation

Implementation of the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to noise. During construction, residences near the project site would be exposed to temporary noise in excess of standards established by the County. The most noise-intensive phase of construction is rough grading, which would last a total of nine months; however, exposure of noise at individual homes would be shorter as grading would occur in different areas of the site at different times throughout the grading phase. Mitigation is proposed to reduce construction-related noise. However, the reduction required to comply with noise standards would not be achievable. No additional mitigation is found to be feasible. During operation, additional vehicles would travel on Saratoga Way and Wilson Boulevard. This would result in a substantial noise increase in exterior noise levels at some existing residences on Saratoga Way. A sound wall is currently in place that would continue to provide exterior noise reduction, and no additional mitigation is feasible. These impacts are therefore considered significant an unavoidable.

VII. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The County has prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project. A copy of the MMRP is included in the Staff Report as Exhibit N. The County, in adopting these findings, also approves the MMRP. The County will use the MMRP to track compliance with project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The MMRP is attached to and incorporated into the project and is approved in conjunction with certification of the EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact. In the event of any conflict between these findings and the MMRP with respect to the requirements of an adopted mitigation measure, the more stringent measure shall control, and shall be incorporated automatically into both the findings and the MMRP.

VIII. RECIRCULATION OF DRAFT EIR

The Board of Supervisors adopts the following findings with respect to the need to recirculate the Draft EIR. Under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, recirculation of an EIR is required when "significant new information" is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review but prior to certification of the Final EIR. The term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.

"Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

(4) The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that

meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

(CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5.)

Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR. The above standard is "not intend[ed] to promote endless rounds of revision and recirculation of EIRs." (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California* (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112, 1132.) "Recirculation was intended to be an exception, rather than the general rule." (*Ibid.*)

The Board of Supervisors recognizes that the Final EIR incorporates information obtained by the County since the Draft EIR was completed, and contains additions, clarifications, modifications, and other changes. As explained in the Final EIR (Chapter 2, Revisions to the Draft EIR), the recent voter approval of Measure E required text changes to mitigation measures. These text changes were reflected in the Final EIR and included in the MMRP. As discussed in the previous section of these findings, where changes have been made to mitigation measures, these changes do not change the significance of any conclusions presented in the Draft EIR.

CEQA case law emphasizes that "[t]he CEQA reporting process is not designed to freeze the ultimate proposal in the precise mold of the initial project; indeed, new and unforeseen insights may emerge during investigation, evoking revision of the original proposal." (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 736-737; see also *River Valley Preservation Project v. Metropolitan Transit Development Bd.* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 154, 168, fn. 11.) "'CEQA compels an interactive process of assessment of environmental impacts and responsive project modification which must be genuine. It must be open to the public, premised upon a full and meaningful disclosure of the scope, purposes, and effect of a consistently described project, with flexibility to respond to unforeseen insights that emerge from the process.' [Citation.] In short, a project must be open for public discussion and subject to agency modification during the CEQA process." (*Concerned Citizens of Costa Mesa, Inc. v. 33rd Dist. Agricultural Assn.* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 929, 936.) Here, the changes made to mitigation measures are exactly the kind of project improvements that the case law recognizes as legitimate and proper.

The changes to the mitigation measures are described in Final EIR Chapter 2. The changes are designed to reflect new County policy enacted by voters through Measure E. The modifications do not alter the mitigation action, but rather the funding source and implementing agent (direct funding and implementation by the applicant rather than funding through the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program). These revisions do not require recirculation of the Draft EIR. (See Final EIR Chapter 2.) None of these changes involves "significant new information" triggering recirculation because the changes to the mitigation measures do not result in any new significant environmental effects, any substantial increase in the severity of any previously identified significant effects, or otherwise trigger recirculation. Instead, the modifications were either environmentally benign or environmentally neutral, and thus represent the kinds of changes that commonly occur as the environmental review process works towards its conclusion. Under such circumstances, the County finds that recirculation of the EIR is not required.

IX. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A. Findings Regarding Project Alternatives

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation

measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects."

Where a lead agency has determined that, even after the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, a project as proposed will still cause one or more significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided, the agency, prior to approving the project as mitigated, must first determine whether, with respect to such impacts, there remain any project alternatives that are both environmentally superior and feasible within the meaning of CEQA. Although an EIR must evaluate this range of potentially feasible alternatives, an alternative may ultimately be deemed by the lead agency to be "infeasible" if it fails to fully promote the lead agency's underlying goals and objectives with respect to the project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417.) "'[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*Ibid*; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) Thus, even if a project alternative will avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project, the decision-makers may reject the alternative if they determine that specific considerations make the alternative infeasible, or if the alternative does not meet the objectives for the project.

All of the environmental impacts associated with the project may be substantially lessened or avoided with the adoption of the mitigation measures set forth in these findings, with the exception of the following impacts:

- Noise, Impact 4.10-1: Construction noise impacts. Project construction could temporarily expose existing sensitive receptors to excess noise levels.

- Noise, Impact 4.10-3: Long-term operational noise impacts to existing receptors. The proposed Saratoga Way connection would increase traffic on existing segments of Saratoga Way, which could increase exterior noise at existing residences along those segments in excess of County standards.

The Board of Supervisors' goal in evaluating the project alternatives was to select an alternative that feasibly attains the project objectives, while further reducing the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. (Draft EIR, p. 6-1) The project objectives are stated above under Section II and in the Draft EIR on page 3-13.

The Draft EIR discussed several alternatives to the project in order to present a reasonable range of options. To meet CEQA requirements for the consideration of alternatives, the EIR evaluates the potential impacts of the project, and four alternatives (including two No Project Alternatives: No Project, No Development Alternative; and No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative).

To be suitable for consideration in the EIR, alternatives must be "potentially" feasible and "attain most of the basic objectives of the project." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6, subd. (a).) The alternatives analyzed in detail in the EIR are:

- Alternative 1: No Project, No Development

- Alternative 2: No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only

- Alternative 3: Reduced Density

- Alternative 4: Maximum General Plan Buildout

The Board of Supervisors finds that that a good faith effort was made to evaluate all feasible alternatives in the EIR that are reasonable alternatives to the project and could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of

the project, even when the alternatives might impede the attainment of the project objectives and might be more costly. As a result, the scope of alternatives analyzed in the EIR is not unduly limited or narrow. The Board of Supervisors also finds that all reasonable alternatives were reviewed, analyzed and discussed in the review process of the EIR and the ultimate decision on the project. (See Draft EIR, pp. 6-1 to 6-15 and Final EIR Response to Comment 12-2.)

B. Alternatives Analyzed in the Draft EIR and Final EIR

The goal for developing alternatives was to identify other means to attain the project objectives while further reducing the environmental impacts caused by the project. The EIR analyzed the proposed project, and Alternatives 1 through 4. The EIR contains a detailed analysis of the impacts of each of these alternatives. The Board of Supervisors hereby incorporates by reference this analysis. Table 6-2 in the Draft EIR summarizes the EIR's conclusions concerning the impacts of each alternative relative to the proposed project.

Based on this analysis, the Board of Supervisors adopts the following findings with respect to each alternative.

These findings focus on whether the alternatives are, in fact, feasible, and attain the project objectives. These findings are therefore distinct from the information in the Draft EIR, in which alternatives are considered if they are merely "potentially feasible," and attain "most" of the project objectives. Under CEQA, these two inquiries are related, but distinct. In adopting these findings, the Board has considered the information in the EIR, as well as other information in the record, to determine whether each alternative is feasible, and/or meets the project objectives.

Alternative 1: No Project, No Development

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, no action would be taken and the site would remain unchanged from current conditions, that is, undeveloped grassland.

Findings Based on Environmental Considerations

The No Project, No Development Alternative would avoid both of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts, and overall, the impacts would be less than those that would occur with the project. However, because the No Project, No Development Alternative would not result in the connection of Saratoga Way, and would leave the roadway unconnected in perpetuity, the alternative would not be consistent with the County's transportation plan. Also, leaving the property undeveloped would not be consistent with the County's General Plan or with the County's housing objectives.

Findings Based on Feasibility/Ability to Meet Project Objectives

Under Alternative 1: No Project, No Development, the Saratoga Estates Project would not be approved, and no development would occur on the site, including the Saratoga Way and Wilson Boulevard connections. This would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts, and lessen the impacts overall. However, as shown in Table 6-1 of the Draft EIR, with the exception of the objective pertaining to protection of natural features and resources, the No Project, No Development Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives, including (but not limited to) contribution to capital improvements, providing a broad range of residential products, and providing open space and recreational amenities. This alternative would also conflict with the County's transportation plan and the General Plan because these plans designate the project site for roadway infrastructure and housing.

Because Alternative 1 would not meet most of the basic project objectives, the Board rejects Alternative 1.

Alternative 2: No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only

The extension of Saratoga Way (2 lanes) is included in the El Dorado County 10-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative assumes that the proposed 317-unit residential development is not constructed, but the County implements only the Saratoga Way extension as a 2-lane roadway, aligned similarly to the proposed extension of Saratoga Way. It is assumed that the remainder of the project site would remain undeveloped. The Wilson Boulevard extension would not be constructed as part of this alternative.

Findings Based on Environmental Considerations

The No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative would avoid one of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts; significant construction noise impacts would be avoided, but the significant roadway noise impacts would remain similar to the proposed project. However, overall, the impacts would be less than those that would occur with the project. In addition, the No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative would be more consistent with the County's transportation plan than the No Project, No Development Alternative. Alternative 2 is considered the environmentally superior alternative. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6; see Draft EIR, p. 6-15.)

Findings Based on Feasibility/Ability to Meet Project Objectives

Under Alternative 2: No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only, the residential development component of the project, including parks, open space, and infrastructure, would not be developed, and only the two-lane connection of Saratoga Way would be constructed. This would avoid one of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts and lessen the impacts overall. However, as shown in Table 6-1 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 2 meets only two project objectives: one objective related to contribution of capital improvements and one objective pertaining to protection of natural features and resources. This Alternative would not meet the project's basic objectives related to implementation of General Plan policies, providing a broad range of residential products, and providing open space and recreational amenities. Because Alternative 1 would not meet most of the basic project objectives, the Board rejects Alternative 2.

Alternative 3: Reduced Density

The Reduced Density Alternative assumes development of the project site at the lowest density contemplated under the County's General Plan land use designation for the project site: High Density Residential (HDR). The General Plan's HDR designation allows a minimum of 122 single-family units (almost 200 fewer units than the proposed project). Consistent with County policy, this reduction in density would be accomplished primarily by clustering lots, which would allow for increased open space and parkland would reduce the overall development footprint, and would potentially allow for more natural topography in some areas of the project site. The Reduced Density Alternative would include the Wilson Boulevard extension and Saratoga Way connection similar to the proposed project.

Finding Based on Environmental Considerations

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the lower density reduces the overall construction effort and allows for some flexibility for impact avoidance and preserving more natural vegetation. Also, fewer residences generate less traffic and less demand for energy and other utilities, thus reducing pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Because the Reduced Density Alternative would still involve soil-

disturbing construction activities, impacts related to ground disturbance and alteration of the land (biological resources, cultural resources, aesthetics, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and hazardous materials) would be less than the project, but would require similar mitigation measures to minimize impacts. However, because the Reduced Density Alternative would generate less traffic and demand for utilities, the alternative would result in slightly less impact related to utilities (including long-term water supply), traffic, air quality, and climate change. Regarding noise, the Reduced Density Alternative would require a similar types of construction activities, which would generate similar levels of construction noise. Depending on the layout of the development under the alternative, construction noise effects could be somewhat less than the proposed project if grading would occur farther from existing homes, but it would be speculative to conclude that the alternative would result in noise reduction substantial enough to avoid the significant temporary construction noise impact associated with the project. In addition, the Reduced Density Alternative would not reduce or avoid the project's significant impact related to roadway noise. Overall, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in less impact than the proposed project.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that when the no project alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives. As discussed above, the No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative would only achieve two of the project's objectives. Therefore, because it would result in less overall environmental impact than the proposed project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered environmentally superior. However, in a strong housing market, the reduction of nearly 200 units on the project site would likely result in demand for development of those units elsewhere in the County. This could result in other unknown environmental impacts, which could be less than, or greater than those associated with the proposed project.

(Draft EIR, pp. 6-9 through 9-12)

Although the EIR identifies the Reduced Density Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative (next to the No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative), the alternative would not avoid the significant impacts associated with the proposed project, and the Draft EIR discloses that the superiority is lessened by the uncertainty as to whether other environmental impacts could result from other development required to meet the additional housing need. The Board rejects the Reduced Density Alternative due to the fact that the alternative does not avoid any significant impact associated with the proposed project and due to the uncertainty regarding these potential environmental effects associated with housing placed elsewhere.

Feasibility/Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The Reduced Density Alternative would meet all of the project objectives and would be consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan and10-year CIP.

However, as discussed above and in the Draft EIR (p. 6-12 and 6-15), the reduction of nearly 200 units would likely result in development of those units elsewhere in the County. Therefore, although the Reduced Density Alternative, itself, would meet the project objectives and would be consistent with the General Plan, it is uncertain whether the alternative could result in placement of housing that would align as well as the project with General Plan goals and policies (which are built into the project objectives). For example, Goal 2.1, Land Use promotes, among other things, curtailment of urban/suburban sprawl and location and intensity of future development consistent with the availability of adequate infrastructure. Similarly, General Plan Policy 2.1.1.2, which supports Goal 2.1, requires the County to establish Community Regions to define those areas that are appropriate for the highest intensity of self-sustaining compact urban-type development or suburban type development within the County. The project site is within one of those defined Community Regions and is one of the closest developable

properties in the County to the employment centers along the U.S. Highway 50 corridor, and is especially close to the City of Folsom. The project site is surrounded on all sides by existing development, and is conveniently served by nearby utilities and infrastructure. Although the Reduced Density Alternative would not, itself, conflict with Goal 2.1 or Policy 2.1.1.2, it would not use the land as efficiently as the proposed project and the unmet housing need may result in development of housing elsewhere. This alternative may result in a less efficient growth pattern that may not align with Goal 2.1 or Policy 2.1.1.2.

With regard to the project objectives, the Reduced Density Alternative is, itself, consistent with all project objectives. As described above, however, the alternative may promote a growth pattern that may not be consistent with the following project objectives (based on the General Plan goals and policies discussed above):

- Implement the County's general plan by directing growth to areas with moderate topography, located amongst already developed lands, with access to services, schools, and transportation systems.

- Implement the County's general plan by directing higher density residential development to Community Regions and Rural Centers and encouraging the enhancement of residential environments to include access to parks and trails.

- Implement the County's general plan by providing urban/suburban type development within lands designated for urban development to ensure the preservation of large expanses of open space and agricultural lands within the county.

The Board rejects the Reduced Density Alternative as infeasible based on the less efficient use of land located close to employment centers and the uncertainty associated with whether the unmet housing need may result in future residential development that would also result in environmental impacts of residential development and may not align with project objectives or General Plan goals and policies related to curtailing sprawl and promoting compact urban development within the Community Region.

Alternative 4: Maximum General Plan Buildout Alternative

The Maximum General Plan Buildout Alternative would develop the maximum number of units allowed on the site under the existing General Plan land use designation. The project site's existing HDR land use designation allows a maximum of 605 dwelling units to be developed on the 121-acre project site, which is 288 more units than included in the proposed project. Because the project site is arguably the closest property in El Dorado County to the major employment centers of Folsom and City of Sacramento, increasing density at this site would likely result in lower vehicle miles traveled (VMT) than if those 288 additional units were developed elsewhere in the County.

Finding Based on Environmental Considerations

Because this Alternative would increase the development intensity occurring on the project site, it would likely result in a larger development footprint, a more intense construction program, increased population generation and demand for utilities and services, and increased traffic generation than the proposed project. Implementation of this alternative would consequently result in potentially greater impacts than the proposed project in nearly all of the environmental issue areas, including population employment and housing, hydrology and water quality, biological resources, cultural resources, aesthetics and visual resources, transportation and circulation, air quality, noise, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, public services, and public utilities. It is likely that many of these impacts could be minimized by implementation of mitigation measures, but some impacts, such as noise impacts and impacts related exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants from Highway 50, may not be able to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Overall, the alternative would result in greater impacts than the

proposed project.

At the project level, because the Maximum General Plan Buildout Alternative results in greater trip generation and energy consumption than currently exist on the project site, the GHG emissions of the Alternative, itself, would be greater than the proposed project. However, the Maximum General Plan Buildout Alternative could, as described above, result in a future countywide reduction in VMT due to the placement of housing closer to employment centers and subsequently reducing overall GHG. Because Climate Change is a long-term, cumulative issue, and because the increased trip generation and energy consumption associated with the Alternative's increase in units would also occur if those units were placed elsewhere in the county, the overall impact related to Climate Change, compared to placement of the additional units elsewhere in the county, would likely be reduced.

Although the Maximum General Plan Buildout Alternative would be consistent with the General Plan and could result in a reduction of countywide VMT (thereby reducing countywide GHG emissions), because the impacts associated with all of the other environmental issue areas would be greater, implementation of the Maximum General Plan Buildout Alternative would result in overall greater impacts than the proposed project.

The Board finds that Alternative 4 is not environmentally superior to the project. The Board rejects this alternative on that basis.

Findings Based on Feasibility/Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The Maximum General Plan Buildout Alternative would be consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan, as well as the County's 10-year CIP. The Maximum General Plan Buildout Alternative would conflict with several of the project's objectives. For example, providing the increased density would likely eliminate opportunities to protect the natural features of the project site and would not likely offer substantial open space and passive/active recreation opportunities. Also the increased density would limit the range of housing types available, compared to the project. Objectives associated with wetland preservation would be difficult (and potentially impossible) to achieve under the Maximum General Plan Buildout Alternative.

The Board rejects the Reduced Density Alternative as infeasible due to the failure to meet many of the project objectives.

C. Other Alternatives

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(c) provides the following guidance in selecting a range of reasonable alternatives for the project. The range of potential alternatives for the project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project, and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. Alternatives that fail to meet the fundamental project purpose need not be addressed in detail in an EIR. (*In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165-1167.)

In determining what alternatives should be considered in the EIR, it is important to acknowledge the objectives of the project, the project's significant effects, and unique project considerations. These factors are crucial to the development of alternatives that meet the criteria specified in Section 15126.6(a).

Although, as noted above, EIRs must contain a discussion of "potentially feasible" alternatives, the ultimate determination as to whether an alternative is feasible or infeasible is made by the lead agency's decisionmaking body. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(a)(3).) At the time of action on the project, the decisionmaking body may consider evidence beyond that found in the EIR in addressing such

determinations. The decision-making body, for example, may conclude that a particular alternative is infeasible (i.e., undesirable) from a policy standpoint, and may reject an alternative on that ground provided that the decision-making body adopts a finding, supported by substantial evidence, to that effect, and provided that such a finding reflects a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and other considerations supported by substantial evidence. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417; *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 998.)

The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but were rejected during the planning or scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. The Board adopts the following findings with respect to these alternatives.

Off-site Alternative

The possibility of an off-site location was considered as an alternative to the proposed project; however, the applicant does not currently hold vacant property that could be feasibly developed with a project that would meet the primary project objectives. It is also noted that the project site is surrounded by existing residential development and roadway facilities. Much of the other available vacant land in the County (in contiguous sections large enough to accommodate 317 single-family units) is located in more rural areas where natural resources are often more prevalent and less disturbed. The project site is also just east of the County's border with Sacramento County in which many of the employment centers are located. Locating 317 units on a different site would not likely result in substantial reduction or avoidance of any project-related impacts to natural resources and could increase trip lengths and vehicle miles traveled associated with residents commuting farther, consequently increasing air pollutant and GHG emissions. For these reasons, the off-site alternative was dismissed from detailed evaluation and is rejected by the Board.

Employment Center Alternative

El Dorado Hills is primarily a residential suburb with many employed residents commuting to outside areas. An employment center located at the project site could reduce vehicle miles traveled (and subsequently reduce pollutant emissions, GHG emissions, and highway traffic) by placing an employment center closer to the residents of El Dorado Hills. However, this alternative would not be consistent with the County's General Plan designation for the site (High Density Residential). In addition, the employment center alternative would not be consistent with most of the project objectives. For these reasons, the employment center alternative was dismissed from detailed evaluation in the EIR and is rejected by the Board.

Alternate Saratoga Way Alignment

Since the release of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) in March 2015, minor modifications were made to the site plan, which is shown conceptually in Exhibit 2 of the NOP. The modifications resulted from a change in the proposed alignment to Saratoga Way based on input from County Transportation Department staff. The previous site plan showed proposed residences closer to Highway 50 and did not include the large park adjacent to Highway 50. Rather, a small park was previously proposed near the current terminus of Wilson Boulevard. The previous site plan also included one fewer unit than the currently proposed 317. The Alternate Saratoga Way Alignment was briefly considered as a potential alternative to the proposed project; however, it was determined to be infeasible because the roadway alignment was not consistent with County roadway standards and it was eliminated from further evaluation in the EIR and is rejected by the Board.

No Project, General Plan Buildout

The El Dorado County General Plan designates the project site High Density Residential (HDR), which allows one to five dwelling units per acre. The project site is surrounded by existing residential development and roadways. It is reasonable to expect that if the proposed project were not approved, the

project site would be developed. Because there are no other development plans pending for the site, it is assumed that any future development would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation. The proposed project is consistent with the land use type and overall density allowed under the General Plan, and it is likely that any alternative would be substantially similar. Therefore, it is assumed that the environmental impacts resulting from the No Project, General Plan Buildout Alternative would be substantially similar to the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. A thorough comparative discussion is not necessary to reach this conclusion. Therefore, the No Project, General Buildout Alternative was dismissed from detailed evaluation in the EIR and is rejected by the Board.

D. Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 states that an EIR should identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives when the no project alternative is environmentally superior. Section 6 of the Draft EIR provides a comparison of the environmental effects of the alternatives in relation to the proposed project to assist in identifying the environmentally superior alternative.

As discussed above, the No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative because it would result in reduction in the degree of project-related impacts for most of the environmental issues and avoids a significant project impact. Unlike the No Project, No Development Alternative, the No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative remains consistent with the County's transportation plan. Therefore, the No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative. However, implementation of the No Project, No Development Alternative would only meet two of the project objectives (related to provision of infrastructure and conservation of natural resources). Also, implementation of the No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative would require provision of additional housing elsewhere in the County to meet the County's housing supply projections (which included high density residential units at the project site). This could result in significant environmental impacts, but since it is unknown where the housing would be provided (multiple sites would be possible) the type and level of environmental impact are unknown.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that when the no project alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives. As discussed above, the No Project, Saratoga Way Extension Only Alternative would only achieve two of the project objectives. Therefore, because it would result in less overall environmental impact than the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would be considered environmentally superior. However, in a strong housing market, the reduction of nearly 200 units on the project site would likely result in demand for development of those units elsewhere in the County. This could result in other unknown environmental impacts, which could be less than, or greater than those associated with the proposed project.

As discussed above, the Board rejects the Reduced Density Alternative based on uncertainty related to potential environmental effects associated with future development necessary to accommodate the unmet housing need (compared to the proposed project). The Board also rejects the Reduced Density Alternative based on uncertainty regarding whether that potential future development would align with County goals and policies, as well as project objectives, related to curtailing sprawl and promoting compact urban development within the Community Region.

X. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project against its unavoidable risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered acceptable. CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record.

The County of El Dorado has made a reasonable good faith effort to eliminate or substantially mitigate the environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. The County recognizes, however, that even with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, the project will have significant and unavoidable impacts. In particular, the proposed project would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to noise generated by project construction and noise resulting from increased traffic caused by the extension of Saratoga Way. These significant unavoidable impacts are identified and discussed in Section 6 of these Findings and in the table included as Attachment A. The County further specifically finds that these significant unavoidable impacts are outweighed by the proposed project's benefits and constitutes an overriding consideration warranting approval of the proposed project.

The County of El Dorado finds that any one of the benefits set forth below is sufficient by itself to warrant approval of the proposed project, and justify the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts from the project. This determination is based on the findings herein and the evidence in the record. Having balanced the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts against each of the benefits, pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guideline 15093, the County of El Dorado adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations, for the following reasons:

A. Economic Considerations

At build-out, the project is projected to generate positive fiscal impacts to the County's operating funds. The annual revenue generated by the project from various taxes, licenses, and permits is estimated to exceed the costs of services the County will provide by approximately $568,899.

B. Social and Recreational Benefits

The proposed project provides social and recreational benefits. The proposed project provides diverse housing types, sizes, and designs to accommodate varying lifestyles and income levels to meet the needs of the changing demographics of the County. The project includes a balance of residential densities, consistent with the General Plan, in a location that provides close access to shopping and employment centers.

The project also provides considerable open space as well as active recreational amenities (parks and trails) that would be available for public use. A variety of pedestrian circulation amenities are included in the project design, and a series of pedestrian paths and trails are proposed. Open space is proposed throughout the project site to preserve existing trees and wetlands and to naturally convey stormwater flows. Parks, open space, trails, and landscaped areas would total approximately 41 acres (34 percent) of the project site.

The project also includes the extension of Saratoga Way, which is identified in the County's 10-year CIP and would provide a critical connection to Iron Point Road and improve the local transportation network. The proposed extension of Wilson Boulevard would also provide a needed transportation connection and would improve the local transportation network.

3. Environmental Benefits

A fundamental objective of El Dorado County's General Plan is to direct intensive development to the identified Community Regions and Rural Centers. By directing growth to the Community Regions and Rural Centers, the General Plan helps protect the County's agricultural lands, open space, and natural resources. The project site is entirely within the urban limit line of the El Dorado Hills Community Region; the residential development proposed by the project furthers the County's vision of compact growth, which in turn, protects the County's important agricultural and natural resources located outside of the Community Regions and Rural Centers.

The project has been designed to avoid and substantially minimize environmental impacts. Approximately 27 acres of open space and 8 acres of parks, plus another 6 acres of trail, landscaping, and other open space areas, (41 acres total parks, trails, and open space) are included in the proposed project. The project improvements and drainage crossings are designed to accomplish total avoidance of on-site wetlands, including the existing natural drainage that runs through the center of the site. The project incorporates this natural drainage area into the proposed open space. The project site is not designated prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, and the project site is not identified as "choice agricultural land" in the County's General Plan.

4. Policy

The proposed project implements and furthers important plans and policies adopted and endorsed by the County. Development of the proposed residential, recreational, and open spaces uses is endorsed by the El Dorado County General Plan as a logical location for these proposed uses. By directing growth to the El Dorado Hills Community Region, the proposed project is compatible with existing and future uses and with General Plan policies related to growth, and would provide needed housing and facilities for the County's growing population.

ATTACHMENTS

A Findings table

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
4.1 Land Use Compatibility			
Impact 4.1-1: Divide an established community. The majority of the project site is currently undeveloped. The proposed residential development would not create a physical barrier within the project site, nor would it remove existing means of access to and through existing nearby neighborhoods.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.1-2: Conflict with applicable land use plans or policies. The proposed project includes rezoning from R and OS to R-PD and OS-PD to allow for the development of 317 residential units and associated infrastructure and amenities on the site. Application of the PD Combining Zone District would be consistent with the County's general plan land use designation. In addition, all standards, densities, and other requirements are required to conform to the current base zone of R1 and OS.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.1-3: Compatibility with surrounding land uses. The project would be similar in scale to existing and planned residential developments within the vicinity. In addition, open space areas would generally surround the perimeter of the site, providing a buffer from surrounding land uses and a transition from adjacent communities to the proposed residential subdivision.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.2 Population, Employment, and Housing			
Impact 4.2-1: Directly or indirectly induce	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
substantial population growth during construction. During the five-year construction period, the project would require approximately 140 workers for peak construction. Because the project site is located in an urban area with a substantial construction workforce, it is expected that workers would be drawn from the local labor pool and that a sufficient number of construction workers are available in the county and adjacent communities to meet this demand. Furthermore, even if some construction workers from outside the region were employed at the project site, construction workers typically do not change residences when assigned to a new construction site, and substantial permanent relocation of workers to the area is not anticipated.			impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.2-2: Directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth during operation. The Saratoga Estates project would provide housing for an estimated 929 individuals. These additional residences would accommodate population growth in the unincorporated community of El Dorado Hills that is consistent with the growth projections in the *El Dorado County General Plan* and related planning documents.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.3 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact 4.3-1: Short-term construction-related water quality degradation. Soils onsite have a high potential for erosion. Project construction activities would involve extensive grading and	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-1: Prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan.** The applicant shall prepare and implement a SWPPP that complies with the SWRCB Statewide Construction General Permit. The SWPPP must identify BMPs that will protect water quality from polluted stormwater runoff.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation 4.3-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by requiring the applicant to prepare a stormwater pollution prevention plan.

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
movement of soil, which could result in erosion and sedimentation, and discharge of other nonpoint source pollutants in onsite stormwater that could then drain to offsite areas and degrade local water quality.			The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** The Project could result in erosion, sedimentation, and discharge of other pollutants that could degrade local water quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would reduce construction-related water quality impacts and ensure compliance with General Plan Policy 7.3.2.1 by requiring the project applicant to incorporate appropriate BMPs into the design of the development to prevent water quality degradation. The plan would be designed to prevent increased discharge of sediment at all stages of construction, from initial ground disturbance to project completion. Adequate surface drainage control would be designed by the project civil engineer in accordance with the latest applicable edition of the California Building Code. All slopes should have appropriate drainage and vegetation measures to minimize erosion of soils. In addition, the project shall fully comply with El Dorado County's SWMP, Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Quality Ordinances (Chapters 110.14 and 8.79, respectively), Design and Improvement Standards Manual, and Drainage Manual. Contract provisions would require compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control, and Stormwater Quality Ordinances, as well as-SWMP and implementation of BMPs.. With adherence to existing requirements, impacts related to water quality degradation as a result of soil erosion would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-13)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Impact 4.3-2: Increase in surface water runoff potentially exceeding the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. The proposed development would add additional impervious surfaces at the project site, which would increase surface runoff on an ongoing basis. This increase could result in an increase in both the total volume and the peak discharge rate of stormwater runoff, and could result in exceeding the capacity of onsite stormwater systems and greater potential for on- and offsite flooding.	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-2: Complete final drainage plan and provide adequate onsite storm drainage facilities.** The applicant shall prepare a Final Drainage Analysis conforming to the County's Drainage Manual and the County's West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan requirements~~Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP)~~ with each final map (phase) of the project. The Final Drainage Analysis shall be submitted to the County along with the Improvement Plans for each phase. The Final Drainage Analysis shall identify project drainage facilities and design features that ensure runoff from the project site will not exceed pre-development levels. The identified drainage facilities and design features shall be included in the Improvement Plans for each phase. At a minimum, the necessary drainage facilities and design features constructed with each phase of development shall be sufficient to mitigate post-development runoff to pre-development levels for each phase. Drainage facilities and design features for later phases of the project may be constructed with earlier phases of the project. The Final Drainage Analysis for each phase shall include evaluation of the final design for the 85th percentile storm (water quality storm), the tenth percentile storm (10-year storm) and the one percentile storm (100-year) storm. The Final Drainage Analysis for each phase shall include a discussion of that phase set in the context of the overall project, considering prior and future phase drainage facilities and design features and the West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan requirements. Maintenance of the project drainage facilities and design features shall be the responsibility of the Home Owner's Association (HOA). A provision for maintenance and management of the drainage facilities and design features shall be included in the Codes, Covenants and Restrictions for the project. A separate Maintenance Program shall be developed for LID and water quality features in accordance with the County's West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan requirements ~~SWMP~~ to guide the long term maintenance and management of the systems by the HOA. The Maintenance Program shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to recordation of the first final map.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.3-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by requiring the applicant to complete final drainage plan and provide adequate onsite storm drainage facilities. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** The Project could increase surface water runoff potentially exceeding capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-2 would reduce the significant impact associated with increased surface runoff that could exceed the capacity of the stormwater drainage system, resulting in on- and offsite flooding to a less-than-significant level by providing adequate onsite storm drainage facilities to accommodate the proposed project's stormwater demands and reducing runoff from the project site to rates not exceeding pre-project conditions. All plans are subject to review and approval by El Dorado County. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-14)
Impact 4.3-3: Long-term water quality degradation. The conversion of undeveloped land to urban uses would alter the types, quantities, and timing of contaminant	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-1: Prepare and implement a SWPPP.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-1, as described above. **Mitigation Measure 4.3-2: Complete final drainage plan and provide adequate onsite storm drainage facilities.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2, as described above.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation 4.3-1 and 4.3-2, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by requiring the applicant to prepare and implement a SWPPP

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
discharges in stormwater runoff. Overall, the project could cause or contribute to long-term discharges of urban contaminants (e.g., oil and grease, trace metals and organics, trash) into the stormwater drainage system compared with existing conditions if the system is not properly designed.			and to complete final drainage plan and provide adequate onsite storm drainage facilities. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** While the potential for development of the project site to cause or contribute to long-term discharges of urban contaminants into the stormwater drainage system could increase compared to existing conditions, the applicant would be required to comply with federal, State, and County stormwater management regulations. Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 and 4.3-2 require the incorporation of appropriate BMPs into the design of the development to prevent long-term water quality degradation. The applicant would prepare a SWPPP and Final Drainage Analysis, which will include the incorporation of source control, site design, treatment control BMPs, and hydromodification management measures pursuant to the County's West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan requirements to address anticipated and potential pollutants and water quality degradation.. This would be a less-than-significant impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-15)
4.4 Biological Resources			
Impact 4.4-1: Disturbance to or loss of special-status wildlife species and habitat during construction activities. Implementation of the project could result in the degradation of	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-1a: Avoid or minimize effects to valley elderberry longhorn beetle.** If rough grading and/or removal of onsite elderberry shrubs do not occur by May 2016, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys for VELB according to the USFWS protocol outlined in USFWS' *Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle* (1999) (or other	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.4-1a through 4.4-1e, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by requiring avoidance and minimization of

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
habitat and loss of several special-status species, including nesting birds, amphibians, and reptiles. Special-status species are protected under ESA, CESA, California Fish and Game Code, CEQA, or other regulations. Ground-disturbing activities during construction such as vegetation removal, grading, and excavation could result in a substantial adverse effect on these species.	USFWS conservation guidelines in effect at the time these activities are implemented) before any ground disturbing construction activities. The biologist shall, at a minimum, identify and map all elderberry shrubs with stems measuring 1 inch or greater in diameter at ground level on and within 100 feet of the project site, take stem counts, and document any exit holes. If no exit holes are found, no additional mitigation is required. If exit holes are identified during the survey, the applicant shall implement all take avoidance measures identified by the USFWS, including, but not limited to the following measures (as updated or amended by USFWS at the time the above-described construction activities are implemented): ◢ Impacts to VELB will be avoided and minimized by following the Conservation Guidelines for cases where elderberry shrubs can be retained and protected within 100 feet of the project footprint. ◢ If elderberry shrubs are 100 feet or more from project activities, no direct or indirect impacts are expected. Shrubs will be protected during construction by establishing and maintaining a high visibility fence at least 100 feet from the drip line of each elderberry shrub with stems 1 inch in diameter or greater. ◢ If elderberry shrubs can be retained within the project footprint, project activities may occur up to 20 feet from the dripline of elderberry shrubs if precautions are implemented to minimize the potential for indirect impacts. Specifically, these minimization measures include: ◤ A minimum setback of at least 20 feet from the dripline of each elderberry plant with stems greater than 1-inch diameter at ground level will be maintained to avoid direct impacts. The buffer area will be fenced with high visibility construction fencing before commencement of ground-disturbing activities and will be maintained for the duration of construction activities. The project applicant will ensure that ground-disturbing activities on the project site do not alter the hydrology of the site or otherwise affect the likelihood of vigor or survival of elderberry shrubs. ◤ The project proponent will ensure that project activities, such as truck traffic or other use of machinery, do not create excessive dust on the project site, such that the growth or vigor of elderberry shrubs is adversely affected. Enforcement of a speed-limit and watering dirt roadways are potential methods to ensure that excessive dust is not created.		impacts to special-status wildlife and habitat during construction. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project construction activities could result in potential impacts to VELB, Western pond turtle, special-status birds, and bats. Mitigation Measure 4.4-1e would generally limit the potential for disturbance to, or loss of, special-status wildlife species and habitat during construction activities. In addition, Mitigation Measures 4.4-1a through 4.4-1d would provide protections to specific species of concern, as summarized below. Through implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1a, in consultation with and under approval of USFWS, the potential loss of elderberry shrubs and potential take of VELB would be offset by avoiding, minimizing, and if necessary, offsetting loss through compensatory mitigation in accordance with the Conservation Guidelines (USFWS 1999), or other USFWS conservation guidelines in effect at the time construction activities are implemented. Incidental Take authorization would be required for any shrubs deemed VELB habitat that would be affected by project development. The impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1b would reduce significant impacts to western pond turtle to a less-than-significant level by requiring worker awareness training and implementing pre-construction surveys for western pond

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
	▼ Areas that are disturbed temporarily will be restored to pre-disturbance conditions. Erosion control measures will be implemented to restore areas disturbed within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs. ▼ No insecticides, herbicides, fertilizers, or other chemicals will be used within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs. Herbaceous vegetation may be mowed or removed using hand tools within 100 feet, but not within 20 feet of the elderberry shrubs. ▼ If new permanent development is to occur within the 100-foot buffer (but outside the 20-foot buffer), the potential for indirect effects will be evaluated by a qualified biologist. If indirect effects are likely to occur, the project applicant will consult with USFWS to determine the appropriate conservation measures. If indirect effects are not likely to occur, then no additional minimization measures would be required. ◢ For elderberry shrubs that cannot be avoided by at least 20 feet or impacts to the beetle minimized through the measures listed above, consultation with USFWS in compliance with the ESA will be carried out to seek incidental take authorization. ◢ No elderberry shrub will be removed or transplanted without prior coordination with USFWS and assurance that the project proponent has abided by all pertinent conditions of any applicable incidental take authorization. Conservation and minimization measures are likely to include preparation of supporting documentation that describes methods for relocation of existing shrubs and maintaining existing shrubs and other vegetation in a conservation area. ◢ Relocation of existing elderberry shrubs and planting of new elderberry seedlings and associated riparian species and/or the purchase of mitigation credits at an approved mitigation bank will be implemented according to the Conservation Guidelines (USFWS 1999) or other applicable USFWS conservation guidelines in effect at the time of construction implementation. The current Conservation Guidelines use stem count data, presence or absence of exit holes, and whether the affected elderberry shrubs are located in riparian habitat to determine the number of elderberry seedlings or cuttings and associated riparian vegetation that would need to be planted as compensatory mitigation for affected VELB habitat. Compensatory mitigation may include planting replacement elderberry seedlings or cuttings and associated native plants within suitable areas of the project site, planting replacement elderberry seedlings or cuttings and associated native plants at a suitable offsite location, purchasing credits at an approved mitigation bank, or a combination thereof. Relocated and replacement shrubs and associated native		turtle before ground-disturbing construction activities within 200 feet of aquatic or riparian habitats. If a western pond turtle is found during construction, impacts would be avoided by relocation of individual turtles by a qualified biologist to suitable habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1c would reduce potentially significant impacts on special-status and otherwise protected bird species, including golden eagle and other raptors, to a less-than-significant level because it would require preconstruction surveys to identify active nests and measures to avoid or minimize disturbances of active nests so that project construction would not result in nest abandonment and loss of eggs or young. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1d would reduce significant impacts to bat individuals and colonies to a less-than-significant level by surveying for bats before disturbance to potential roosting habitat, and minimizing impacts if they are present by providing alternative roost habitat and excluding the bats from the roost habitat to be removed. (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-22)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	plantings will be placed in the on- or offsite conservation areas providing a minimum of 1,800 square feet per transplanted shrub. These conservation areas will be preserved in perpetuity as habitat for VELB. The final VELB mitigation plan, including transplanting procedures, long-term protection, management of the mitigation areas, and monitoring procedures will be consistent with the *Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle* (USFWS 1999), or other USFWS guidelines in effect at the time the construction activities are implemented. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-1b: Avoid or minimize effects to western pond turtle.** ◢ Within 24 hours before beginning construction activities within 200 feet of suitable aquatic habitat for western pond turtle, a qualified biologist will inspect areas of anticipated disturbance for the presence of western pond turtle. The construction area will be re-inspected whenever a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or more has occurred. The monitoring biologist will be available thereafter; if a turtle is encountered during construction activities, the monitoring biologist will have the authority to stop construction activities until a qualified biologist can relocate the western pond turtle to the nearest suitable aquatic habitat outside the area of disturbance. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-1c: Avoid or minimize the loss of special-status bird nests.** The project applicant will implement the following measures to avoid or minimize the loss of nests of golden eagle, white-tailed kite, and other raptors and special status birds: ◢ To the extent feasible, vegetation (including tree) removal, grading, and other ground disturbing activities will be carried out during the nonbreeding season (September 1 through February 14) for migratory birds. ◢ If construction activity is scheduled to occur during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31), the project applicant shall utilize a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for all potential special-status bird species (golden eagle, white-tailed kite, burrowing owl, and tricolored blackbird) and suitable habitat onsite and within 500 feet of the project site to identify active nests that could be affected by project construction. The surveys shall be conducted before the approval of grading and/or improvement plans (as applicable) and no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction in a particular area. If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required. ◢ If active nests are found, impacts on nesting birds, including golden eagle, white-tailed kite, burrowing owl, and other raptors, as well as tricolored blackbirds shall be		

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	avoided by establishment of appropriate buffers around the nests. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that any young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. A 500-foot buffer around raptor nests, burrows, and/or colonies are generally adequate to protect them from disturbance, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW depending on site-specific conditions. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities will be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-1d: Avoid or minimize loss of protected bat species.** Prior to construction, suitable roosting habitat (assumed to be trees on the project site) for roosting bats on the project site will be surveyed by a qualified biologist. Surveys will consist of a daytime pedestrian survey looking for evidence of bat use (e.g., guano) and may also include an evening emergence survey to note the presence or absence of bats, if warranted. The type of survey will depend on the condition of the potential roosting trees. If no bat roosts are found, then no further study is required. If evidence of bat use is observed, the number and species of bats using the roost will be determined. Bat detectors may be used to supplement survey efforts, but are not required. If roosts of pallid or silver-haired bats are determined to be present and must be removed, the bats will be excluded from the roosting site before the tree is removed. A program addressing compensation, exclusion methods, and roost removal procedures will be developed in consultation with CDFW before implementation. Exclusion methods may include use of one-way doors at roost entrances (bats may leave but not reenter), or sealing roost entrances when the site can be confirmed to contain no bats. Exclusion efforts may be restricted during periods of sensitive activity (e.g., during hibernation or while females in maternity colonies are nursing young). The loss of each roost (if any) will be replaced in consultation with CDFW and may require construction and installation of bat boxes suitable to the bat species and colony size excluded from the original roosting site. If determined necessary during consultation with CDFW, replacement roosts will be implemented before bats are excluded from the original roost sites. Once the replacement roosts are constructed and it is confirmed that bats are not present in the original roost site, the roost trees may be removed. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-1e: Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (biological resources element).** Prior to any ground disturbing activities that would affect riparian or aquatic habitats, a qualified biologist shall conduct an education program for all		

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
	persons employed or otherwise working on the project. The program shall consist of a presentation from the biologist that includes a discussion of the biology of the habitats and species potentially affected by project development. The biologist shall also include as part of the education program information about the distribution and habitat needs of any special-status species that may be present, legal protections for those species, penalties for violations, and project-specific protective measures identified by regulatory authorizations. Interpretation shall be provided for non-English speaking workers, and the same instruction shall be provided for any new workers prior to their performing work onsite. The permittee shall prepare and distribute wallet-sized cards or a fact sheet that contains relevant biological data for workers to carry onsite. Upon completion of the education program, employees shall sign a form stating they attended the program and understand all protection measures.		
Impact 4.4-2: Loss and/or modification of riparian habitat and fill or other disturbance of waters of the United States during construction. Proposed structures, utilities, roads, and trails are designed to avoid permanent fill of waters of the United States including wetlands and riparian habitat However, because grading and excavation would occur close or adjacent to these areas, they could be affected through either minor inadvertent removal of vegetation, excessive ground disturbance to the bed and bank causing erosion into waterways, or inadvertent placement of fill materials in waters of the United States, wetlands, and/or riparian areas.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-1e: Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (biological resources element).** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1e, as described above. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a: Avoid effects to sensitive natural communities by fencing resources.** Before construction activities commence, all sensitive areas will be flagged or fenced with brightly visible construction flagging and/or fencing under the direction of the qualified biologist to ensure that grading, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activities will not occur within these areas. This delineation shall be consistent with and incorporate the USACE-approved preliminary jurisdictional determination or verified jurisdictional determination. Foot traffic by construction personnel will also be limited in these areas to prevent the introduction of invasive or weedy species. Periodic inspections during construction will be conducted by the monitoring biologist to ensure the integrity of exclusion fencing/flagging is maintained throughout the period of construction involving ground disturbance. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b: Obtain all required regulatory authorizations if project development would result in the fill of Waters of the United States.** Prior to any grading or construction activities within waters of the United States., the appropriate Section 404 permit will be obtained for any project-related impacts. Any waters of the United States that would be affected by project development shall be replaced or restored on a "no-net-loss" basis in accordance with USACE mitigation guidelines (or the applicable USACE guidelines in place at the time of construction). In association with the Section 404 permit (if applicable) and prior to the issuance of any grading permit, Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.4-1e and 4.4-2a through 4.4-2c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by avoiding loss or modification of riparian habitat and fill or disturbance of waters of the United States during construction. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Although the project design avoids wetland features, the proposed project could result in loss and/or modification of riparian habitat and fill of waters of the United States if construction works inadvertently affect these areas. Significant impacts associated with loss of riparian habitat and fill of waters of the United States would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementing a Worker Environmental Awareness Program, flagging and/or fencing sensitive

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
	Water Quality Control Board shall be obtained. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2c: Obtain all required regulatory authorizations if project development would result in impacts to aquatic or riparian habitats within CDFW jurisdiction.** If it is determined that project development would affect the bed, bank, channel, or associated riparian habitat subject to CDFW jurisdiction under Fish and Game Code Section 1602, a Streambed Alteration Notification shall be submitted to CDFW, pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code. If proposed activities are determined to be subject to CDFW jurisdiction, the project proponent shall abide by the conditions of any executed agreement prior to the issuance of a grading permit by El Dorado County.		natural resources, and obtaining all required regulatory authorizations. (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-23)
Impact 4.4-3: Conflict with County policies related to required setbacks from wetland features. El Dorado County General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 and the Interim Interpretive Guidelines for that Policy (adopted June 22, 2006) require a minimum setback of 50 feet from intermittent streams and wetlands. An alternative setback can be approved when the applicant demonstrates that the alternative setback would still provide sufficient protection to the affected biological resources and avoid or minimize impacts as required by the general plan, or if the alternative setback is necessary to allow "reasonable use" of an existing legal parcel and appropriate mitigation measures and/or best management practices are incorporated into the project.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-1e: Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (biological resources element).** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1e, as described above. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a: Avoid effects to sensitive natural communities by fencing resources.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a, as described above. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b: Obtain all required regulatory authorizations if project development would result in the fill of Waters of the United States.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b, as described above. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2c: Obtain all required regulatory authorizations if project development would result in impacts to aquatic or riparian habitats within CDFW jurisdiction.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-2c, as described above. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-3a: Implement additional actions to further reduce impacts to wetland features due to alternate minimum setback during construction.** The following actions shall be implemented during grading and other ground-disturbing construction activities within 100 feet of the onsite wetland features: ◢ A qualified biologist shall be onsite during all initial vegetation clearing and grading activities. ◢ High-visibility orange fencing shall be installed 10 feet from the edge of aquatic features and riparian habitat or at the edge of the grading/construction footprint, whichever is greater. The fencing shall be installed at the edge of the construction footprint around all aquatic features, as directed by the monitoring biologist. The fencing shall be installed prior to ground-disturbing activities and shall remain throughout the duration of construction activities. The fencing shall be checked daily by the superintendent or foreman to ensure that the fencing remains intact. ◢ Excavation and ground disturbance within 100 feet of any aquatic feature (excluding	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.4-1e, 4.4-2a through 4.4-2c, and 4.4-3a and 4.4-3b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by minimizing effects to wetland features during construction, improving revegetation, and providing habitat monitoring, discouraging invasive plants, and educating residents. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Significant impacts associated with conflicts to County's setback policy would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementing additional measures to minimize potential direct and indirect effects to wetland features during construction activities and by including additional features and maintenance activities into the project to improve revegetation, provide monitoring of habitat in open space areas, discouraging use of invasive plant species, and informing residents of effects to wildlife from domestic

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
	removal of trees) shall be limited to dry periods (generally between April 15 and October 15). ◢ Within identified wetland features, the top 4 inches of topsoil within the temporary disturbance area shall be stripped and stockpiled onsite. Once construction of the lots is complete, the topsoil shall be returned to the permanent buffer areas to maintain an existing seed bank and promote rapid re-establishment of vegetative cover. ◢ If rain is forecasted to occur, all bare soil shall be covered with plastic sheeting, or equivalent, 24 hours prior to an anticipated precipitation event. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-3b: Provide permanent design features and monitoring to further reduce impacts to wetland features due to alternate minimum setback during operation.** ◢ The applicant shall hire a qualified biologist to prepare a revegetation plan and submit to the County's Community Development Department prior to the start of construction. The plan shall include information on planting, maintenance, monitoring, and adaptive management strategies. For all disturbed areas within 40 feet of aquatic features and riparian habitat, the revegetation plan shall specify revegetation with native plant material, including native shrubs and trees to improve bank stability and habitat values. ◢ To ensure establishment of native habitat, a monitoring plan prepared by a qualified biologist shall be submitted to the County's Community Development Department that includes monitoring of the habitat within the open space buffers for a minimum of five years after the final certificate of occupancy is issued. The plan shall include adaptive management responses to implement if habitat quality is declining. ◢ The Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R) for the development shall discourage residents from using species considered invasive by the California Invasive Plant Council (CAL-IPC) in landscaping throughout the development. This restriction should be enforced by the Home-owners Association for the development. ◢ Informational signs informing residents about impacts that domestic animals can have on wildlife shall be installed in parks and trail corridors.		animals. (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-26)
4.5 Cultural Resources			
Impact 4.5-1: Disturb archaeological resources. Implementation of the proposed	**Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a: Avoid impacts to P-9-822.** Construction activities occurring within the boundaries of P-9-822 shall not include any scarification or excavation activities. Any	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a through 4.5-1c, which have been required or incorporated

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
project could cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource. One archaeological resource (P-9-822) has been recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR. The proposed project has been designed to avoid this resource; however, mitigation measures are needed to ensure the resource is avoided. Also, project-related ground-disturbing activities could cause a substantial change in the significance of an as yet undiscovered archaeological resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	construction proposed within the boundaries of P-9-822 shall only include covering the site with layer(s) of chemically compatible soil prior to construction of any physical structures or other improvements. A qualified archaeologist shall be onsite continuously to monitor all ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of P-9-822 and all soil capping activities. The qualified archaeologist shall have the authority to stop work if necessary to protect the integrity of the site. **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b: Develop and implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (heritage and cultural resources element).** The project applicant shall submit to the El Dorado County Planning Department a Worker Environmental Awareness Program, prepared by a qualified archaeologist that will be provided to all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter and alter heritage and cultural resources. The topics to be addressed in the Worker Environmental Awareness Program will include, at a minimum: ◢ types of heritage and cultural resources expected in the project area; ◢ types of evidence that indicates heritage or cultural resources might be present (e.g., ceramic shards, trash scatters, lithic scatters); ◢ what to do if a worker encounters a possible resource; ◢ what to do if a worker encounters bones or possible bones; and ◢ penalties for removing or intentionally disturbing heritage and cultural resources, such as those identified in the Archeological Resources Protection Act. **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1c: Stop work and implement recommendations in the event of an archaeological discovery.** In the event that evidence of any prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities (e.g., ceramic shard, trash scatters, lithic scatters), all ground-disturbing activity in the area of the discovery shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can access the significance of the find. If an archeological site, the appropriate Native American group shall be notified. If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the CRHR standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, and a data recovery plan shall be prepared. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find is determined to constitute either an historical resource or		into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by minimizing effects to known and undiscovered archaeological resources. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** The proposed project could potentially disturb known and undiscovered archaeological resources. Implementation of Mitigation 4.5-1a would ensure that project development would not result in any activities within the boundaries of site P-9-822 that could result in significant impacts to the site as defined under Public Resources Code Section 15064.5(b). In addition, Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a requires that all construction activities in the vicinity of site P-9-822 would be overseen by a qualified archaeologist with stop-work authority in order to ensure the integrity of the resource is not inadvertently compromised. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.5-1b and 4.5-1c would reduce potentially significant impacts to currently undiscovered archaeological resources because actions would be taken to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impact to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-13 and 4.5-14)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
	a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist shall work with the project applicant to avoid disturbance to the resources, and if completed avoidance is not possible, follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard DPR Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System office for the project area (the NCIC).		
Impact 4.5-2: Accidental discovery of human remains. Although unlikely, construction and excavation activities associated with project development could unearth previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains.	**Mitigation Measure 4.5-2: Stop work and implement recommendations if human remains are discovered.** If human remains are discovered during any demolition/construction activities, potentially damaging ground-disturbing activities in the area of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the project applicant shall notify the El Dorado County coroner and the NAHC immediately, according to Section 5097.98 of the PRC and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined by the NAHC to be Native American, the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The project applicant shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience to conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant, if any, identified by the NAHC. Following the coroner's and NAHC's findings, the archaeologist, and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in PRC Section 5097.94.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.5-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by minimizing effects in the event that human remains are discovered during construction. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** There is potential for unknown human remains to be uncovered during project construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-2 would reduce potentially significant impacts to human remains because actions would be implemented to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the remains appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid or minimize the disturbance of human remains, and to appropriately treat any remains that are discovered, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-14)
Impact 4.5-3: Destroy a unique paleontological resource. The project site is considered to have a low paleontological sensitivity because the site rests on soils that are predominantly	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
igneous (volcanic). No paleontological resources are known to occur within the project site or a 1-mile radius of the site.			
4.6 Aesthetic and Visual Resources			
Impact 4.6-1: Scenic vista impacts. Development of the proposed project would not obstruct views of existing scenic vistas or important scenic resources, as no such views are currently available from public vantage points surrounding the site.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.6-2: Visual character and quality impacts. Existing topographical and landscape features would be maintained where feasible and open space buffers would visually separate the new development from existing adjacent developments. Most onsite rock outcroppings would be removed from the site, but they are not considered significant geologic or visual features and are commonly found throughout El Dorado County. Although some trees would be removed, most of the existing oak trees located in proposed open space areas, along the stream corridor, in the northwest corner of the site, and along the eastern project boundary would be retained, and trees would be planted throughout the site, consistent with surrounding neighborhood and park landscaping. The change in character of the project site, once developed, would be visually compatible with surrounding existing residential neighborhoods to the north, east, and west. Therefore, the proposed project	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.			
Impact 4.6-3: Light and glare impacts. The proposed residential development would include indoor lighting and outdoor lighting for safety purposes. The proposed roadways, parks, and pathways would also include outdoor safety lighting. These new sources of light would be visible from a distance at night. The new light sources would be consistent with the surrounding suburban development. Compliance with general plan Policy 2.8.1.1 and Section 130.14.170 of the Zoning Ordinance before building permit issuance would ensure that light and glare created by the proposed development would be the minimum required, and comparable to that of surrounding residential neighborhoods.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.7 Transportation and Circulation			
Impact 4.7-1: Existing plus project intersection LOS impacts. Under the existing plus project conditions, operation of the study intersections range from LOS C to LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The freeway facilities are shown to operate from LOS A to LOS E during peak hours. Segments would operate at LOS D and E. Intersection operations associated with El Dorado Hills Boulevard at Saratoga Way/Park Drive and Latrobe Road at Town Center Boulevard would operate at LOS F, and the project would result in more than 10	**Mitigation Measure4.7-1a: Pay ~~TIM Fees~~ project's fair share of the Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange (Phase 1).** The applicant shall pay fair share fees to El Dorado County for the Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange (Phase 1) to address the project's contribution to traffic at the El Dorado Hills Boulevard at Saratoga Way/Park Drive Intersection. Fee amount shall be determined by the County. All fees shall be paid at the time of issuance of building permits. Note that since the release of the Draft EIR, the interchange (Phase 1) has been completed; therefore, the physical traffic-related impact of the project on the El Dorado Hills Boulevard at Saratoga Way/Park Drive Intersection is already mitigated. Fair share fee contribution is required for reimbursement. **Mitigation Measure 4.7-1b: Complete a Signal Timing Plan.** The project applicant shall prepare and implement a signal timing plan for the intersections along El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road corridor from Saratoga Way/Park Drive through Town Center	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.7-1a and 4.7-1b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by reducing impacts to intersection LOS (under existing plus project conditions). The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** The proposed

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
additional vehicle trips per peak hour.	Boulevard to provide acceptable LOS in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The plan for signal optimization shall be prepared by a California-licensed civil engineer or traffic engineer obtained by the project applicant, and shall be submitted to the County Transportation Division and Caltrans, as appropriate. Prior to issuance of ~~occupancy certificates~~building permits, the applicant shall ensure the signal timing improvements are completed in coordination with the County Transportation Division and Caltrans.		project could result in impacts to local intersection LOS. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7-1a and 4.7-1b, the applicant would pay the project's fair share of the Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange (Phase 1). The applicant will also prepare and implement optimized signal timings along the El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road corridor. The Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange (Phase 1), a CIP project, is currently under construction and will be completed in 2016, prior to the time at which development of the project would begin. The Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange (Phase 1) consists of a new overcrossing over Highway 50, new on- and off-ramps with signalized intersections, and new bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The purpose of the interchange project is to provide another access point to Highway 50 for motorists in El Dorado Hills. The completion of Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange will result in a redistribution of the traffic and would affect delays associated with roadways near the project site, including El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Latrobe Road. The interchange will decrease congestion on several roadways near the project site and improve travel time by providing more direct access to Highway 50 for many area residents and businesses that would otherwise be required to access Highway 50 from El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Latrobe Road, or Bass Lake Road. Modeling of the project, in combination with operation of the Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway and optimized signal cycle length and reallocation of the green time at intersections in the area, is provided in Table 4.7-18 of the Draft EIR. As shown, under these conditions, LOS conditions would be acceptable and degraded conditions would improve. The new interchange, along with revised signal

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			timings, would result in acceptable LOS E or better operations along the corridor during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Because this improvement will be completed prior to development on the project site, payment of fair share fees will satisfy the project's obligation towards this improvement. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7-1a and 4.7-1b, intersection LOS associated with the existing plus project condition would meet, and in some cases exceed, requirements for traffic operations within the County. Thus, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-29 and 4.7-30; Final EIR p. 2-7)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Impact 4.7-2: Near Term (2024) plus proposed project conditions intersection LOS impacts. Under Near Term (2024) conditions, operation of the study intersections would range between LOS B and LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The study freeway facilities would range from LOS A to LOS E during peak hours. The study roadway segments would operate acceptably at LOS E or better. The El Dorado Hills Boulevard at Saratoga Way/Park Drive and Latrobe Road at Town Center Boulevard intersections would operate unacceptably at LOS F.	**Mitigation Measure 4.7-2: Road and intersection improvements.** ~~Prior to issuance of occupancy permits~~In accordance with conditions of approval for timing of improvements, the applicant shall coordinate with the County to improve the El Dorado Hills at Saratoga Way/Park Drive intersection by adding a southbound right-turn lane and re-allocating the traffic signal green time, and improve the Latrobe at Town Center Drive intersection by restriping of the westbound Town Center Boulevard approach to include one shared through/left-turn lane and two right-turn lanes, adding a right-turn overlap signal phase for the westbound right-turn, and adding a component of Phase 2B improvements at the adjacent Highway 50 interchange with El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road. ~~As determined by the County's Community Development Agency (CDA), the project applicant shall pay TIM fees to satisfy the project's fair share obligation towards these improvements, if they are included in the 10-Year CIP. Alternatively, as determined by the CDA, the project applicant may construct the improvements if they are needed, but not included in future updates to the 10-Year CIP, and~~ The project applicant may be eligible for either reimbursement or fee credit for costs that exceed the project's proportional share.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by reducing impacts to intersection LOS (under near-term [2024] plus project conditions). The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Unacceptable operations at the El Dorado Hills Boulevard at Saratoga Way/Park Drive and Latrobe Road at Town Center Boulevard intersections are due to a combination of increased traffic from planned development and changes in travel patterns associated with planned infrastructure improvements, like the Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange and the Saratoga Way extension. The Near Term (2024) analysis includes planned roadway improvements, as well as growth consistent with the 2004 General Plan and with approved and reasonably foreseeable projects within the study area. As noted, these intersections operate at unacceptable LOS F in the Near Term (2024) scenario without the project, which includes other foreseeable but unapproved projects. Therefore, the project is only responsible for its proportional share of the proposed mitigation under Near Term conditions. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-2, the applicant would be required to construct the needed improvements and may be reimbursed for cost above and beyond the fair share contribution, as determined by the CDA. As shown in Draft EIR Table 4.7-22, implementation of

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
			the roadway improvements would result in acceptable intersection operations during the a.m. and p.m. peak-hours. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-34 and 4.7-35; Final EIR p. 2-7 through 2-9)
Impact 4.7-3: Cumulative (2035) plus proposed project conditions intersection LOS impacts. Under the cumulative (2035) conditions, the study intersections would operate between LOS B and LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak-hours. Segments would operate at A and B LOSs. The freeway facilities would operate from LOS B to LOS D during peak-hours. The result indicates inadequate LOS at the intersections of El Dorado Hill Boulevard and Saratoga Way/Park Drive, and Latrobe Road and Town Center Boulevard. These intersections would continue to experience LOS F conditions and contribute more than 10 peak-hour trips.	**Mitigation Measure 4.7-1a: Pay ~~TIM Fees~~ project's fair share of the Highway 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange (Phase 1).** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-1a, as described above. **Mitigation Measure 4.7-1b: Complete a Signal Timing Plan.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-1b, as described above. **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2: Road and intersection improvements.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 as described above.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.7-1a, 4.7-1b, and 4.7-2, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by reducing impacts to intersection LOS (under cumulative [2035] plus project conditions). The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** The significant impact at the El Dorado Hills Boulevard at Saratoga Way/Park Drive intersection can be mitigated by performing signal cycle length optimization and reallocation of green time. This would be implemented by the applicant through preparation and implementation of a signal timing plan for the El Dorado Hills Boulevard at Saratoga Way/Park Drive intersection, as described in Mitigation Measure 4.7-1b. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-2, the applicant would be required to construct the necessary improvements and may be reimbursed for cost above and beyond the fair share contribution, as determined by the CDA. As shown in Draft EIR Table 4.7-26, implementation of the roadway improvements discussed above would result in

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
			acceptable intersection operations during the p.m. peak-hour. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-39; Final EIR p. 2-7 through 2-9)
Impact 4.7-4: Construction-related traffic impacts. Construction of the project would result in temporary construction traffic and temporary disruption to traffic circulation along roadways near the project site. The amount of construction activity would vary depending on the particular type, number, and duration of usage for the varying equipment, and the phase of construction.	**Mitigation Measure 4.7-4: Prepare and implement a construction traffic management plan.** The applicant (or designated construction manager) shall prepare a construction Traffic Management Plan (TMP) in consultation with the El Dorado County Transportation Division, as well as all other applicable transportation entities, including Caltrans for state roadway facilities and City of Folsom for city roadway facilities. The TMP will ensure that construction traffic does not result in exceedance of peak-hour LOS at existing affected transportation facilities beyond baseline conditions. The County will ensure implementation of the construction TMP during all applicable construction phases. The TMP would address the following, as needed: ◢ scheduling for oversized material deliveries to the work site and haul routes, including flagging, scheduling off-peak deliveries (recognizing applicable noise standards may limit early morning/evening deliveries); ◢ coordination of construction traffic with other concurrent, major construction projects in the same local transportation network; ◢ other actions to be identified and developed as may be needed by the construction manager/resident engineer to ensure that temporary impacts on transportation facilities are minimized. Such actions could include offering a ride-sharing program for construction workers, offering some flexibility for start- and end-work times, and even restricting peak hour construction trips, if necessary. The TMP would include an up-to-date evaluation of current operational characteristics of the roadways to verify that the plan is successful, or to identify whether additional measures should be added (as described above).	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.7-4, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by requiring preparation and implementation of a construction traffic management plan (TMP). The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project-related construction activities and traffic could result in short-term traffic impacts. The construction TMP would reduce the significance of this impact by reducing peak hour construction traffic and would substantially improve and manage construction-related traffic conditions on area roadways. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-40 and 4.7-41)
Impact 4.4-5: Pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities impacts. The project would be required to construct onsite roadway and pedestrian facilities in accordance with County	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
design guidelines. These onsite pedestrian and bicycle facilities would connect the project with the future adjacent Class II bike lanes along Saratoga Way. Through this connection to the proposed bike lane network, the project would provide continuity with adjacent projects, schools, parks, and other public facilities.			
Impact 4.7-6: Access and circulation impacts. Based on a review of general access and onsite circulation conducted by a traffic engineer, adequate access to/from Saratoga Way and the surrounding transportation network would be provided.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.7-7: Traffic safety impacts. Several intersections in the project area have been identified as areas prone to vehicle accidents. Although the project is consistent with the amount of development contemplated in the County's recent travel demand model and land use update, it would result in introduction of additional people to unsafe intersections and roadway segments. However, existing safety issues in the project vicinity have either recently been corrected, or improvements are imminent.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
4.8 Air Quality			
Impact 4.8-1: Short-term, construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors. Short-term, construction-generated emissions would exceed EDCAQMD's significance threshold for ROG, but would not exceed thresholds for mass emissions of NOX, PM10, and PM2.5 for all years of construction.	**Mitigation Measure 4.8-1a: Use architectural coatings with low-VOC content.** During construction, architectural coatings with an average VOC content of 150 grams per liter or less shall be used. **Mitigation Measure 4.8-1b: Apply Rule 403 from SCAQMD, as adopted by EDCAQMD.** During construction, implement SCAQMD's Best Available Fugitive Dust Control Measures and Best Available Fugitive Dust Control Measures for High Wind Conditions as adopted by EDCAQMD.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.8-1a and 4.8-1b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by requiring low-VOC architectural coatings and complying with SCAQMD Rule 403 (adopted by EDCAQMD) to control dust. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project-related construction activities could generate air pollutant emission levels that exceed EDCAQMD thresholds. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8-1a and 1b would reduce significant impacts associated with emissions of ROG and TAC from construction activities to a less-than-significant level through the use of low-VOC architectural coatings and application of other BACT. Mitigated ROG emissions were estimated based on the reduced VOC content paint as specified in Mitigation Measure 4.8-1a and are shown in the Table 4.8-7 in the Draft EIR. The effect of this mitigation measure would only occur during years in which architectural coatings are expected to be applied. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-22)
Impact 4.8-2: Long-term, operation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors. Long-term, operational emissions	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3),

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
would not exceed significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10}. Thus, long-term operational emissions of precursors would not violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and/or conflict with air quality planning efforts.			15091.)
Impact 4.8-3: Mobile-source CO concentrations. Local mobile-source CO emissions near roadway intersections are a direct function of traffic volume, speed, and delay. Short-term construction and long-term operation of the proposed project would not result in increases in traffic such that the adopted screening criteria would be triggered. Therefore, the project would not result in increased concentrations of CO that would expose sensitive receptors to unhealthy levels.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.8-4: Exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs. Construction activities would result in substantial emissions of diesel PM and NOA and would take place near offsite receptors. During operations, diesel powered equipment would not be as prominent and diesel PM emissions would be limited to emissions from on-road diesel vehicles. The project would not be a major source of other TACs, as these are primarily associated with industrial operations. However, the project is located in close proximity to Highway 50 and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial health risks	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-1: Prepare and implement a SWPPP.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-1, as described above. **Mitigation Measure 4.8-4a (NOA during construction): Comply with Applicable Recommendations in the Geotechnical Engineering Study.** A professional geologist shall be retained by the project applicant. As determined necessary by the geologist, grading activities shall be observed to identify materials likely to contain NOA. Collection of soil/rock samples for analyses for NOA shall be conducted where recommended by the onsite geologist. An asbestos dust mitigation plan shall be prepared by the applicant and submitted to EDCAQMD that includes: ◢ Provisions for testing of all soils to be exported from the project site during construction. At least one sample per 1,000 tons of material shall be required. ◢ Prohibition of rock crushing where materials may contain asbestos. ◢ Track-out control measures.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 and 4.8-4a through 4.8-4c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by minimizing emission of toxic air contaminants during construction and operation of the project. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project-related

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
from roadway emissions.	◢ Prohibition of fugitive dust that extends beyond the project site. ◢ Specifications for the depth to which NOA-containing materials will be used as fill. NOA shall be used only in deep fills to avoid contact during future excavations (i.e., for pools or maintenance of utilities). ◢ A contingency under which the Buckeye Union School District (which includes William Brooks Elementary School) and the Folsom Cordova Unified School District (which includes Russell Ranch Elementary School) shall be notified if there is a release, or suspected release, of asbestos in fugitive dust that extends beyond the project site. Coordinate with EDCAQMD to determine if air monitoring for NOA is necessary during construction. Following construction, finished lot testing for NOA shall be completed, as recommended by EDCAQMD. **Mitigation Measure 4.8-4b (diesel PM during construction): Use Tier 3 construction equipment.** To reduce diesel PM emissions during construction, limit construction equipment to those that comply with Tier 3 emission control standards. **Mitigation Measure 4.8-4c (diesel PM during operation): Implement measures to reduce health risks from Highway 50.** ◢ Houses located within 500 feet of Highway 50 shall include air filtration systems that have a minimum efficiency reporting value of 13 and mechanical airflow and ventilation systems that are equipped to handle necessary air flow needs, as determined by a specialist certified by the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air-Conditioning Engineers. (Note: the minimum efficiency reporting value rates the effectiveness of air filters. A rating of 13 indicates that particles between 0.3 and 1 micrometers are removed 75 percent of the time.) ◢ To filter outdoor air and minimize TAC concentrations, the project applicant shall fund the planting of trees in the open space along the southern boundary of the project site. The plantings shall be located on the northern side of Saratoga Way, adjacent to the soundwalls shown on Exhibit 3-3 in Chapter 3, "Project Description." Trees shall consist of evergreen species, so that the potential for particle deposition and filtration is relatively consistent year-round. Two contiguous rows of trees will be planted, with individual plantings not more than 15 feet apart. The plantings in one row shall be staggered relative to the plantings in the other row. All trees shall be planted prior to occupancy of homes within 500 feet of Highway 50.		construction activities could result in substantial emissions of diesel PM and NOA near offsite receptors. The project is located in close proximity to Highway 50 and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial health risks from roadway emissions. The existing NOA levels onsite are at or below EDCAQMD's definition of "asbestos-containing material," which is defined as any material that has asbestos content of 0.25 percent or greater by ARB TM 435. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4..3-1 and 4.8-4a would require the construction and design of the project to conform to recommendations from the geotechnical engineering study that were designed to reduce exposure to NOA during construction. The project would also comply with all applicable rules and regulations from ARB and EDCAQMD that would further reduce exposure to NOA during project construction. Thus, the application of these mitigation measures would reduce the likelihood of exposure of sensitive receptors to NOA and would reduce significant impacts associated with NOA to be less-than-significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-4b would result in compliance with EDCAMQD thresholds by requiring the use of construction equipment technology that reduces diesel PM emissions. The use of Tier 3 construction equipment would result in a significance threshold of 98,143 gallons. Thus, the diesel fuel use estimated for the project's construction would fall below the adjusted threshold. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-4c would reduce impacts related to exposure to diesel PM from Highway 50. The unmitigated health risk conservatively estimated for the project is just under the 100 in a million threshold. Therefore, implementation of measures listed under Mitigation Measure 4.8-4c would be expected to reduce

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
	The specific tree species selected for the site shall be suited to the site conditions and constraints. All trees shall be planted in accordance with the planting standards established by the Western Chapter of the International Society of Arboriculture's *Guideline Specifications for Selecting, Planting, and Early Care of Young Trees* (Kempf and Gilman 2011), including standards for root ball management, root pruning, staking, mulching, and irrigation. The trees will be maintained in perpetuity by the EDHCSD, a landscape and lighting district, or by the HOA. As part of the ongoing maintenance, trees lost to disease, age, or other cause shall be replaced with the same tree species to maintain the screening.		indoor and outdoor exposure of sensitive receptors to diesel PM to below the level of significance. Thus, after mitigation, the impacts associated with diesel PM emissions would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-28 and 4.8-29)
Impact 4.8-5: Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors. Neither construction nor operation of the project would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, because the proposed development does not include construction and operation of the types of facilities that are known to produce odors and any diesel exhaust odors generated by construction equipment would be intermittent and temporary, and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.9 Climate Change			
Impact 4.9-1: Construction-generated greenhouse gas emissions. Construction-generated GHG emissions would not exceed EDCAMQD's recommended GHG emissions threshold.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.9-2: Operational greenhouse gas emissions. The project would be consistent with SACOG's MTP/SCS because it would be located in the area designated "Established Community" in the MTP/SCS, and proposed	**Mitigation Measure 4.9-2: Reduce operational GHG emissions** Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy, the project applicant shall incorporate mitigation measures into the project to reduce operational GHG emissions to levels that do not exceed the identified performance standard, that is, the GHG efficiency target. The following measures are recommended given the state of the science today. However, in consideration	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.9-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by minimizing GHG emission during operation of the project. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
land use would be consistent with the overall land use, density, and intensity information provided for this community type in the MTP/SCS. However, GHGs associated with operation of the proposed project would exceed the Tier I mass-emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO_2e/year and operational GHGs would exceed the GHG efficiency-based Tier II threshold developed for the project based on statewide reduction targets and post-2020 conditions.	of new and advanced technologies that may be introduced, other feasible, enforceable measures that result in emissions reductions additional to regulatory requirements and that would also achieve the performance standard may be substituted, with prior approval by El Dorado County. **Transportation** All single family homes shall include adequate electric wiring and infrastructure to support a 240-Volt electric vehicle charger in the garage or off-street parking area to allow for the future installation of electric vehicle chargers. This connection should be separate from the connection provided to power an electric clothes dryer. **Energy** ◢ All houses shall be designed to exceed the 2013 Title 24 standards by a minimum of 25 percent. Title 24 regulates energy uses including space heating and cooling, hot water heating, and ventilation. Therefore, potential options to meet the 25 percent improvement goal could include, but not be limited to, high-efficiency HVAC systems, efficient hot water heaters (e.g., tankless or solar), and insulation requirements that exceed Title 24 standards. ◢ Energy Star appliances (including clothes washers, dish washers, fans, and refrigerators) shall be installed in all residential units. ◢ The project shall achieve reductions in onsite electricity and natural gas use through a combination of on-site renewable energy (e.g., solar photovoltaic panels) and elimination of fireplaces in specified number of units. The pathway to achieving this reduction would be flexible, as long as the specified reductions in GHGs are achieved. ◤ For example, the project could include solar photovoltaic panels, or an equivalent mode of on-site renewable energy generation, with all houses to offset 30 percent of net annual electricity demand by single family residences. Based on the projected electricity consumption for the project (2.3 million kWh annually), this would amount to a total system size of 500 kilowatts. The total area required for the photovoltaic panels is expected to be approximately 40,000 square feet and the total number of solar panels required would range from approximately 2,000-2,500 depending upon the panel wattage. The project would have the flexibility to		mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project operation could generate GHGs in excess of Tier I and Tier II thresholds. Implementation of identified actions and achievement of performance standards identified under Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 would reduce the project's GHG emissions as shown in Table 4.9-3 of the Draft EIR. As shown in Table 4.9-3, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.9-2, the project would operate with a GHG efficiency of 4.2 MT CO_2e/SP/year upon full buildout in 2022, which meets the GHG efficiency goal computed for 2022. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-22)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact

meet this requirement by installing an average number of panels on all homes (example, 6-8 panels on each home) or larger systems on a portion of the homes, as long as the 30 percent net annual electricity demand is met through onsite renewable energy. (Note that the values provided here are preliminary estimates. The actual system size and design would be determined at the project's design stage.)

- Alternatively, the project could include various combinations of solar photovoltaic panels and elimination of fireplaces in the units as follows:

Number of solar panels per unit	Number of units with fireplaces
6-8	317
4-6	269
3-4	254
2-3	238
1-2	222
0	159

Note:
The data presented in the section assumes one natural gas fireplace per single family unit in the unmitigated condition.

- Building design, landscape plans (tree placement), and solar panel installation shall take into account solar orientation to maximize solar exposure.

Area Sources

- Electrical outlets shall be provided on the exterior of project buildings to allow sufficient powering of electric landscaping equipment.

Water Conservation

- The project shall include the following measures related to water conservation:
  - Install low-flow kitchen faucets that comply with CALGreen residential voluntary measures (maximum flow rate not to exceed 1.5 gallons per minute at 60 psi).
  - Install low-flow bathroom faucets that exceed the CALGreen residential mandatory

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
	requirements (maximum flow rate not to exceed 1.5 gallons per minute at 60 psi) ▼ Install low-flow toilets that exceed the CALGreen residential mandatory requirements (maximum flush volume less not to exceed 1.28 gallons per flush) ▼ Install low-flow showerheads that exceed the CALGreen residential mandatory requirements (maximum flow rate not to exceed 2 gallons per minute at 80 psi) ▼ Install a "Smart" irrigation control system that uses weather, climate, and/or soil moisture data to automatically adjust watering schedules in response to environmental and climate changes, such as changes in temperature or precipitation levels. Appropriate systems that could be installed to comply with this measure include Calsense, ET Water, and EPA-certified WaterSense Irrigation Partners. **Waste Diversion/Recycling** ▲ The project shall comply with the following performance measure related to reducing solid waste disposal: Achieve a 20 percent reduction in the generation of solid waste, relative to baseline waste disposal rates. This performance standard may be achieved through a combination of actions. Strategies to reduce landfill waste include increasing recycling, reuse, and composting. The project can achieve this reduction by providing a recycling collection service and providing separate recycling and waste containers to future residents. The project may also include provisions to divert all green waste from the park and landscape lots and recycle it as mulch. It should be noted that this list of measures is not intended to be all-inclusive. If it can be demonstrated that other measures or technologies achieve an equivalent reduction, these may be implemented with County authorization.		
Impact 4.9-3: Impacts of climate change on the project. Climate change is projected to result in a variety of effects that would influence conditions in the project area including increased temperatures, leading to increased wildfire risk; and changes to timing and intensity of precipitation, resulting in increased stormwater runoff and flood risk.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
However, there are numerous programs and policies in place to protect against and respond to wildfire.			
4.10 Noise			
Impact 4.10-1: Construction noise impacts. The project is anticipated to be built out over approximately five years. Construction would occur between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Night construction is not proposed. Worst-case construction-related activities could result in noise levels of up to 86 dBA Leq and 91 dBA Lmax, which could exceed El Dorado County daytime (i.e., 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.) noise standards (i.e., 55 dBA Leq / 75 dBA Lmax) at or within 855 feet of proposed construction activity. A majority of the project site and potential construction locations are located over 855 feet from surrounding existing sensitive land uses. However, some existing residences on the northern edge of the project site are located directly adjacent to (and thus within 855 feet of) potential construction areas and, therefore, could potentially be exposed to noise levels above applicable El Dorado County standards (i.e., 55 dBA Leq / 75 dBA Lmax).	**Mitigation Measure 4.10-1: Implement construction-noise reduction measures.** To minimize noise levels during construction activities, construction contractors shall comply with the following measures during construction: ◢ All construction equipment and equipment staging areas shall be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive land uses, and/or located such that existing topography blocks line-of-site from these land uses to the staging areas. ◢ All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation. ◢ Where feasible and consistent with building codes and other applicable laws and regulations, individual operations and techniques shall be replaced with quieter procedures (e.g., using welding instead of riveting, mixing concrete offsite instead of onsite). ◢ All construction equipment with back-up alarms shall be equipped with either audible self-adjusting backup alarms or alarms that only sound when an object is detected. The self-adjusting backup alarms shall automatically adjust to 5 dBA over the surrounding background levels. All non-self-adjusting backup alarms shall be set to the lowest setting required to be audible above the surrounding noise levels. In addition to the use of backup alarms, the construction contractor shall consider other techniques such as observers and the scheduling of construction activities such that alarm noise is minimized. ◢ When future noise sensitive uses are within close proximity to prolonged construction noise, noise attenuating buffers such as structures, truck trailers, temporary noise curtains or sound walls, or soil piles shall be located between noise sources and the receptor to shield sensitive receptors from construction noise. ◢ The applicant or construction contractors shall post visible signs along the perimeter	SU	**Finding:** Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. However, the Board of Supervisors finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the Project's noise impacts, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project construction could result in excess noise at homes within 855 feet of proposed construction activity. To lessen this potentially significant effect, the project is required to implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-1, which would reduce construction noise for the entire construction area by requiring specific equipment features, such self-adjusting back-up alarms, noise-reducing mufflers, and noise-reducing engine shrouds. The mitigation also requires increased distance from sensitive receptors, as feasible, as well as use of site topography and construction equipment to block noise, as feasible. Signage disclosing the construction times and duration is also required. The use of noise barriers, which can reduce noise by up to 10 dB, would further reduce noise at sensitive receptors located within 855 feet of construction activities. Although noise

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
	of the construction site that disclose construction times and duration. A contact number for an El Dorado County enforcement officer shall be included where noise complaints can be filed and recorded. The applicant will be informed of any noise complaints and will be responsible for investigating complaints and implementing feasible and appropriate measures to reduce noise at receiving land uses. These may include: ◤ Noise-reducing enclosures and techniques shall be used around stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., concrete mixers, generators, compressors). ◤ For construction activity that occurs within 855 feet of existing sensitive land uses, install temporary noise curtains that meet the following parameters: ▪ temporary noise curtains shall be installed as close as possible to the boundary of the construction site within the direct line of sight path of the nearby sensitive receptor(s). ▪ temporary noise curtains shall consist of durable, flexible composite material featuring a noise barrier layer bounded to sound-absorptive material on one side. The noise barrier layer shall consist of rugged, impervious, material with a surface weight of at least 1 pound per square foot.		reduction would be achieved with implementation of these measures, reductions of up to 31 dB would be required to comply with the 55 dBA L_{eq} daytime noise standard. Reductions of this magnitude are not expected to be achieved under all circumstances with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 and this impact would be significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, p. 4.10-14.)
Impact 4.10-2: Short-term construction vibration impacts. Site preparation could require the use of blasting to remove potential rock outcroppings, if discovered. Ground vibration levels associated with blasting could result in structural damage to nearby structures if it were to occur within 75 feet. Blasting could also result in disturbance/annoyance to occupied structures within 230 feet of blasting activities. Specific locations where blasting could occur are not known at this time and would depend on specific soil/ground conditions. However, construction activities would occur as close as 50 feet to existing residences and, therefore,	**Mitigation Measure 4.10-2: Reduce blasting-related vibration.** For any proposed blasting that would occur within 230 feet from any existing occupied structure, alternatives to traditional blasting (silent demolition), such as non-explosive chemical agents, expansive grout, or any other non-explosive technology, shall be used to eliminate vibration and noise from blasting.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by minimizing ground vibration due to blasting. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Blasting may be required to remove rock outcroppings. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-2 would require the use of alternative methods to traditional blasting should the removal of any large outcropping be required within 230

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
blasting could potentially also occur within 50 feet of existing residences, resulting in annoyance to residents and potentially damaging structures.			feet of an existing residence (the distance for which blasting could cause disturbance to sensitive receptors). As such, blasting activities located within close proximity to sensitive receptors would not result in vibration levels that would exceed exceed disturbance (i.e., 80 Vdb) or structural damage thresholds (i.e., 0.2 in/sec PPV). This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 4.10-16)
Impact 4.10-3: Long-term operational noise impacts to existing receptors. Implementation of the project would result in the extension of Saratoga Way and Wilson Boulevard, thus resulting in new noise sources at these new roadways. In addition, existing traffic patterns would be diverted because of these new roads, resulting in traffic-noise increases. Traffic-noise increases were modeled for all roadways potentially affected by construction of the project. Traffic-noise levels on Saratoga Way between El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Arrowhead Drive would result in an 11.9 dB increase at 100 feet from the centerline. Maximum noise levels on Saratoga Way would reach 56.7 dB, accounting for noise reduction from the existing sound wall along Saratoga Way, which is considered a substantial long-term increase in noise (i.e., 5 dB or more).	No feasible mitigation measures have been identified.	SU	**Finding:** Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. However, the Board of Supervisors finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the Project's noise impacts, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Opening the proposed extension of Saratoga Way would increase the volume of vehicles on existing segments of Saratoga Way. The corresponding increase in roadway noise would potentially result in a substantial noise increase at existing residences along Saratoga Way. The portion of Saratoga Way from El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Arrowhead Drive would result in an up to 11.2 dB increase in noise as a result of the project. An existing sound barrier is located between the line-of-sight of the traffic on Saratoga Way and the existing sensitive receptors. As such, the existing sound barrier would continue to shield the existing sensitive

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			receptors from future traffic increases and, as described above, exterior and interior noise levels at these receptors would continue to remain below El Dorado County maximum allowable standards for transportation sources (i.e., 45 dBA L_{dn} for interior and 60 dBA L_{dn} for exterior). Although maximum allowable noise levels would not be exceeded (i.e., 60 dB L_{dn}/CNEL), project-generated traffic-noise levels would result in a substantial increase in noise (i.e., 11.2 dB) from existing noise levels. Considering that a noise barrier is already exists at these receptors, the only remaining mitigation would be to redesign the existing noise barrier to provide an additional reduction of at least 7 dB so that the incremental increase in noise as a result of the project does not exceed 5 dB. Based on FHWA criteria for sound barrier construction, a barrier can achieve an additional 1 dB of noise reduction with every 2 feet of height after it breaks the line of sight (with a maximum theoretical reduction of 20 dB). Therefore, to achieve an additional 7 dB reduction, the new sound wall would need to be 29 feet tall (24 feet above the line of sight). However, this level of reduction would be considered "very difficult" by FHWA standards. A wall of this size would block the views from upper level balconies and windows of the existing residences and, thus, may not be acceptable to all affected residences. In addition, a wall of this size would have other structural, safety, and aesthetic limitations that would need to be evaluated (e.g., wind load, seismic). This mitigation is considered infeasible. Other mitigation measures to protect existing residential exterior areas are not available; therefore, the proposed extension of Saratoga Way would result in the exposure of existing sensitive land uses (i.e., residences located adjacent to Saratoga Way between El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Arrowhead Drive) to an increase

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
			(11.2 dB) in noise levels that exceed applicable El Dorado County standard (5 dB) for noise increases (even though the resulting noise level would be within El Dorado County's 60 dB exterior noise standard). This impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, p. 4.10-19.)
Impact 4.10-4: Long-term operational noise impacts to proposed sensitive receptors. Implementation of the project would result in development of new sensitive receptors located in close proximity to existing and future roadways including Highway 50, Saratoga Way, and Wilson Boulevard. Noise increases on Wilson Boulevard would not exceed applicable El Dorado County noise standards. Noise Levels from Saratoga Way would exceed El Dorado County noise standards of 60 dBA L_{dn} (exterior) at proposed receptors located adjacent and to the north of Saratoga Way. Noise levels from Highway 50 would exceed El Dorado County noise standards of 60 dBA L_{dn} (exterior) and 45 dBA L_{dn} (interior) as residences located directly to the north of Highway 50.	**Mitigation Measure 4.10-4: Implement building design measures to reduce interior noise levels at proposed residences.** To reduce interior noise levels at all elevated south, east, and west-facing properties located adjacent to Saratoga Way, the following design standard shall be met. Refer to Figure 2 of Appendix D for properties requiring these design measures. ◢ An exterior-to-interior noise reduction of at least 30 dB shall be achieved. This level of noise reduction can be achieved with incorporation of the following measures: ◤ All windows and doors shall meet a minimum sound transmission class rating of 33; ◤ Air conditioning shall be provided to allow occupants to close doors and windows; and ◤ Additional insulation designed specifically for noise reduction shall be used in walls facing Saratoga Way and Highway 50.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10-4, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by reducing interior noise levels at proposed homes along Saratoga Way. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** The proposed project includes a sound barrier; however, interior noise levels at proposed homes along Saratoga Way could exceed interior noise standards. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-4 would reduce noise exposure at these proposed residences. The inclusion of a sound-barrier at the new residences located north of Saratoga Way and Highway 50 would be required to provide, at a minimum, 12 dB of reduction. Therefore, predicted noise levels of 72 dBA L_{dn} from Highway 50 would be reduced to 60 dBA L_{dn} at the residences located behind the barrier. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-4 would ensure that interior noise levels at the residences affected by Highway 50 and Saratoga Way would comply with interior noise standards of 45 dBA L_{dn} by requiring additional sound reduction through building design measures. This impact would be reduced to

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
			a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 4.10-21)
4.11 Geology and Soils			
Impact 4.11-1: Expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, ground shaking, liquefaction, or slope failure. Due to the relatively shallow depth to bedrock and the relatively low seismicity of the area, the potential for damage because of site liquefaction, slope instability, and surface rupture are considered negligible.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.11-2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of substantial topsoil. The soils on the project site are susceptible to erosion, particularly during grading and excavation activities.	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-1: Prepare and implement a SWPPP.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-1, as described above.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.3-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring implementation of a SWPPP to minimize soil erosion. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project-related construction activities have the potential to result in soil erosion. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would reduce construction-related erosion impacts by requiring the project applicant to prepare a SWPPP that complies with the SWRCB Statewide Construction General Permit. The SWPPP would incorporate appropriate BMPs into the design of the development to prevent soil erosion. The plan would be designed to prevent increased discharge of sediment at

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
			all stages of construction, from initial ground disturbance to project completion. Adequate surface drainage control would be designed by the project civil engineer in accordance with the latest applicable edition of the California Building Code. All slopes should have appropriate drainage and vegetation measures to minimize erosion of soils. Contract provisions would require compliance with the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance and SWMP and implementation of BMPs. With adherence to existing requirements, impacts related to soil erosion would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.11-9)
Impact 4.11-3: Construction on expansive soils and potential for settling. The project would be built on fill material. Grading would generally eliminate the expansive qualities of the clay materials on the site through mixing. However, if not sufficiently compacted, these materials can settle under the weight of project structures.	**Mitigation Measure 4.11-3 Evaluate soil compaction and implement recommendations during grading.** The applicant shall employ a qualified engineer to observe the stripping of deleterious material and over excavation of any unsuitable materials, and provide consultation and supplemental recommendations, as field conditions dictate, to the grading contractor in the field. Fill soil compaction shall be evaluated through means of in-place density tests performed during fill placement so that adequacy of soil compaction efforts may be determined. This will likely include the periodic excavation of test pits within the fill materials to observe and document that a uniform over-optimum moisture condition, and absence of large and/or concentrated voids has been achieved before additional fill placement. If large quantities of expansive soils are encountered at the project site, recommendations shall be made by a qualified engineer based on observations at the time of construction and the proper disposition of clays on site shall be observed and documented by a qualified third party monitor.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.11-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by providing third party oversight of grading activities. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Although grading would generally eliminate the expansive qualities of fill material through mixing, these materials, if not sufficiently compacted, could settle. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce significant impacts associated with potential for settlement of fills and damage because of expansive soils to a less-than-significant level by requiring compaction tests and by providing third party oversight of grading activities. (Draft EIR, p. 4.11-10)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
4.12 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact 4.12-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project would require transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction and operation in quantities typical of single-family residential development. The potential for such activities to result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment would be effectively managed through adherence to existing regulations and compliance with the safety procedures mandated by applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.12-2: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes, within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. No significant emissions of hazardous materials are anticipated during construction or operation of the proposed project. However, construction of the project could result in the disturbance of naturally occurring asbestos.	**Mitigation Measure 4.8-4a: Limit potential for release of asbestos to affect sensitive receptors.** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-4a, as described above.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.8-4a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring notification of school districts of any offsite release of asbestos during construction. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Construction activities could result in disturbance of NOA on the project site. It is anticipated that any potential health effects would be minimized through implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.8, "Air Quality." The

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			mitigation will include contingencies to notify the school districts of any offsite release of asbestos during construction. Further, initial grading activities are likely to occur in the summer months, when the presence of children at the school site is reduced. With implementation of the mitigation measures established for the protection of air quality, the project would have a less-than-significant potential to produce hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school. (Draft EIR, p. 4.12-9)
Impact 4.12-3: Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Project implementation would not impair implementation of, or interfere with, the County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. Adequate road design for emergency vehicle access and private vehicle evacuation would be provided, as required under El Dorado County General Plan Policy 6.2.3.2.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.12-4: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death because the site is not in an area of high fire potential, and the site would be graded and appropriate building standards and setbacks would be maintained.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
4.13 Public Services			
Impact 4.13-1: Impact on fire facilities. The project would include development that would increase demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. However, the site is approximately 1 mile from the nearest fire station and EDHFD has adequate equipment and staff to maintain acceptable fire service ratios, response times, and other performance objectives with implementation of the project. No additional facilities would be needed to serve the project site, and the project would be required to pay impact fees and comply with all conditions of approval.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.13-2: Impact on law enforcement facilities. The project would include development that would increase demand for law enforcement services. While average response times in 2014 met County requirements for most call priority categories, Priority 4 (i.e., lowest priority) response times may not meet minimum standards. Development of the proposed project would have the potential to exacerbate this condition. The applicant for the Saratoga Estates Project may be required to pay impact fees as required by the County.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.13-3: Impact on schools. Development of the proposed project could result in issues related to school capacity. Payment of school facility mitigation fees, which have been deemed by the State	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
legislature (per Government Code Section 65995(h)) to constitute full and complete mitigation of impacts of a development project on the provision of adequate school facilities, would be required.			
Impact 4.13-4: Impact on parks and recreation facilities. The Saratoga Estates Project includes new recreation and park facilities, the potential effects of which are addressed throughout this EIR and, by providing parkland onsite, would not increase the use of existing park and recreation facilities in the area such that they would experience deterioration, or require improvement or expansion.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.14 Utilities and Energy Conservation			
Impact 4.14-1: Water supply and infrastructure impacts. The project would require approximately 325 EDUs of water supply, which have been requested from EID. As stated in the FIL, and verified through the July 2015 Water Resources and Service Reliability Report, sufficient water supply exists to serve buildout of the project. Several nearby connections to the water supply system are available to accommodate the project.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.14-2: Wastewater treatment capacity availability. The project site is located within EID's service area, but does not currently have any connection to the existing collection and conveyance infrastructure. The connection would be made in accordance with the	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
County's and EID's ordinances and requirements. The project would require approximately 317 EDUs of sewer service. EID provided a FIL to the applicant on January 20, 2015, which confirmed that adequate wastewater treatment capacity is available.			
Impact 4.14-3: Solid waste disposal capacity. The El Dorado Disposal Service provides solid waste collection, disposal, and recycling services to the project site. The project would generate approximately 3,160 pounds of waste per day. This increased amount of solid waste would not result in the need to expand or construct new landfill facilities. In addition, this project would adhere to all required State and County waste management ordinances and requirements.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 4.14-4: Electricity and natural gas service. Development of the proposed project would occur in a location with immediate access to electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications services. The project would not result in energy demands that would require the development of new energy sources or affect service to existing customers.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
5.1 Cumulative Impacts			
Land Use Compatibility. The proposed project includes rezoning to allow for the development of 317 residential units and associated infrastructure and amenities on the site. Application of the planned development (PD)	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
combining zone district would be consistent with the County's general plan land use designation. In addition, all standards, densities, and other requirements are required to conform to the base zone. Thus, the proposed project would be consistent with the *El Dorado County General Plan* and Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the incremental effect of project implementation on land use compatibility would not be cumulatively considerable.			
Population, Employment, and Housing. Because the project's construction crews would not be expected to relocate into the study area to construct the project, any incremental indirect impacts on population growth associated with the project's labor force would not be cumulatively considerable.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Hydrology and Water Quality: Stormwater Capacity. In accordance with federal, state, and local stormwater regulations, new construction and significant redevelopment must maintain pre-project hydrology and incorporate proper pollutant source controls, minimize pollutant exposure outdoors, and treat stormwater runoff through proper post-construction BMPs. Therefore, before any construction-related ground disturbance, final drainage plans would be required to demonstrate that all runoff would be appropriately conveyed and would not leave the project sites at rates exceeding pre-project runoff conditions. In addition, implementation of	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 and 4.3-2 would further reduce the project's contribution to stormwater runoff in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a considerable contribution to cumulative stormwater drainage impacts.			
Hydrology and Water Quality: Water Quality. Construction of the proposed project, as well as construction of the related projects, would result in ground disturbance. Existing vegetation would be removed, thereby increasing the potential for erosion. Operational activities and proposed land uses would generate pollutants which would be carried in stormwater runoff and could adversely affect water quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 and 4.3-2 would reduce the project's contribution to the cumulative effect on water quality to a less-than-considerable level. Also, in accordance with federal and state stormwater regulations, other new construction projects must maintain pre-project hydrology and incorporate proper BMPs. Therefore, the project and other projects would reduce site-specific water quality impacts such that cumulatively adverse water quality impacts would not occur and the project would not have a considerable contribution such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur.	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Biological Resources. Given its isolated nature (surrounded by existing development), the project site does not support large or important populations of any special-status species, nor	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002;

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
does it provide a movement corridor for special-status or common species. The most valuable habitat component, the perennial drainage and limited riparian habitat, would be preserved and incorporated into the project design to minimize adverse effects and preserve its integrity to the extent possible. No high-quality habitat important to the long-term conservation of any species in the region is present on the project site. Development of the project would primarily result in the loss of annual grassland habitat, which provides foraging habitat and limited nesting/burrow habitat for various avian species. Potential impacts on biological resources resulting from development of the project would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures described in Draft EIR Section 4.4, "Biological Resources." After implementation of mitigation measures, the project would not substantively contribute to reduction of any affected species. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to impacts on native wildlife populations would not be cumulatively considerable.			CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Cultural Resources. The loss of any one archaeological site affects all others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.5 "Cultural Resources," the proposed project is designed to avoid damage to archaeological resource P-9-822, which has been	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
determined eligible for the state and national registers. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a would ensure that impacts to the resource would be avoided. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.5-1b and 4.5-1c would reduce potentially significant impacts to currently undiscovered archaeological resources. Implementation of these mitigation measures would minimize the project's potential to adversely affect local archaeological resources and would therefore also minimize the project's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact, and the project's contribution is less than considerable. Although no evidence suggests that any un-marked human interments are present within or near the project site, there is a potential for these resources to become unearthed during construction. The proposed project, in combination with other development in the Nisenan and Miwok territory, could contribute to the loss of ancestral remains. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-2 would reduce the project's contribution to this cumulative impact to a less than considerable level.			
Aesthetics and Visual Resources: Most of the projects identified in Table 5-1 of the Draft EIR would contribute a similar alteration to the visual setting, creating an environment that is increasingly residential in character. When compared to the projects in Table 5-1, the Saratoga Estates Project represents a relatively	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
small-scale development in an area where suburban residential land uses already dominate. Although construction of the related projects would represent a substantial visual change and a significant impact to aesthetic and visual resources in the region, the project's contribution, in the context of its location adjacent to a major highway and surrounded on three sides by residential development, would not be a considerable incremental effect.			
Transportation and Circulation. The Draft EIR evaluated cumulative traffic impacts in Section 4.7, "Transportation and Circulation." Although there could be a cumulative impact under the cumulative scenario, the project would generally improve traffic conditions in the area. As identified in Impact 4.7-3, anticipated delay times would be improved for most studied intersections and freeway segments. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-1, the level of service at the Saratoga Way/Wilson Boulevard intersection that would be constructed as part of the proposed project would meet applicable standards through signal length optimization. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact.	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Air Quality. The context for cumulative air quality impacts is the entire air basin, where air emissions from a variety of sources, affected by meteorology, topography, and other factors, combine to determine the ambient air. For this reason, the analysis of air quality impacts	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
associated with the project in Draft EIR Section 4.8, "Air Quality," is inherently a cumulative analysis. The project would not violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and/or conflict with air quality planning efforts. As summarized in Draft EIR Table 4.8-3, the Mountain Counties Air Basin is in nonattainment for applicable National or State ambient air quality standards related to ozone, CO, and PM. Section 4.8 concludes that, because the project would not exceed established thresholds with implementation of identified mitigation measures, it would not substantially contribute to a basin-wide (i.e., cumulative) impact.			
Climate Change. The quantity of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions required to induce climate change is not precisely known; however, it is clear that the quantity is enormous, and no single project alone would measurably contribute to a noticeable incremental change in the global average temperature, or to global, local, or micro climate. Therefore, from the standpoint of CEQA, the analysis of GHG emissions in the context of global climate change is inherently cumulative. As described in Section 4.9, "Climate Change," the project's mitigated GHG emissions would not exceed the efficiency targets. In addition, the project would be consistent with adopted long-range plans and policies designed to reduce communitywide GHG emissions, consistent with	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
Assembly Bill 32 and other local and State policies. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation measures, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to global climate change.			
Noise: Cumulative Short-Term Construction Noise. Cumulative impacts from construction-generated noise could result if other future planned construction activities were to take place in close proximity to the project and cumulatively combine with construction noise from the project. There are several community plan developments that would occur in El Dorado County in the near future. Portions of these specific plans are already constructed and will continue to be developed into the future. However, specific construction schedules and phasing is unknown, as these types of developments typically occur based on market demand. Therefore, it is assumed that some construction activities at the Ridgeview and El Dorado Hills Specific Plan may overlap in time with the construction at the proposed project site. However, construction of the proposed project would be relatively short (i.e., approximately five years) and noise generated by the proposed construction activities would be localized to the project site. Further, mitigation is in place that would reduce construction-related noise and would provide adequate noise reduction at the project site. As such, construction-noise at the proposed project	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
would not combine with any future construction activities located at nearby development.			
Noise: Cumulative Long-Term Ambient Noise Levels. Cumulative noise levels could be affected by additional build-out of surrounding land uses and increases in vehicular traffic on affected roadways. Several new large developments are planned in the project area (See Draft EIR Table 5-1). Traffic-noise modeling was conducted for the cumulative condition (2035) with and without the proposed project and showed that several roadways exceed the County's noise standard under the cumulative no project condition. Project-generated increases in noise on all modeled roadways would be below 1 decibel. In many cases, no increase in noise at all would occur. The project's contribution to traffic-noise in the cumulative plus project scenario would not result in a noticeable increase in noise on any roadways. Thus, the project would not contribute substantially to the already existing cumulative impact with regards to regional traffic-noise.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Geology and Soils. Impacts on geology and soils are generally localized and do not result in regionally cumulative impacts. The geographic scope of cumulative impacts related to geology, soils, or seismic hazards, therefore, includes only projects immediately adjacent to the project site. Adjacent projects would be constructed in accordance with the most recent version of the California Building Code construction and seismic safety requirements and recommendations	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
contained in project-specific geotechnical reports. It is anticipated, therefore, that any potential impacts associated with geologic and soil conditions could be mitigated within these project sites. Due to the relatively shallow depth to bedrock and the relatively low seismicity of the area, the potential for damage because of site liquefaction, slope instability, and surface rupture on the project site are considered negligible. Potential impacts could be associated with loss of topsoil and construction on expansive soils. However, with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 and 4.11-3, all geologic, soils, and seismic hazard impacts of the project would be less than significant. Project-specific impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity would not cause or contribute to a significant cumulative effect and would not be cumulatively considerable.			
Hazards and Hazardous Materials. There is no existing significant adverse cumulative condition relating to hazards and hazardous materials in the vicinity of the project and, alone, the incremental impacts of the project would not cause a significant adverse cumulative impact. Further, construction activities associated with the project would not substantially increase the hazard potential in the study area, and operation of the project would have no impact. Other projects in the vicinity of the project would create similar hazardous material effects during standard construction activities. Current and	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable, due in part to the mitigation of project-specific impacts. Thus, no additional mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable need not be considered significant by the Lead Agency, and no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15130, 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
reasonably foreseeable projects would also be required to comply with measures that would minimize and/or avoid exposure of hazardous materials to people or the environment. Accordingly, the cumulative impact would be less than significant and the project would not have a cumulatively considerable incremental effect on potential hazards.			
Public Services. The project would be required to provide fire and emergency medical services to the project site consistent with the *El Dorado County General Plan* and El Dorado Hills Fire District standards. The project would be reviewed, pursuant to Policy 5.7.3.1 of the *El Dorado County General Plan*, by the Sheriff's Department to determine the ability of the department to provide protection services to the site and existing development at acceptable levels. Impact fees recommended by the Sheriff's Department may be incorporated as conditions of approval. Payment of school facility mitigation fees would mitigate impacts on the provision of adequate school facilities. Specific school facility developments would be subject to environmental review on a project-by-project basis. Given the EDHCSD standard of 5 acres of park land per 1,000 residents, the proposed project would meet the standard and would increase the amount of parks acreage available to District patrons. As described above, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
demand for public services. Because the projects identified in Draft EIR Table 5-1 would be subject to standards and mitigating requirements similar to those described above, no cumulative adverse impact to public services is expected.			
Public Utilities: Water. The El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) evaluated water supply capacity and concluded that buildout of the General Plan would result in a significant and unavoidable impact due to projected water supply shortage. The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors certified the 2003 General Plan EIR and adopted a statement of overriding considerations for the significant and unavoidable impacts, including the significant impact related to water supply. The proposed project is consistent with the land use type and density designated for the site in the general plan, and is therefore consistent with the overall water demand projections included in the 2003 General Plan EIR. CEQA Section 15183(a) mandates that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The proposed project does not include any features that would require unusually high water demand; therefore, regarding water supply,	Pursuant to CEQA Section 15183(a), no additional CEQA review is necessary for this impact. No additional mitigation measures are required.	NA	This impact was evaluated in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR, certified in 2003. The project is consistent with the land use type and density designated for the site by the General Plan and Zoning. The EIR concludes that no project-specific effects peculiar to the project or project site would result from project implementation. The project would also not result in off-site or cumulative effects that were not evaluated in the General Plan EIR. No substantial new information exists to suggest that the project would result in more severe adverse impacts than evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Pursuant to CEQA Section 15183(a), no additional CEQA review is necessary for this impact.

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
there would be no project-specific effects peculiar to the project or its site. Consistent with CEQA Section 15183(1), the project's impacts related to water supply were already evaluated as part of the 2003 General Plan EIR, and no additional CEQA analysis is required. Since certification of the 2003 General Plan EIR, El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) and El Dorado County Water Agency (EDCWA) have both published updated water supply documents. The updated information confirms the 2003 General Plan EIR's conclusion.			
Public Utilities: Wastewater. According to EID's Wastewater Facilities Master Plan, the existing ADWF at the El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant (EDHWWTP) is 2.65 million gallons per day (mgd). When considering future additional flow at buildout of the County's general plan (2026), EDHWWTP would receive an additional 2.80 mgd. As a result, the average dry weather flow capacity required at the EDHWWTP is estimated to be 5.45 mgd. This wastewater treatment plant was recently expanded (El Dorado Phase III Expansion) to increase the rated capacity from 3.0 to 4.0 mgd. A subsequent expansion phase will be implemented to provide the ultimate buildout capacity of 5.45 mgd (EID 2013b). According to long-range planning efforts, wastewater treatment plant expansion should be online and operational by the time the influent flow reaches approximately 80 to 90 percent of the plant capacity to provide flexibility to	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance after Mitigation**	**Findings of Fact**
accommodate unforeseen conditions. There is potential that expansion of the EDHWWTP could result in environmental impacts, such as issues associated with biological resources, air quality, and water quality depending on the scope and extent of an expansion. Thus, because the project would contribute toward the need for expansions under EID's Capital Improvement Program, the proposed project would contribute to a potential cumulatively significant impact; however, because the proposed project's wastewater treatment demand (approximately .3 mgd) represents a small fraction of the overall treatment demand (5.5 percent) and because the project would be completely developed and operational prior to the need for expansion of the EDHWWTP, the project's contribution to these unknown potential impacts would not be substantial..			
Public Utilities: Electricity, Natural Gas and Telecommunication Systems. The potential impact of increased natural gas and electricity services is not cumulative in nature because PG&E periodically considers the need to purchase more energy resources. In addition, infrastructure considerations are site-specific, and must be addressed during individual project planning and development. Therefore, the project would not have a considerable contribution such that a new significant cumulative electricity, natural gas, or telecommunication impacts would occur.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Impact Statements, Mitigation Measures, and Findings of Fact			
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Public Utilities: Increased Solid Waste. Impact 4.14-3 considers the existing plus project condition to determine if the project would exceed capacity at the WERS Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility and the Potrero Hills Landfill. As described, both facilities are currently accepting quantities of waste far below their accepted level. Therefore, the project would not have a considerable contribution such that a new significant cumulative solid waste impact would occur.	No mitigation is required.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)