


File No. TM96-1321-R3

 Bell Ranch Site

Location Map

Bell Ranch
Tentative Map Revision



APPROVED
EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION




DATE April 28, 2016

BY Roger Trout
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Exhibit A

BY *K. S. [Signature]*
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

DATE April 27, 2016
APPROVED
EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION



SOURCE: CTA Engineering & Surveying, 2015

Bass Lake Hills Project . 140843

Figure 2
Study Area

Exhibit B



File No. TM96-1321-R3
Aerial Map
Bell Ranch
Tentative Map Revision

 Bell Ranch Site

0 375 750 1,500 Feet

APPROVED
EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION


DATE April 28, 2016
BY Roger Trout/CNT
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY



Exhibit C

POR. SECS. 5 THRU 9, T.9N., R.9E., M.D.M.

119:02



APPROVED
EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: *April 28, 2016*

BY: *[Signature]*
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY


Acresages Are Estimates

Exhibit D

Rev. Jan. 2, 2008

Assessor's Map Bk. 119 - Pg. 02
County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and characteristics are not guaranteed. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.




File No. TM96-1321-R3

Land Use Map

Bell Ranch
Tentative Map Revision

- Bell Ranch Site
- Adopted Plan (AP)
- Commercial (C)
- High Density Residential (HDR)
- Low Density Residential (LDR)
- Medium Density Residential (MDR)

- Multi-Family Residential (MFR)
- Open Space (OS)
- Public Facilities (PF)
- Research & Development (R&D)
- Rural Residential (RR)
- Tourist Recreational (TR)




APPROVED
EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE April 28, 2016

BY Roger [Signature]






**File No. TM96-1321-R3
Zoning Map**

Bell Ranch
Tentative Map Revision

Exhibit F BY *Roger Traut*
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY



- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Bell Ranch Site | Single-Family Three-Acre (R3A) |
| Planned Development | Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) |
| One-Family Residential (R1) | Estate Residential Ten-Acre (RE-10) |
| One-Half Acre Residential (R20,000) | Open Space (OS) |
| One-Acre Residential (R1A) | Transportation Corridor (TC) |



Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan Conditions of Approval Amendments Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

Project Title Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan – Hawk View, Bell Woods, and Bell Ranch Conditions of Approval Amendments

File Numbers: Hawk View TM00-1371-R
Bell Woods TM01-1380-R
Bell Ranch TM96-1321-R-3

Site Address North of U.S. Highway 50 / Bass Lake Road Interchange

APN 115-040-16 (Hawk View), 119-020-050 (Bell Woods), 119-020-52 (Bell Ranch)

Project Applicant BL Road, LLC
3001 I Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 343-2401

Previously Prepared Environmental Documents:

- Bass Lake Road Study Area Program Environmental Impact Report, **SCH #:** 1990020375 (certified March 17, 1992);
- Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan EIR Addendum (approved November 7, 1995);
- Hawk View Mitigated Negative Declaration, **SCH #:** 2005012107 (certified May 24, 2005);
- Bell Woods Mitigated Negative Declaration, **SCH #:** 2005032044 (certified May 24, 2005); and
- Bell Ranch Mitigated Negative Declaration, **SCH #:** 2005022144 (certified January 12, 2006).

Exhibit G

APPROVED
EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE April 28, 2016
BY Roger [Signature]
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN FOR
 Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan COA Amendments

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
AIR QUALITY				
<p>Mitigation Measure 3-1: The project proponent shall test soils at the project site to determine whether ultramafic rock is present. Due to the potential for ultramafic soils within the BLHSP area, and for the possible unexpected discovery of ultramafic rock during construction, the project proponent shall ensure that its construction contracts are written so that, if ultramafic soils are discovered, the construction contractor(s) will implement asbestos dust mitigation measures consistent with the CARB's Final Regulation Order for Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations. The contractor shall also adhere to El Dorado County's Naturally Occurring Asbestos & Dust Protection Ordinance No. 4548. Finally, the project proponent shall ensure that the project complies with the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District's (El Dorado County APCD's) Rule 223 – Fugitive Dust.</p> <p>If ultramafic rock is discovered, prior to the start of construction, the project proponent shall prepare an Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan that shall be designed to eliminate, to the greatest extent possible, the emissions of fugitive dust from grading, excavation, and other soil disturbing construction activity. This plan shall be prepared in coordination with the County's Air Quality Engineer, assigned to monitor and control airborne asbestos in the County. At a minimum, the Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan shall include the following components, which are in addition to the standard fugitive dust mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle access and speed on exposed serpentine and rock containing asbestos material areas to reduce fiber releases; • Cover area exposed to vehicle travel with non-asbestos cover material; • Maintain a high moisture condition of the disturbed surface or treat the disturbed surface of the work area with an approved "palliative" material to seal loose fibers 	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<p>to the parent rock particle;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide employee notification of the potential health risk of airborne asbestos and requirements of the plan; and • Clean visible track-out onto paved roads using wet sweeping or a HEPA filter-equipped vacuum device within 24 hours. 				
<p>Mitigation Measure 3-2: Prior to any construction or earthworks, each contractor shall submit a list of all diesel equipment to be used during construction to the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (El Dorado County APCD) for review and approval. The project applicant shall ensure that toxics best available control technology (T-BACT) is applied to reduce emissions of Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) from off-road diesel equipment used during project construction. TBACT is defined as the use of 1996 or later model year engines in all diesel equipment. Consequently, the project applicant must ensure that all diesel powered equipment used on-site during construction is equipped with engines of 1996 or later model year.</p>	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant's Contractor		
<p>Mitigation Measure 3-3: Prior to approval of site work, the project applicant shall provide a report showing the location, size, and health of trees that would be impacted or removed by construction activities. If any of the trees that would be removed are native oaks, the project applicant shall mitigate for the loss by planting replacement trees on site using a 2:1 mitigation ratio. The following Tree Replacement Mitigation Guidelines shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-seed with quality acorns harvested from the various species within the general area where the mitigation is to be performed. If it is not possible to collect acorns on site then they must be purchased from a wholesale distributor such as the CDF nursery in Davis, California. Seeds must be ordered a year in advance. • Each planting site will be prepared and receive five acorns. Each site will include a protective device to discourage damage from birds, rodents, and deer brows. This device must remain in place for the first two years after planting. No more than one inch of organic mulch will be spread over the soil surface within the fenced 	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<p>enclosure. No organics except natural humus that may contain Mycorrhiza will be allowed inside the protective device.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An application for an approved pre-emergent for weed control will be necessary once the groups have been planted and the cones are in place. No pre-emergent can be used inside the cones. Future weed control will be determined on an as-needed basis. • The planting will be done in groups of ten to thirty planting sites of mixed species. Environments where only valley oaks can grow will be the only exception to planting a mix of species. Each planting site within the group must not be closer than six feet to any adjacent site. To promote normal root development, no irrigating or fertilizing will be allowed. Commercial Mycorrhiza is okay. • When the tree's crown emerges from the top of the cone it will be necessary to spray it at least three times a season to control deer brows. The first application shall be made when the foliage is over fifty percent developed. Reapply if there has been heavy rain. The year after the foliage has emerged from the protective cone it must be pulled. Arrangements shall be made in the contract for the disposal of these devices. This is a good time to thin out the weaker trees if more than one seedling survives. • The tree replacement mitigation shall comply with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 regarding canopy coverage standards by retaining or replacing 70 percent of the existing oak tree canopy. • As an alternative to acorn planting as described above, the project proponent may mitigate for tree loss by reverting to the measures identified in the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan or preservation of existing offsite oak woodlands, or a combination of both. 				

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree replacement mitigation guidelines shall include maintenance and inspection of tree replanting areas, including a schedule for inspection and maintenance over a five-year period and an annual reporting program to the County on the progress of the mitigation. Tree plantings shall have a minimum survival rate of 80 percent at the end of the five-year monitoring and maintenance period. If this rate is not met, the program will require replanting and continual monitoring for five additional years. 				
<p>Mitigation Measure 3-4: The project applicant shall comply with the following tree protection requirements and employ best management practices and measures (established in the BLHSP and County ordinances and design and improvement standards) to minimize for potential impacts to any protected trees. In addition, the following measures shall be incorporated into the project improvement plans and implemented during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction within 50 feet of an oak tree requires placement of a 6 foot tall temporary fence (chain link, ski fencing, or other suitable material) to serve as a physical barrier to alert construction workers and property owners of the protection. The fencing shall be installed one foot outside the dripline of any single tree or grove (defined as the root protection zone or RPZ) that is within 50 feet of any potential construction. A sign shall be posted which describes the trees as protected and subject to forfeiture of a security deposit. Perform a field inspection prior to site grading to ensure that trees to be preserved in areas affected by grading activities are fenced at the dripline. Any activities within the RPZ, either above or below the soil surface, must be supervised by a qualified arborist. Underground utilities installed within the temporary fence must be hand dug so not to cut any roots over 2 inches. Roots 2 inches or larger must be cleanly cut with pruning equipment. While working around roots they must be protected by 	Measures shall appear on project improvement plans and adhered to throughout construction.	Project Applicant		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<p>wrapping with foam or burlap to prevent drying.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only dead or weakened branches may be removed by a licensed arborist. • Oak tree foliage must be hosed off weekly during construction. • If root loss is extensive it may be necessary to establish a supplemental irrigation program to provide the tree with adequate moisture during summer months. • Avoid stripping of the surface of natural organic layers if it is not necessary. If the natural organic layer has been removed within the RPZ, each injured tree must have three to four inches of quality organic mulch reinstalled. • If it is necessary to cross over the RPZ of a protected tree with a vehicle, a road can be constructed using eight to ten inches of shredded mulch as a driving surface. When the project is completed that material can be used as a top dressing where needed. • Loss or damage of protected trees shall be compensated for in the form of a cash settlement based on the diameter at diameter breast height (DBH) of the lost or damaged trees. • A replacement bond of \$40,000.00 (equal to twice the compensation rate for a 40-inch diameter tree) for the cost of current mitigation work or remedial tree care shall be submitted to El Dorado County. • All trees to be preserved shall be numbered and tagged. Care shall be taken when performing soil cuts, fills, alteration of existing grades, soil compaction and mechanical injuries in tree areas. 				

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
<p>Mitigation Measure 4-1: Prior to approval of site work, the project applicant shall provide a report showing the location, size, and health of trees that would be impacted or removed by construction activities. If any of the trees that would be removed are native oaks, the project applicant shall mitigate for the loss by planting replacement trees on site using a 2:1 mitigation ratio. The following Tree Replacement Mitigation Guidelines shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-seed with quality acorns harvested from the various species within the general area where the mitigation is to be performed. If it is not possible to collect acorns on site then they must be purchased from a wholesale distributor such as the CDF nursery in Davis, California. Seeds must be ordered a year in advance. • Each planting site will be prepared and receive five acorns. Each site will include a protective device to discourage damage from birds, rodents, and deer brows. This device must remain in place for the first two years after planting. No more than one inch of organic mulch will be spread over the soil surface within the fenced enclosure. No organic except natural humus that may contain Mycorrhiza will be allowed inside the protective device. • An application for an approved pre-emergent for weed control will be necessary once the groups have been planted and the cones are in place. No pre-emergent can be used inside the cones. Future weed control will be determined on an as-needed basis. • The planting will be done in groups of ten to thirty planting sites of mixed species. Environments where only valley oaks can grow will be the only exception to planting a mix of species. Each planting site within the group must not be closer than six feet to any adjacent site. To promote normal root development, no irrigating or fertilizing will be allowed. Commercial Mycorrhiza is okay. 	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the tree's crown emerges from the top of the cone it will be necessary to spray it at least three times a season to control deer brows. The first application shall be made when the foliage is over fifty percent developed. Reapply if there has been heavy rain. The year after the foliage has emerged from the protective cone it must be pulled. Arrangements shall be made in the contract for the disposal of these devices. This is a good time to thin out the weaker trees if more than one seedling survives. The tree replacement mitigation shall comply with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 regarding canopy coverage standards by retaining or replacing 70 percent of the existing oak tree canopy. As an alternative to acorn planting as described above, the project proponent may mitigate for tree loss by reverting to the measures identified in the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan or preservation of existing offsite oak woodlands, or a combination of both. The tree replacement mitigation guidelines shall include maintenance and inspection of tree replanting areas, including a schedule for inspection and maintenance over a five-year period and an annual reporting program to the County on the progress of the mitigation. Tree plantings shall have a minimum survival rate of 80 percent at the end of the five-year monitoring and maintenance period. If this rate is not met, the program will require replanting and continual monitoring for five additional years. 				
<p>Mitigation Measure 4-2: The project applicant shall comply with the following tree protection requirements and employ best management practices and measures (established in the BLHSP and County ordinances and design and improvement standards) to minimize for potential impacts to any protected trees. In addition, the following measures shall be incorporated into the project improvement plans and implemented during construction:</p>	Measures shall appear on project improvement plans and adhered to throughout construction.	Project Applicant		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction within 50 feet of an oak tree requires placement of a 6 foot tall temporary fence (chain link, ski fencing, or other suitable material) to serve as a physical barrier to alert construction workers and property owners of the protection. The fencing shall be installed one foot outside the dripline of any single tree or grove (defined as the root protection zone or RPZ) that is within 50 feet of any potential construction. A sign shall be posted which describes the trees as protected and subject to forfeiture of a security deposit. • Perform a field inspection prior to site grading to ensure that trees to be preserved in areas affected by grading activities are fenced at the dripline. • Any activities within the RPZ, either above or below the soil surface, must be supervised by a qualified arborist. • Underground utilities installed within the temporary fence must be hand dug so not to cut any roots over 2 inches. Roots 2 inches or larger must be cleanly cut with pruning equipment. While working around roots they must be protected by wrapping with foam or burlap to prevent drying. • Only dead or weakened branches may be removed by a licensed arborist. • Oak tree foliage must be hosed off weekly during construction. • If root loss is extensive it may be necessary to establish a supplemental irrigation program to provide the tree with adequate moisture during summer months. • Avoid stripping of the surface of natural organic layers if it is not necessary. If the natural organic layer has been removed within the RPZ, each injured tree must have three to four inches of quality organic mulch reinstalled. • If it is necessary to cross over the RPZ of a protected tree with a vehicle a road can be constructed using eight to ten inches of shredded mulch as a driving surface. When the project is completed that material can be used as a top dressing where 				

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<p>needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss or damage of protected trees shall be compensated for in the form of a cash settlement based on the diameter at diameter breast height (DBH) of the lost or damaged trees. • A replacement bond of \$40,000.00 (equal to twice the compensation rate for a 40-inch diameter tree) for the cost of current mitigation work or remedial tree care shall be submitted to El Dorado County. • All trees to be preserved shall be numbered and tagged. Care shall be taken when performing soil cuts, fills, alteration of existing grades, soil compaction and mechanical injuries in tree areas. 				
<p>Mitigation Measure 4-3: If construction is expected to occur during the nesting season (February-August) for raptors and (March to August) for songbirds, the applicant shall submit to the El Dorado County Development Services Division a pre-construction raptor survey to determine if any active nests occur on the project site. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 5 days prior to the initiation of construction. If nests are found and considered to be active, construction activities shall not occur within 500 feet of the nests until the young have fledged or until a biologist determines that the nests are no longer active. If construction activities are proposed to occur during non-breeding season (August-January) for raptors and (August to February) for songbirds, a survey for raptors is not required and no further studies are necessary.</p>	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		
<p>Mitigation Measure 4-4: The applicant shall submit to the El Dorado County Development Services Division a burrowing owl survey conducted no more than 5 days prior to the onset of construction. Burrowing owls can be present during all times of the year in California, so this survey is recommended regardless of the time construction activities occur.</p> <p>If active burrows are located during the preconstruction survey, a 250-foot buffer zone shall be established around each burrow until the young have fledged and are able to exit the burrow. If</p>	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<p>occupied burrows are found without nesting activity or active burrows are found after the young have fledged, or if development commences after the breeding season (typically February-August), relocation of the birds shall be performed. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) shall be consulted for guidelines for relocation of any owls found onsite. Mitigation acreage may be required for project impacts that result in impacts to active owl burrows and foraging habitat. CDFW recommends 6.5 acres of foraging habitat be preserved for each active burrow impacted by project activities.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure 4-5: The project applicant shall design the project to avoid impacts to potential habitat for VELB, if feasible. If project development is required in areas that may impact elderberry shrubs containing stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level (development within 100 feet of shrub dripline), the project applicant shall perform one of the following measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fence and flag all areas to be avoided during construction activities. In areas where encroachment on the 100-foot buffer has been approved by the USFWS, provide a minimum setback of at least 20 feet from the dripline of each elderberry plant. 2. Brief contractors on the need to avoid damaging the elderberry plants and the possible penalties for not complying with these requirements. 3. Erect signs every 50 feet along the edge of the avoidance area with the following information: "This area is habitat of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, a threatened species, and must not be disturbed. This species is protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Violators are subject to prosecution, fines and imprisonment." The signs should be clearly readable from a distance of 20 feet and must be maintained for the duration of construction. 4. Instruct work crews about the status of the beetle and the need to protect its elderberry host plant. 	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<p>Restoration and Maintenance</p> <p>1. Restore any damage done to the buffer area (area within 100 feet of elderberry plants) during construction. Provide erosion control and re-vegetate with appropriate native plants.</p> <p>2. Buffer areas must continue to be protected after construction from adverse effects of the project. Measures such as fencing, signs, weeding and trash removal are usually appropriate.</p> <p>3. No insecticides, herbicides, fertilizers or other chemicals that might harm the beetle or its host plant should be used in the buffer areas, or within 100 feet of any elderberry plant with one or more stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level.</p> <p>4. The applicant must provide a written description of how the buffer areas are to be restored, protected and maintained after construction is completed.</p> <p>5. Mowing of grasses/ground cover may occur from July through April to reduce fire hazard. No mowing should occur within five feet of elderberry plant stems. Mowing must be done in a manner that avoids damaging plants (e.g., stripping away bark through careless use of mowing/trimming equipment).</p> <p>If the shrub cannot be avoided, then a mitigation plan shall be developed and implemented in consultation with USFWS consistent with the conservation guidelines for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, which likely includes one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain credits at an approved mitigation bank; or • Implement an onsite mitigation and monitoring plan that includes transplantation of the shrub and planting of elderberry seedlings. <p>The mitigation plan shall be approved by the USFWS prior to acceptance by the County. Any required onsite mitigation shall be incorporated into subsequent improvement and construction plans.</p>				

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
Mitigation Measure 4-6: The Applicant shall retain qualified personnel the County to perform a formal wetland delineation following published Corps guidelines to establish actual acreage of potential impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and other Waters of the United States. This delineation shall then be submitted to the Corps for verification prior to issuance of the Final Map. This measure is in accordance with County policy 7.3.3.1.	Prior to issuance of Final Map	Project Applicant		
Mitigation Measure 4-7: If impacts to "waters of the U. S." are not avoidable, and onsite preservation is not possible, then habitat compensation shall be required at a 1:1 impact preservation ratio. This measure is in accordance with County policy 7.3.3.2.	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		
Mitigation Measure 4-8: In order to comply with federal regulations regarding impacts to "waters of the United States" (as defined in the Clean Water Act Section 404) the Applicant shall comply with required Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit conditions including maintenance of minimum protective buffer/set back areas surrounding wetlands. A mitigation and monitoring plan shall be required that will identify impacts on all jurisdictional features and mitigation measures that will be implemented to achieve the "no net loss" policy. Evidence of compliance shall be submitted to El Dorado County prior to site disturbance.	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		
Mitigation Measure 4-9: The Applicant shall also comply with required Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement issued by CDFW for projects that substantially divert, obstruct natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of river, stream, or lake designated by CDFW. Evidence of compliance shall be submitted to El Dorado County prior to site disturbance.	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Mitigation Measure 5-1: Survey Specific Resources for Eligibility for the NRHP or CRHR. Prior to any earthmoving activities within areas adjacent to known sensitive cultural resources, evaluate the following resources for NRHP and/or CRHR eligibility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P-09-1695 (Bass Lake Road). 	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
			Initials	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Segments of P-09-0809 (Placerville-Sacramento Road) in Country Club Drive (G-H) and Church Street. Elements of P-09-1670 (Mormon Hill Historic District) and P-09-688 (CA-ELD-600/H) which would be impacted by the Gravity Sewer and Silver Dove Way components. This would include documentation on DPR523 forms, and possible subsurface testing. <p>If specific resources are determined to be eligible for NRHP/CRHR eligible then the proposed project activities should avoid disturbing the resource. If avoidance is not feasible, the resource should be preserved in place. If preservation is not feasible, the resource should be recorded consistent with CRHR and/or NRHP guidelines.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure 5-2: Paleontological Mitigation Program. Prior to earthmoving activities associated with mass grading, a qualified supervising paleontologist shall be contracted to conduct a field survey of the proposed construction area to identify areas of likely sensitivity for paleontological resources. The supervising paleontologist shall also conduct construction crew training in identification of paleontological resources that may be discovered during the course of excavation. The paleontologist will also conduct paleontological monitoring during ground disturbing activities in areas identified through survey and archival review as sensitive for paleontological resources. In the event of discovery of vertebrate, plant, or invertebrate fossils, the paleontologist shall have the authority to halt or redirect excavation operations until the probable significance of the find can be assessed, and the resource salvaged as appropriate. Any significant fossils recovered during monitoring and salvage shall be cleaned, repaired, and hardened, and then donated to a repository institution.</p> <p>In the event of the discovery of buried paleontological deposits it is recommended that project activities in the vicinity of the find should be temporarily halted and a qualified paleontologist consulted to assess the resource and provide proper management recommendations. Possible management recommendations for important resources could include resource avoidance or data recovery excavations.</p>	Prior to approval of site disturbance	Project Applicant		



RESOLUTION No. 288-95

OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO

CERTIFICATION OF THE ADDENDUM TO THE BASS LAKE ROAD STUDY AREA
PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT;
STATEMENT OF FINDINGS;
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS;
CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN (PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT) FINDINGS;
TIME EXTENSION FOR ADOPTION OF GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS; AND
ADOPTION OF THE BASS LAKE HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN.

The Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado resolve as follows:

Section 1. The Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado finds as follows:

A. A Program Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") and Addendum ("Addendum") was prepared for and by El Dorado County ("County") for the Bass Lake Road Study Area and Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan (the "Project") pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Resources Code 21000 et seq.), Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act ("Guidelines") (2 Cal. Code of Regulations 15000 et seq.), and the local procedures adopted by the County pursuant thereto.

B. The Notice of Completion for the Draft EIR was forwarded to the Office of Planning and Research and the Secretary of the Resources Agency pursuant to Section 15085 of the Guidelines on August 8, 1991.

C. The County distributed copies of the Draft EIR to those public agencies which have jurisdiction by law with respect to the Project and to other interested persons and agencies and sought the comments of such persons and agencies.

D. Notice inviting comments on the Draft EIR was given in compliance with Guidelines Section 15087.

E. The County Planning Commission conducted public hearing on the Draft EIR on August 8, 1991 to further solicit public comments.

Exhibit I

APPROVED
EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE April 28, 2016

BY Roger Trout
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

F. The Draft EIR was thereafter revised and/or supplemented to respond to the comments received, as provided in the Guidelines Section 15132, and as so revised and supplemented, the Final EIR for the Project was completed.

G. On February 13, 1992, the Planning Commission conducted a noticed public hearing regarding the Bass Lake Road Study Area Program EIR to forward a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to certify that:

1. The Draft and Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; (Sections 15080 through 15090);
2. The Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the Lead Agency, and the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving any project.

H. On March 17, 1992, the Board of Supervisors conducted a noticed public hearing regarding the Bass Lake Road Study Area Program EIR and certified that:

1. The Draft and Final EIR had been completed in compliance with CEQA (Sections 15080 through 15090);
2. The Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the Lead Agency, and the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving any project.
3. Final EIR reflects independent view and judgment of the County of El Dorado.

I. On April 9, 1992, the County Planning Commission held a noticed public hearing on the Addendum in conjunction with its hearing on the Project and recommended that the Addendum be certified as complete and appropriate for the Project and that the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan be adopted by resolution along with the Statement of Overriding Considerations and Findings.

J. On November 7, 1995, the Board of Supervisors conducted a noticed public hearing on the Addendum in conjunction with its hearing on the Project. The record of this hearing includes the following as submitted to and considered by the County Planning Commission and the County Board of Supervisors:

- (1) The Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan (the "Project");
- (2) The Final Program EIR, including the Draft EIR, Technical Appendices, written comments received during the public comment period and responses thereto, and the Addendum to the Final Program EIR;

(3) All staff reports, memoranda, maps, letters, minutes of meetings, and other documents prepared by County staff relating to the Project and presented to the County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors at its hearing on the Addendum and the Project;

(4) All testimony, documents, and other evidence presented by or on behalf of the applicant relating to the Addendum and the Project, including testimony given before the County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, written reports, and exhibits;

(5) The proceedings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors relating to the Project and Addendum, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at the public hearings, the transcripts of all hearings of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors related to this matter, and the official minutes of such meetings;

(6) County Planning Commission recommendations (via minutes) adopted by the Planning Commission, and the actions of the Board of Supervisors approving the Project.

(7) The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Project contained in the Addendum.

(8) The revised Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan, dated October 1995, and the EIR Addendum, dated October 1995, were referred back to the El Dorado County Planning Commission for review and comment on November 2, 1995.

Section 2. Certification of the Addendum. Pursuant to Sections 15080 through 15090 of the Guidelines and with changes detailed in the Addendum, herein incorporated by this reference, the Board of Supervisors hereby finds and certifies that the Final EIR Addendum for the Project has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the Guidelines, and the local procedures adopted by the Board of Supervisors pursuant thereto, and that the County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors have reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR Addendum prior to making a determination on the Project, and that the Addendum represents the independent view and judgement of the County of El Dorado.

Section 3. Significant or Potentially Significant Impacts Mitigated to Less Than Significance. The significant and potentially significant environmental impacts, including cumulative impacts, of the Project which are being mitigated to a less than significant level are set out in Exhibit A attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein. These impacts are identified in the Final Program EIR and Addendum or have otherwise been identified by the Board of Supervisors. Pursuant to Section 21081(a) of CEQA and Section 15091 of the Guidelines, as to each such impact, the Board of Supervisors, based on the evidence in the record before it, including the recommendations of the Planning Commission, finds that changes or alterations incorporated into the Project by means of conditions or otherwise, mitigate, avoid or substantially lessen to a level of insignificance these significant or potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project. The basis for this finding for each identified impact is set forth in Exhibit A.

Section 4. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts. Pursuant to Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines certain other significant and potentially significant environmental impacts, including cumulative impacts, of the Project are unavoidable and even through substantial mitigation cannot be fully mitigated in a manner that would lessen the impacts to insignificance. These impacts are set out in Exhibit B attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein. Notwithstanding disclosure of these impacts, the Board of Supervisors elects to approve the Project pursuant to Sections 21002, 21002.1, 21081, and 21083 of the Public Resources Codes due to overriding considerations as set forth below in Section 8, the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Section 5. Project Alternatives. The Board of Supervisors has considered the Project alternatives discussed in the Final EIR and presented during the comment period and public hearing process. Some of these alternatives have the potential to avoid or reduce certain significant or potentially significant environmental impacts, as set forth in Exhibit D, attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein. The Board of Supervisors specifically finds these alternatives to be infeasible given the stated goal of the Project and the level of impacts associated with each alternative. Each alternative and the facts supporting the finding of infeasibility of each alternative are set forth in Exhibit C.

Section 6. Consistency with General Plan and Time Extension For Adoption of General Plan Findings.

A. The Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Section 65450 et. seq. of the Public Resources Code and based on facts in the record, finds that the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan includes the required contents, is consistent with the General Plan (Public Review Draft General Plan), shall be adopted by this Resolution, and will be utilized to approve future applicable projects consistent with the Specific Plan.

B. Time Extension For Adoption of General Plan Findings: The Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Conditions 2(b) and 3(b) of the California State Legislative Time Extension For Adoption of General Plan (Section 65850 et. seq. [SB 903] and Section 65361 of the Government Code), makes the following findings reasonably supported by evidence in the record.

1. The Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan is consistent with the Public Review Draft General Plan and the Project Description General Plan as presently articulated by the Planning Commission, and

2. There is little or no probability the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan will be detrimental to or interfere with the future adopted General Plan.

Section 7. Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Board of Supervisors, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15092, finds that in approving the Project it has eliminated or substantially lessened all significant and potentially significant effects of the Project on the environment through mitigation where feasible as shown in Sections 1 through 5 of this

Resolution. The Board of Supervisors further finds that the remaining unavoidable significant and potentially significant impacts are acceptable, and makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations in accordance with Section 15093 of the Guidelines. For the reasons set forth in Exhibit E, attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, the Board of Supervisors finds that the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse impacts which may result from the Project, and the overriding considerations set forth in Exhibit D support approval of the Project.

Section 8. Mitigation Monitoring Plan: The Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, recognizes that proposed mitigation measures require a program to ensure compliance during Project implementation. Such a program has been prepared, is set forth in Section 4.0 of the EIR Addendum, and is incorporated herein by reference.

Section 9. Upon approval of the Project by this Resolution, the Planning Director shall file a Notice of Determination with the El Dorado County Clerk of County and, if the Project requires a discretionary approval from any state agency, with the State Office of Planning and Research pursuant to the provisions of Section 21152 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15094 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 10. Adoption of Specific Plan: The Board of Supervisors, pursuant to California Government Code Section 65453(a), the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado at a regular meeting of said Board, held on the 7TH day of NOVEMBER, 19 95, by the following vote of said Board:

SUPERVISORS: RAYMOND J. NUTTING, J. MARK NIELSEN,
Ayes: WALTER L. SHULTZ, JOHN E. UPTON

ATTEST

DIXIE L. FOOTE

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By Margaret B. Moody
Deputy Clerk

Noes: SUPERVISOR: WILLIAM S. BRADLEY

Absent: NONE

Walter L. Shultz
Chairman, Board of Supervisors

I CERTIFY THAT:
THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT IS A CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE.

DATE _____

ATTEST: DIXIE L. FOOTE, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado, State of California.

By _____
Deputy Clerk

EXHIBIT A

Findings of significant or potentially significant impacts reduced to less than significant levels through mitigation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)) (Evidence in the record follows each rational in parentheses):

I. GEOLOGY, SEISMIC AND SOILS

A. Significant Impact: The Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan area is subject to seismically induced ground-shaking. Development of the study area will increase the number of people and value of personal property exposed to this phenomena. The potential for seismic events in the study area cannot be reduced, and thus future residents cannot be isolated from such phenomena.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Each project within the Bass Lake Specific Plan area will retain a geotechnical engineer to identify soil constraints and make recommendations regarding development of roadways, foundations, and other structures. Each engineer will be required to submit documentation of field evaluation of facilities to the Department of Transportation (Mitigation Measure ("MM" D01).

b. El Dorado County requires that structures be constructed to the standards of the Uniform Building Code (UBC). The required strength of these structures is intended to be adequate to withstand a seismic event of the probable maximum expectable intensity predicted for the region. To this end, the County requires that each structure be approved prior to construction and inspected prior to occupation. (MM D02)

B. Significant Impact: As a consequence of the scattered rock outcrops and shallow depth to rock, blasting could be required to facilitate development. There are a variety of potentially adverse impacts which can accompany blasting, most notably noise and ground vibration. Noise impacts associated with blasting are addressed in the noise section of these mitigations.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. The necessity for blasting will be determined on a project-by-project basis. In instances where blasting is required, the affected project will obtain appropriate permits from the County. Blasting will be performed only by professional firms in accordance with pertinent regulations. (MM D03)

C. Significant Impact: Development will require grading. This activity will remove vegetation and expose soils increasing the susceptibility of the site to erosion.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Prior to development, each project will submit a Grading Plan to the El Dorado County Planning Department and Department of Transportation for review and approval under current ordinance and guidelines. (MM D04)

b. Grading, trenching, and similar construction activities which involve disturbance of the soil will be performed in accordance with the provisions of the County Grading Ordinance. The ordinance specifies that such activities be restricted to the summer season and/or extended periods of dry weather. Filter berms, sandbag or hay bale barriers, culvert risers, filter inlets, and/or sediment detention basins will be utilized as appropriate during construction to protect area waterways from siltation and debris. All developed intermittent streams will be appropriately vegetated or lined with coarse rock to reduce bank erosion. (MM D05)

C. Grading will be subject to Specific Plan grading standards in Section 6.1, restricted to areas designated on the grading constrains map to further mitigate erosion and sedimentation impacts, and conform to the *Hillside and Ridgeline Development Guidelines for Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan* (Appendix A of Specific Plan) (MM D05, Policy 6.1.)

II. HYDROLOGY

A. Significant Impact: Hydrologic analysis indicates that development of the study area will increase the volume of runoff generated within the Carson Creek drainage during a 100-year storm event by +32 acre-feet with an accompanying 23 percent increase in flow rate (cfs). Examination of Carson Creek has indicated that insufficient capacity of culverts exists downstream of the study area to accommodate this increase.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Each project will provide detention adequate to maintain pre-project flow conditions. Although individual projects in the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan area may elect to provide individual detention facilities to accomplish this, a single facility serving the entire study area could be constructed. The appended hydrologic analysis indicates that construction of a detention facility with +40 acre-feet of capacity will provide adequate mitigation to prevent exacerbation of the potential flooding situation created by the substandard channel segment located downstream of the study area. Construction, operation and maintenance of any facilities would be provided through an Area of Benefit. (MM E02)

b. The Specific Plan contains a Storm Drainage Plan which identifies the major drainage patterns and catchment boundaries within the Plan area. (Section 5.4)

B. Significant Impact: Project implementation will adversely impact runoff water quality. Construction has the potential to generate sediment and debris, contributing to short-term degradation of runoff quality from the study area. Development will eliminate livestock contamination of intermittent drainages, providing an improvement in water quality.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Prior to development, each project will submit a Grading Plan to the El Dorado County Planning Department and Department of Transportation for review and approval. (MM D04)

b. Grading, trenching, and similar construction activities which involve disturbance of the soil will be performed in accordance with the provisions of the County Grading ordinance. The ordinance specifies that such activities be restricted to the summer season and/or extended periods of dry weather. Filter berms, sandbag or hay bale barriers. (MM D05)

C. Specific Plan further restricts grading activities on slopes and in oak tree areas. (Section 6.1)

III. VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

A. Significant Impact: Grading will be required for building pads, roadways, and utility trenches. This activity will expose soils making them more prone to erosion. Erosion could contribute to degradation of aquatic habitat through siltation.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Prior to development, each project will submit a Grading Plan to the El Dorado County Planning Department and Department of Transportation for review and approval. (MM D04)

b. Grading, trenching, and similar construction activities which involve disturbance of the soil will be performed in accordance with the provisions of the County Grading Ordinance. The ordinance specifies that such activities be restricted to the summer season and/or extended periods of dry weather. Filter berms, sandbag or hay bale barriers, culvert risers, filter inlets, and/or sediment detention basins will be utilized a appropriate during construction to protect area waterways from siltation and debris. All developed intermittent streams will be appropriately vegetated or lined with coarse rock. (MM D05)

c. Specific Plan requires grease and oil traps to pretreat runoff from urbanized areas. (Policy 5.4.1.3.)

B. Significant Impact: Implementation of the Project has the potential to adversely impact three elderberry bushes which exist in the study area. As habitat for the elderberry longhorn beetle, elderberry plants are subject to United States Fish and Wildlife Service (U.S.F.W.S.) protection.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Properties which harbor elderberry plants will obtain clearance from the U.S.F.W.S. prior to disturbance of the plants. It is anticipated that the U.S.F.W.S. will require mitigation for disturbance of these plants. This clearance will be required for approval of any tentative map project. (Mitigation Measure ("MM" F02)

C. Significant Impact: Implementation of the Project has the potential to adversely impact wetland resources and the wildlife habitat they support within the plan area.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Prior to approval of tentative maps, properties identified in this EIR as supporting wetland resources will be required to provide evidence of compliance with Department of Fish and Game policy and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act as administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. To satisfy Section 404 requirements, each project supporting wetland resources will be required to provide a site specific wetland assessment and mitigation plan. The County will determine, on a project-by-project basis, the form in which additional information is to be submitted. (MM F03)

NOTE: The majority of wetland areas will be protected and enhanced through Specific Plan policies regarding wetlands and intermittent streams. (Section 7.4.)

IV. AIR QUALITY

A. Significant Impact: Construction activity will produce short-term air quality impacts. The greatest short-term air quality impact associated with development will be dust generation produced during grading and land development activities.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Sprinkling of graded or similarly exposed areas will be performed at least twice a day during construction. Environmental Protection Agency estimates indicate that this action can reduce dust emissions by up to 50 percent (EPA-450/3-74-036a: 1974). (MM G01)

b. Consistent with the County Ordinance 3983, grading will not be permitted during periods of high winds. (MM G02)

B. Significant Impact: Project generated traffic will contribute to local and regional air contaminant levels. Predicted emissions from Project generated traffic include 120 tons of carbon monoxide, 1438 tons of hydrocarbons, and 148 tons of nitrogen oxides per year. The volume of ozone which will form as a consequence of Project traffic emissions is assumed to be comparable to the predicted production of hydrocarbons. These emissions will exacerbate regional efforts to reduce carbon monoxide, particulate, and ozone levels, compounding the non-attainment status for ozone.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. The most recent amendment of the California Clean Air Act stipulates that each Air Pollution Control District (APCD) designated as a non-attainment area is required to prepare and submit a plan for attaining and maintaining the State Ambient Air Quality standards. The El Dorado County APCD sent a draft of the required plan to the ARB on February 11, 1992. The plan identifies measures required to facilitate attainment of the ambient air quality standards. Individual projects within the Bass Hills Specific Plan area will comply with the requirements of the attainment plan.

b. Individual projects will provide turnout lane(s), bus stop shelters, or other infrastructure necessary to facilitate extension of transit services to the study area. The location, number, and design of these facilities will be established based on consultation with El Dorado Transit and the El Dorado County Department of Transportation. The required facilities will be identified on tentative maps and identified as conditions of approval of the various projects. (MM G04)

c. Specific Plan requires park and ride, encourages alternatives to automobile use, bike and equestrian trails. (Section 4.0.)

C. Significant Impact: Use of gas furnaces and wood burning devices will produce air contaminants, contributing to the degradation of local air quality. Operation of gas furnaces is predicted to generate 127 pounds of particulates, 31 pounds of sulfur dioxide, 5,077 pounds of nitrogen dioxide, 1,015 pounds of carbon dioxide, 269 pounds of non-methane hydrocarbons, and 137 pounds of methane hydrocarbons per year. Wood-burning devices are predicted to produce <1.0 ton of PAH, 846 tons of carbon monoxide, and 71 tons of particulates per year.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Aside from continuing technological improvement, mitigation to reduce furnace emissions has not been identified. Mitigation of wood stove emissions is provided by the Federal government through regulation of design and sale of wood stoves. (Federal Woodstove Regulations)

V. NOISE

A. **Significant Impact:** The most significant short-term noise impact generated by development of the study area will be that produced by construction activities. As shown in Table H2 of the EIR, these noise levels can be expected to range from 70 to 95 dB(A). If blasting is utilized, noise in excess of 100 dB(A) within 50 feet of detonation would be expected.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Construction activity commonly occurs in developed or developing residential areas. Practical consideration and common sense have, in practice, minimized noise impacts to already occupied homes. All construction equipment is subject to established performance regulations which include adequate mufflers, enclosure panels, or other noise suppression attachments as appropriate. However, should the need arise, construction noise is subject to regulation through existing ordinances. In instances where difficulties arise, the County has the authority to restrict the hours that noisy activities can be conducted to 7:00 a.m. - 7:00 p.m. weekdays and 8:00 a.m. - 8:00 p.m. weekends. In instances of exceptional noise, such as blasting, a special County permit is required and warning or temporary relocation of neighbors may be necessary. (MM H01)

b. Limitations on grading by Specific Plan will reduce noise from heavy equipment. (Section 6.0 et. seq.)

B. **Significant Impact:** Traffic generated by development of the study area will contribute to noise levels along roadways. Assuming buildout of the study area in 2010, the Federal Highway Administration (F.H.W.A.) traffic noise prediction model predicts that the 65 dB Ldn noise contour will be 858 feet from the centerline of U.S. Highway 50. Within the study area, the predicted distance to the 65 dB Ldn contour will range from 138 to 166 feet from the centerline of Bass Lake Road.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. As individual projects are proposed within the study area, they will be subjected to Specific Plan noise standards (Section 7.1). This review will include the determination of the need for further noise analysis. This analysis will include, as appropriate, an on-site noise assessment to determine the actual location of noise contours. In situations where the predicted 65 dB(A) noise contour falls outside of the roadway right-of-way and within residential property, projects will be required to implement measures to reduce the noise to the recognized standards included in the El Dorado County General Plan Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element. Typical measures which may be implemented include setbacks, sound walls, and landscaped berms. In some instances, noise attenuation of individual residential units will be most appropriate. Construction techniques which may be utilized to reduce interior noise levels include in-wall installation, double pane windows, properly sealed joints, and placement

of bedrooms away from noise sources. In accordance with State standards, residential housing must attain interior noise levels of less than 45 dB. (MM H02, Specific Plan Section 7.0.)

VI. LAND USE

A. **Significant Impact:** The introduction of a higher density residential development into the existing low density rural residential setting will increase the potential for land use compatibility conflicts. This will be especially true during the transition period when higher density residential land use will be juxtaposed with existing established land uses. Problems which could occur include flies and odors associated with the keeping of livestock, noise from agricultural machinery at unusual hours, the application of agricultural chemicals in close proximity to homes, loose domestic pets disturbing livestock, and an increased need for security and fencing for agricultural operations. The potential for such conflicts is minimized in the study area by: 1) Many of the current parcels are being integrated into the new developments; and 2) There are no substantial areas of traditional crop-related agricultural within or adjacent to the study site. The property adjacent to the southwest corner of the Plan area is zoned Exclusive Agriculture (AE) and is under a Williamson Act Land Use Contract. Buffers are not required by current ordinance adjacent to livestock activities.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Mitigation for potential land use conflicts between existing agricultural operations and development of the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan is provided by the Agricultural Land Protection Standards in Section 7.3. The adjacent lands within the Plan area are designated Low Density Residential (L) permitting a maximum density of one unit per five acres. New lots created shall maintain 10-acre minimum lot size. (Section 7.3.2.)

b. The change in land use from low density rural residential to urban/suburban density residential uses will also be mitigated by the Wetlands and Intermittent Stream and Drainage Protection Standards (Section 7.4.1) which requires "Non-building setbacks of 25 feet from intermittent streams and drainages; 50 feet from wetlands; and 100 feet from ponds." "Riparian areas should be maintained in a natural state (Section 7.4.1.10). Where alteration is proposed, the Department of Fish and Game will be notified."

c. Specific Plan requires additional provision of oak retention and open space. (Section 7.5)

d. Density allowed by Specific Plan is lower than that of General Plan (Public Review Draft General Plan).

VII. RECREATION

A. Significant Impact: Using 3.3 persons per household and a recreational space requirement of 5 acres per thousand persons, development of the proposed Project will generate a need for approximately 24 acres of recreational space. This need includes both large area-wide facilities as well as small neighborhood facilities consisting primarily of tot lots with some improvements and open space area for more passive recreational activities.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. El Dorado County ordinance requires an agreement with the Board of Supervisors as to the manner in which the park requirements are met. This may be land dedication, payment of fees, or a combination of both. (MM I02)

b. The Specific Plan describes recreation opportunities on an area-wide basis for consideration, including a linear park (old toll road), off-street pedestrian paths, and "traditional" park sites. (Section 5.6.1.)

c. Pedestrian and bicycle circulation is promoted by the Specific Plan through designation of bike routes and pedestrian trails. (Circulation Plan Map)

VIII. PUBLIC UTILITIES: SEWER

A. Significant Impact: At the rate of 300 gallons of wastewater per day per dwelling unit, the 1,458 homes anticipated to be developed within the study area would require treatment for 437,400 gallons per day. At the peaking factor of 2.5 for wet weather conditions, the peak demand would be for treatment of 1,093,500 gallons per day. Provision of this amount of treatment will require extension of new collection lines and, coupled with other anticipated development in the vicinity, will require expansion of treatment facilities.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Presently proposed capacity with programmed expansions are adequate to handle anticipate growth in the near term, as described above. For the long-term, other options will need to be examined by EID to assure that capacity for ultimate needs is available. Developers will enter into the necessary service agreement(s) with EID to facilitate extension of service prior to rezone. Included in these agreements will be developer installation of conveyance facilities in accordance with EID requirements. Parcels not already within the District will require annexation. (MM K02)

b. Specific Plan requires area-wide sewer trunk line plan to be approved by EID engineering staff. (Sewer Plan Map)

IX. PUBLIC UTILITIES: GAS AND ELECTRICITY

A. Significant impact assuming an average use of 175 therms per month, the 1,458 homes anticipated at full buildout of the study area would use 255,150 therms per average month.

Assuming an average monthly use of 1,000 kilowatt hours of electric power per home, the 1,458 homes would utilize an average of 1,458,000 kilowatt hours per month. If any homes do not use natural gas, but rely upon electric power for heating, their electric use could be double the average.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Developers will need to enter into the required agreements with PG&E for the provision of services to the Project in accordance with Public Utilities Commission (PUC) regulations. Developers will need to be responsible for relocation or rearrangement of the existing gas and/or electric facilities required to facilitate each development. (MM K03)

b. Energy conservation as required by codes will reduce energy consumption. (Uniform Building Code, Title 24, California Energy Commission)

X. PUBLIC UTILITIES: TELEPHONE

A. Significant Impact: No unusual problems are anticipate with the provision of telephone service to the Project site.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. In accordance with Pacific Bell and PUC regulations, developers will be responsible for any relocation costs of existing overhead or underground telephone facilities and will provide the underground supporting structure to each lot. (MM K04)

XI. POLICE SERVICES

A. Significant Impact: Assuming 3.3 persons per household, and the objective to provide at least 1.0 officer per 1,000 residents, development of the study area will generate the need for approximately four new officers.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. The Sheriff's Department is funded through the County General Fund. The County Board of Supervisors has the responsibility to allocate funds to maintain an adequate level of service. (MM K05)

XII. SOLID WASTE

A. **Significant Impact:** Assuming each home generates an average of +60 gallons of solid waste per week, the 1,458 homes within the study area will generate 87,480 gallons of solid waste per week.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. El Dorado Disposal Service has indicated that pickup services can be extended to the new development in the study area. The El Dorado County Environmental Management Department has indicated that recent actions by the Board of Supervisors allows for the expansion of the disposal site that provides capacity to the year 2012. (MM K07 as modified in Addendum)

XIII. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

A. **Significant Impact:** Implementation of the Project carries the potential for disturbance of the historic cemetery (Site 1) located within the study site.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. The historic cemetery (Site 1) should be preserved intact and in place. If relocation or disturbance of any kind is contemplated, specific legal requirements must be met. Such action would require research into the significance and specific history of the cemetery and its occupants. Grave relocation should be done in consultation with living relatives. (MM N01)

B. **Significant Impact:** Implementation of the Project carries the potential for disturbance of the identified historic and prehistoric sites (Sites 2-5) which occur on the site. As stated in the appended archaeological report, these sites should be preserved if at all possible. If not, their recordation is deemed sufficient mitigation.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Relocation of identified sites deemed sufficient mitigation. (Appendix E, Program Final EIR)

C. **Significant Impact:** Considering the sensitivity of the vicinity, it is possible that undiscovered sites of historic or archaeological significance could exist in the study area. Construction activities have the potential for disturbance of any such sites.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Construction workers will be informed of the archaeological history of the study area and instructed as to the types of materials and/or artifacts which would be indicative of sensitive site. If any presently unknown artifacts or sites are discovered during construction, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find should be halted until a qualified archaeologist has an opportunity to evaluate the find and recommend appropriate action. (MM N02)

EXHIBIT B

Findings of significant or potentially significant and unavoidable impacts, that despite substantial mitigation, economic, social, or other considerations make mitigation to less than significance infeasible (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091(a)(3)): These impacts will require Statement of Overriding Considerations as described by Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines. (Evidence of substantial mitigation in the record follows each rational in parentheses).

I. HYDROLOGY

A. **Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** Long-term degradation of runoff water quality is an unavoidable consequence of residential development that cannot be entirely avoided, but will be partially mitigated.

1. **Rationale for Finding:**

a. Individual projects within the study area will adhere to the standards identified in the Plan which specifies "Non-building setbacks of 25 feet from intermittent streams and drainages; 50 feet from wetlands; and 100 feet from ponds. Drainage shall be conveyed in vegetated corridors. Except for limited measures to provide public and maintenance access and to minimize erosion potential (bank stabilization, planting of native compatible vegetation to enhance cover and wildlife habitat, etc.), limited development will be permitted within these corridors. All culverts will be designed to allow the passage of aquatic organisms. (Mitigation Measure ("MM" E01)

b. Consistent with the methodology identified in *CONTROLLING URBAN RUNOFF: A Practical Manual for Planning and Designing Urban BMPs*, each project will submit a Best Management Practices (BMP) Plan which specifies the measures which will be implemented to protect water quality. These measures will be identified on tentative maps and adopted as conditions of approval. (MM E03)

c. Specific Plan requires installation of silt and grease/oil traps to improve water quality of runoff prior to entry into intermittent streams. (Policy 5.4.1.3.)

II. VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

A. **Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** Development of the Bass Lake Study Area will require disruption and/or loss of natural communities. Grading and removal of vegetation to accommodate homes, streets, and facilities will disrupt approximately one-third of the area while domestic landscaping will likely be planted over an additional 50 percent of the area. Following development, it is anticipated that less than one-fourth of the area will support native vegetation. Wildlife species which are not compatible with these changes will be permanently displaced from the study area. Species which are less sensitive to human environments will adapt to the new conditions and continue to occupy the area. Even if areas are set aside for wildlife, the presence of residential use in the vicinity will unavoidably impact these areas. Allowing pets which prey upon wildlife to run free, misuse of pesticides, herbicides, and

fertilizers, and over-watering of native oak trees are examples of unintentional impacts which adversely impact natural areas in urban communities.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. The inherent incompatibility of residential land use with natural areas cannot be fully resolved. The loss of wildlife habitat is an unavoidable impact which cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level. Although this impact cannot be reduced to a less than significant level, measures are proposed to protect and enhance remaining resources:

(1) Implementation of oak tree policies will provide protection to many individual trees, but will not provide adequate mitigation to preserve the woodland habitat as it now exists.

(2) Reforestation of individual lots will expand woodland habitat beyond what exists today. (Section 7.5.)

(3) Compensation trees planted in rights-of-way and intermittent stream corridors will replace trees impacted by initial subdivision activity. (Policy 7.5.6.)

(4) Survival rates will be subject to performance standards. (Policy 7.5.10.)

(5) Wetland permitting will provide additional mitigation during review of individual maps. (MM F03, Standard 7.4.1.11.)

B. Significant and Unavoidable Impact: Implementation of the Project will adversely impact the special status species known to occupy the area. The various raptors and the great blue heron will be impacted by the loss of foraging area. The raptors will also be impacted by a reduction of perch and nesting habitat. No active nesting sites were identified in the Project area.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. The inherent incompatibility of residential land use with natural areas cannot be fully resolved. The loss of wildlife habitat is an unavoidable impact which cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. Although this impact cannot be reduced to a less than significant level, measures are proposed to protect individual resources. Implementation of oak tree policies will provide protection to individual trees but will not provide adequate mitigation to preserve the woodland habitat. Maintaining of intermittent streams and drainages will ensure that intermittent streams continue to exist in a more natural state. Implementation of permitting measures provide protection of the wetland habitat on the Project site. (MM F01, F02, F03; Section 7.4.)

b. Each project proposed on a property which supports native oak trees will retain an arborist to prepare a tree survey. The survey will provide an inventory of trees on the site as well as recommendations for the removal or preservation of individual trees as well as a reforestation plan. Prior to grading or construction, fencing will be installed outside of the dripline of trees which are to be protected. (MM F01, Section 7.5.)

c. Each project will comply with Specific Plan policies regarding oak trees, intermittent streams and wetlands. (Sections 7.4 and 7.5.)

III. LAND USE

A. Significant Impact: Implementation of the required zoning change and subsequent development of residential projects within the study area will produce a substantial change in land use from the present low intensity rural residential and agricultural use to a more urban environment consistent with medium and high density single-family residential land use.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. This is an unavoidable significant impact of Project implementation which cannot be fully mitigated. (Addendum, Page 41)

b. Retention of open space, oak trees, intermittent stream setbacks, and habitat as required by Specific Plan will substantially mitigate this impact. (Sections 5.7, 7.4, and 7.5.)

c. Specific Plan results in densities lower than current General Plan would potentially allow. (Section 3.0.)

d. Specific Plan will coordinate development of the area and enhance the function of the built environment. (Addendum, Page 41, Sections 3.3, 5.1, and 7.3.)

IV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

A. Significant Impact: Utilizing the County Planning Department figure of 3.3 persons per dwelling unit, the 1,458 single-family houses anticipated to develop in the study area would, at full buildout, result in a population of approximately 4,811 persons.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. As discussed in the various sections of the EIR and Addendum, this increase in housing and population will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to vegetation and wildlife, air quality, traffic, and water supply. For this reason, the impacts of the population increase itself are considered significant and unavoidable. (Addendum, Page 43)

V. TRAFFIC

A. **Significant Impact:** Proposed development of the Bass Lake Specific Plan area will contribute to the volume of traffic using area roadways. Without improvements, virtually all facilities will function at unacceptable Levels of Service. Even with implementation of the identified mitigation, Bass Lake Road is predicted to function at LOS E under the full buildout scenario.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. In order to provide a functional area-wide circulation system, all of the roadway and facility improvements identified in the Specific Plan will be constructed. Project impacts to Bass Lake Road will be mitigated by 1) acquisition of right-of-way for four lanes through the study area, and 2) construction of Bass Lake Road to two lanes with facilities through the study area. Project maps will be conditioned to require construction of improvements as they are warranted. Improvements to County roads beyond those provided by this Project will be funded through County adopted roadway fees. (MM J01, Section 4.0.)

b. For the short-term, impacts to the Bass Lake Road/U.S. Highway 50 interchange will be mitigated by construction of the interim configuration identified by CALTRANS. These improvements will be provided by the Project applicants. Traffic counts will be performed annually to ensure the interchange operates at an acceptable LOS during peak periods. Complete reconstruction of the interchange will be implemented in a timely manner so as to prevent degradation of peak period LOS to less than acceptable levels. Reconstruction of the interchange will be funded through an Area of Benefit or similar financing mechanism established by the County Department of Transportation. (MM J02)

V. PUBLIC UTILITIES - WATER

A. **Significant Impact:** Assuming an average water use rate of 600 gallons per day per dwelling unit, the 1,458 homes proposed in the study area will require an average of 874,800 gallons per day. Using a maximum day demand of 1,500 gallons per household, development in the study area could generate a peak demand for 2,187,000 gallons per day. Provision of this water will require new transmission and distribution lines from the Gold Hill intertie into the study area and LAFCO approval of annexation of those properties not currently within the District. Site specific environmental review of the proposed water lines will be required at the time engineering plans are submitted.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. This impact must be recognized as significant because, as of this time, EID has indicated that water is not available to serve new development. However, it is anticipated that EID will be able to provide water to new development in the near future. The County Water Agency is currently pursuing environmental analysis of various water supply

alternatives for the EID service area. Since the finding of significance is based on the availability of the resource and the ability of the provider to extend service, this impact could be mitigated to a less than significant level at a future date when/if water is available and if EID indicates that service can be extended. At that time, implementation of the following measures are suggested to be sufficient to reduce the magnitude of this impact to a less than significant level. (Program Final EIR, Page 17)

b. Projects which are not currently within the service area of EID will be required to petition LAFCO for annexation. LAFCO requires that EID shall provide written documentation stating its ability to provide adequate service to annexing property when it is anticipated that such services will be needed and that provision of such service will not create a significant negative impact on the properties already receiving service. Additionally, the letter will identify when the service is projected to be needed and the plan which the District has developed for expanding its service capacity to meet the needs of the annexing territory at that time. Extension of service will only be provided in compliance with EID Policies 22 and 41. Tentative maps will not be processed by the County until they are able to demonstrate the long-term viability of their proposed water source. (MM K01)

c. Water conservation requirements of EID, State of California, and Specific Plan will reduce per unit consumption. (Addendum, Pages 51-52)

VI. FIRE PROTECTION

A. Significant Impact: According to fire department officials, construction of a new fire station will be required to serve development in the Bass Lake Road Study Area. The most likely location for a new station will be on the west side of Bass Lake Road. The new station will require at least one acre of land which could be donated by developers or purchased. The estimated cost of the structure and improvements ranges from \$400,000 to \$500,000. Equipment costs will include at least one pumper truck (\$200,000) and one water tender (\$120,000). Annual operating expenses for six staff will be approximately \$300,000.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. Without designation and acceptance by the fire district of a new station site,, this impact cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. Once a station site has been approved by the district, the status of this impact will become "reduced to less than significance" through a payment of fees and or dedication. (Final Program EIR, Page 19)

b. The El Dorado Hills Fire Department is supported by development fees and is a self-supporting enterprise fund with a property tax base. For this reason, there will be no net impact on the County General Fund. The development fee of \$308 per dwelling unit will generate \$449,064 which should cover significant capital costs for structure and equipment for the needed new station. (MM K06)

VII. SCHOOLS

A. Significant Impact: The Project is predicted to generate approximately 1,131 elementary students, 348 middle school students, and 667 high school students. These students will generate a need for approximately 2.3 elementary schools, 46 percent of a middle school, and 44 percent of a high school.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. As a matter of policy, the Buckeye School District does not consider development impacts to be resolved to a less than significant level until needed sites and financing are identified. Implementation of attached mitigation measures provides the necessary financing mechanism. Preliminary school sites are identified on Figure 3-1, Specific Plan Land Use Diagram, but these sites have not been reviewed or accepted by the School District. Although no unusual difficulties are anticipated with selection of a school site, this impact cannot be considered mitigated to a less than significant level until the needed sites are accepted by the School District. The attached mitigation measure is proposed to minimize adverse impacts to existing school facilities. (Program Final EIR, Page 20)

b. Consistent with the fee ordinance in effect at the time of building permit review, each new home in the study area will be assessed the adopted school fee. The fee will be paid at the time of issuance of building permit. As outlined in the ordinance, Stirling fees are included in the fee; and dwelling units which pay the new fee will receive credit for their Stirling fee obligation. (MM K08)

c. The ability to provide service to new students can only be determined by the respective school districts on a project-by-project basis. Projects desiring to proceed prior to the availability of new school(s), must obtain an "ability to serve" letter from the school districts. The school district are responsible for determining the number of students that can be accommodated in available facilities prior to construction of a new school(s). (MM K09)

VIII. VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES

A. Significant Impact: The major visual impact which will occur as a consequence of development of the study area will be the complete change of character from the existing rural setting to that of an urban residential community, not unlike Cameron Park or El Dorado Hills. Contributing to this change will be removal of native trees and vegetation, the introduction of nonnative lawns and landscape species, grading and "stair stepping" of the hillside to create level home sites, and the addition of roofs, pavement, metal, glass, painted surfaces, etc., to the visual environment. In most cases, the large native oak trees on the ridge will still define the horizon line in that direction; but depending upon vantage point, roofs will infringe upon the otherwise natural horizon line. At night, the visual environmental will be dominated by artificial lighting from homes.

1. Rationale for Finding:

a. This is an unavoidable impact associated with development; and although it cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, substantial mitigation will be realized through implementation of Specific Plan policies and Addendum mitigation measures that reduce grading (Section 6.0.), protect open space (Section 5.7.), retain and replant oak trees (MM F01 and Section 7.5), reduce density, and provide setbacks from riparian resources (Section 7.4, MM E01). Such policies that lessen these significant impacts are integral to the Specific Plan.

EXHIBIT C

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(3), the EIR examined potential alternatives to the anticipated use of the Project sites. These alternatives included:

THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE
HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
CURRENT GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION LOWER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
ALTERNATIVE LOCATION FOR SIMILAR PROJECT

The potential environmental effects which could result from each of these alternatives are discussed by subject in the following paragraphs and summarize in Table 1 of this attachment.

A. THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE assumes that development of the study area would occur consistent with existing zoning which allows one dwelling unit per ten acres. Calculation of this alternative is presented in Column 5 of Table 1. As shown, the NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE would allow development of 122 dwelling units in the Bass Lake Road Study Area and perhaps more due to second residential units.

1. Rationale for Finding: Implementation of this alternative would eliminate or lessen most of the Project related impacts discussed in the previous sections of this report and consequently represents an environmentally superior alternative to the PROPOSED PROJECT. However, considering the greater densities that are allowed by the current General Plan land use designation, the current demand for housing in the region, the value of the property and its location in a developing area, the NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE does not appear to be a realistic long-term alternative.

B. HIGHER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

The HIGHER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE is presented as Column 6 of Table 1. This alternative was calculated assuming construction of the nine subdivisions for which the Planning Department has received preliminary information and/or formal applications and development of the remainder of the study area to the maximum densities shown in Column 2 of Table 1. Development to this to this level would result in 3,815 homes in the study area.

1. Rationale for Finding: Development of the property to a higher density residential use would produce greater impacts to both the natural and cultural systems than would the proposed Project. Overall, this alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

C. GENERAL PLAN

Buildout to the maximum density permitted by the existing land use designations identified in the General Plan is calculated in Table 1, Column 2, titled GENERAL PLAN. The first subcolumn under this scenario identifies the current General Plan land use designation. As shown, all of the study area is designated either F or G. Properties labelled F by the General Plan are designated as HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, and development to a density of five units per acre is allowed with a planned development overlay. Per policy B.3. of the Area Plan, properties in proximity to Carson Creek are designated G indicating that MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL use is allowed. MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL use is restricted to a minimum lot size of one acre. Since the General Plan land use designations do not always conform to individual parcel boundaries, some parcels include areas in F and G. In such instances, an estimate of the number of acres in each designation has been made. The second subcolumn identifies the density (units/acre) permitted by the respective General Plan land use designations. In instances where a single parcel is covered by more than one land use designation, an average density has been calculated. The third subcolumn identifies the maximum number of units and is calculated using the General Plan density and the parcel acreage. As indicated in the last row of Table 1, the total number of dwellings which could be developed in the study area under the existing General Plan designations is 5,603 homes.

1. Rationale for Finding: Development of the property to this maximum density residential use would produce greater impacts to both the natural and cultural systems, than would the proposed Project or the previously discussed HIGHER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE. This alternative, although having the potential to lower the cost per unit of development, could be incompatible with the lower density residential land uses in the vicinity. Overall, this alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

D. LOWER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

As described throughout this report, the proposed Project development potential is described as those nine tentative map applications at their proposed densities plus the remainder assumed to build out at three units per acre and 1 d.u./acre on western edge. The known applications presently comprise 1,403 units on 632 acres with an average density of 2.2 units per acre. As a theoretical basis for developing a lower density alternative, the GENERAL PLAN land use designations as shown in Table 1 were shifted one category lower for the remainder of the study area. Under this scenario, those properties assumed to build out at three units per acre under the Project alternative would build out at one unit per acre, and those assumed to build out at one unit per acre would build out at one unit per five acres. Under these assumptions, the total maximum number of units for the study area would be 1,885, a reduction of 1,016 below the proposed Project.

1. Rationale for Finding: Development of the remaining properties to a lower density residential land use would not be expected to change the type of impacts which would occur but would result in proportionately less severe impacts in virtually all subject areas.

Consequently, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed Project as described in the Bass Lake Road Study Area Program EIR. However, this alternative is found to be environmentally inferior to the revised Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan dated October 1995, as amended, which provides for a reduction in the maximum number of units from 1,885 to 1,458 units.

E. ALTERNATIVE LOCATION FOR SIMILAR PROJECT

In order to assess potential alternative sites for the development envisioned for the study area, applicable County planning documents were examined. These documents included: the EL DORADO HILLS/SALMON FALLS AREA PLAN LAND USE MAP updated March 3, 1990; the EL DORADO HILLS/SALMON FALLS AREA PLAN ZONING MAP updated March 3, 1990; and the ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS REPORT - EL DORADO COUNTY 2010 GENERAL PLAN dated December 1990. The ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS REPORT examines three County-wide land use development strategies: 1) The Incremental Growth concept which envisions urban expansion into those areas which can be most effectively served by existing infrastructure; 2) The Village concept which concentrates new development into planned areas designed to facilitate public transit and local employment opportunities; and 3) the Specific Development proposals concept which concentrates on 13 major proposed development projects throughout the County.

The development facilitated by the Program EIR is most consistent with Concept 1 as it is located adjacent to an expanding residential area into which urban infrastructure is being extended. The land use proposed within the study area is consistent with the current General Plan land use designations for the site for high and medium density residential although the current zoning is Estate Residential or Agricultural both of which allow a maximum of one dwelling unit for each ten acres. At present, the majority of the site is subdivided into ten-acre parcels. Many of the proposed subdivisions within the study area are being facilitated by consolidation of these ten-acre parcels.

The most likely area within the general Project area in which the approximately 1,223 acres of single-family development could be alternately located is immediately south of the Project site on the south side of U.S. Highway 50. This region shares many of the attributes of the study area and is served by the same U.S. Highway 50 interchange. Within portions of Sections 7, 8, 17, and 18 of Township 9N, Range 9E, and Sections 12 and 13 of Township 9N, Range 8E immediately south of U.S. Highway 50, the landholding patterns are similar to those of the Project area. Several of the parcels are roughly ten acres in size as are the majority of the Project parcels.

The present zoning of this area is Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) allowing one dwelling unit for each 10 acres, similar to the Project site. The General Plan designation for those map sections closest to U.S. Highway 50, however, is Low Density Residential (H) which allows one dwelling on a minimum parcel size of five acres. The General Plan designation for the properties one map section removed from U.S. Highway 50 is High Density Residential (F) which allows five dwelling units per acre. This latter designation is the same as that for almost all of the study area.

In addition to access from the U.S. Highway 50 interchange (Marble Valley Road), this area could also gain access from Latrobe Road to the west and southwest. There is presently no through roadway access between these two points as is the case with Bass Lake Road which connects U.S. Highway 50 with Green Valley road to the north.

Topographically, this area exhibits steeper slopes and a more variegated landscape which would pose more constraints to development than would development of the study area.

Alternative 1 of the ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS REPORT shows this area remaining in Rural Residential land use while it shows the study area as Medium/High Density Residential. Alternative 3, however, of the ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS REPORT which focuses on specific large landholdings shows much of this property as medium/High Density Residential.

In summary, this area is potentially suitable for similar development to that of the study area. Disadvantages which detract from this suitability include more difficult topography, its location farther from existing utilities and services, more difficult access, and the need for a General Plan amendment to allow such development on the sections adjacent to U.S. Highway 50.

1. **Rationale for Finding:** Similar development to that proposed or anticipated on the study area site on the identified alternative location would produce generally equivalent or greater environmental impacts than would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

Finding: Specific economic and technological considerations make infeasible the alternatives described as supported by the facts briefly stated and supported by substantial evidence in the record. The proposed alternative and option, as described, best meets the objectives of the Project. The feasible alternatives evaluated were not found to be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

EXHIBIT D

Statement of Overriding Considerations. Pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Supervisors makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations: The Board of Supervisors has balanced the benefits of the Bass Lake Road Area Specific Plan as a whole against the risks of environmental damage disclosed in the Bass Lake Study Area Final EIR and Addendum. To the extent that the significant impacts, despite substantial mitigation, may not have been mitigated to a less than significant level, the Board of Supervisors finds the following specific economic, social, and other considerations support approval of the Bass Lake Specific Plan.

A. Additional residential development in western El Dorado County is consistent with and further serves to implement the County's General Plan. Approval of this Project will aid in making the necessary lands available for such development.

B. Approval of the Bass Lake Road Area Specific Plan will result in a large, comprehensively planned area that will result in the provision of financing mechanisms for necessary infrastructure and open space amenities which could not result from incremental development of the area as permitted under the County's existing General Plan.

C. Approval of the Bass Lake Road Area Specific Plan will result in the provision of housing in western El Dorado County and the maintenance of a semi-rural residential setting north of U.S. Highway 50.

D. The Bass Lake Road Area specific Plan will have a positive fiscal impact on the County and insure that development of the area will not impact the service levels of existing County residents as indicated in the Program EIR fiscal analysis.

E. This Board further finds that the benefits of the Project in providing housing and jobs for the area, in addition to the revenue that the Project will create for the County to provide services to its residents, outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the Project. The overall density of the Project of 1.23 units per acre and the Specific Plan requirements for open space habitat improvement, water quality protection, grading limitations, oak retention and reforestation, parks, public services, noise reduction, wetland and intermittent stream protection, and archaeology protection provide an aesthetically pleasing Project that establishes a reasonable balance between the necessity of protecting the environment and providing housing, jobs, and revenue for the County.

Memo



To: Readers of Resolution 288-95

From: Marcie MacFarland, Deputy Clerk
Board of Supervisors

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marcie MacFarland".

Date: June 3, 2014

Re: Clerical Errors in Resolution

Resolution 288-95, which was adopted on November 7, 1995, contains two clerical errors.


During the draft phase of this Resolution, the contents of Exhibit B were moved to Exhibit A, thereby deleting Exhibit B in its entirety. The reference to the exhibits in the Resolution were updated to reflect this change, however, two of these were overlooked.

Page 4, Paragraph 2, Line 4 – Exhibit D should read Exhibit C



Page 5, Paragraph 1, Line 4 – Exhibit E should read Exhibit D



REVISED TENTATIVE MAP
BELL RANCH
 EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



- LEGEND**
- OPEN SPACE
 - GRADING TIES
 - EXISTING TREE GROVES
 - EDGE OUTCROP
 - 100' LOT LINES
 - PROPOSED FIRE HYDRANT
 - EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
 - DIRECTION OF STREET GRADE
 - PITCH GRADE
 - 15' DRAINAGE EASEMENT
 - PROPOSED 100' FIRE HYDRANT 15' BACK SET 15' SPECIFIC PLAN IMPROVEMENT EASEMENT




OWNER OF RECORD
 ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF SACRAMENTO
 O.R. 1482/226
 A.P.N. 108-062-26

DATE PREPARED BY
 COOPER, THORNE & ASSOCIATES, INC.
 CIVIL ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING
 2525 Market Circle, Suite 1
 Redwood City, CA 94063
 650-938-0000 / FAX 650-938-0070

SCALE
 1" = 100'

EXISTING LAND USE
 A.P.N. 108-062-26, 108-062-27, 108-062-28, 108-062-29, 108-062-30, 108-062-31, 108-062-32, 108-062-33, 108-062-34, 108-062-35, 108-062-36, 108-062-37, 108-062-38, 108-062-39, 108-062-40, 108-062-41, 108-062-42, 108-062-43, 108-062-44, 108-062-45, 108-062-46, 108-062-47, 108-062-48, 108-062-49, 108-062-50, 108-062-51, 108-062-52, 108-062-53, 108-062-54, 108-062-55, 108-062-56, 108-062-57, 108-062-58, 108-062-59, 108-062-60, 108-062-61, 108-062-62, 108-062-63, 108-062-64, 108-062-65, 108-062-66, 108-062-67, 108-062-68, 108-062-69, 108-062-70, 108-062-71, 108-062-72, 108-062-73, 108-062-74, 108-062-75, 108-062-76, 108-062-77, 108-062-78, 108-062-79, 108-062-80, 108-062-81, 108-062-82, 108-062-83, 108-062-84, 108-062-85, 108-062-86, 108-062-87, 108-062-88, 108-062-89, 108-062-90, 108-062-91, 108-062-92, 108-062-93, 108-062-94, 108-062-95, 108-062-96, 108-062-97, 108-062-98, 108-062-99, 108-062-100

ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF SACRAMENTO
 O.R. 1482/226
 A.P.N. 108-062-26



APPROVED
 EL DORADO COUNTY
 PLANNING COMMISSION
 DATE April 28, 2016
 BY Rose Trout
 EXECUTIVE SECRETARY



PHASING PLAN NOTES
 1. THIS PHASING PLAN IS A TENTATIVE PLAN AND IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
 2. THE PHASING PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
 3. THE PHASING PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

LAND USE BREAKDOWN	
LOT A - LOT C	LANDSCAPE OPEN SPACE WITH MEADOWS
LOT D	OPEN SPACE
LOT E	LANDSCAPE OPEN SPACE WITH MEADOWS
LOT F - LOT H	SMALL FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
TOTAL ACRES TO BE DEVELOPED: 112.14 ACRES	



ACREAGE BREAKDOWN	
LANDSCAPE OPEN SPACE WITH MEADOWS	38.40
OPEN SPACE	1.00
LANDSCAPE OPEN SPACE WITH MEADOWS	38.40
SMALL FAMILY RESIDENTIAL	34.34
TOTAL	112.14

cta COOPER, THORNE & ASSOCIATES, INC.
 Civil Engineering & Land Surveying
 2525 Market Circle, Suite 1
 Redwood City, CA 94063
 650-938-0000 / FAX 650-938-0070

FILE COPY



REVISED TENTATIVE MAP
BELL RANCH
 EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



- LEGEND**
- - - - - JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES
 - - - - - OPEN SPACE
 - - - - - EXISTING TREES
 - - - - - EXISTING TREE GROVES
 - - - - - EXISTING OUTCROPS
 - - - - - (1) LOT LINES
 - - - - - PROPOSED FIRE HYDRANT
 - - - - - EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
 - - - - - DIRECTION OF STREET GRADE
 - - - - - FURROW GRADE
 - - - - - 15' DRAINAGE EASEMENT
 - - - - - PROPOSED TRAIL, FIRE FILL, 4" x 4" SAND FILL, FILL, SPECIFIC PLAN APPROXIMATE ALIGNMENT

LAND USE BREAKDOWN

LOT #	LAND USE	AREA (SQ. FT.)
LOT 1	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 2	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 3	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 4	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 5	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 6	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 7	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 8	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 9	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 10	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 11	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 12	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 13	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 14	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 15	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 16	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 17	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 18	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 19	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 20	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 21	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 22	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 23	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 24	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 25	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 26	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 27	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 28	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 29	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 30	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 31	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 32	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 33	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 34	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 35	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 36	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 37	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 38	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 39	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 40	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 41	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 42	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 43	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 44	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 45	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 46	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 47	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 48	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 49	RESIDENTIAL	10,000
LOT 50	RESIDENTIAL	10,000



ACREAGE BREAKDOWN

DESCRIPTION	AREA (ACRES)
TOTAL ACRES	11.77
RESIDENTIAL LOTS	10.00
OPEN SPACE	1.77
TOTAL	11.77

NOTE: THE TOTAL AREA OF THE PROJECT IS 11.77 ACRES. THE TOTAL AREA OF THE PROJECT IS 11.77 ACRES. THE TOTAL AREA OF THE PROJECT IS 11.77 ACRES.

DATE OF RECORD: _____
SCALE: _____
CONVEYANCE INSTRUMENT: _____
SECTION, TOWNSHIP AND RANGE: _____
ASSIGNED PARCEL NUMBER: _____
EXISTING LAND USE: _____
PROPOSED LAND USE: _____
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT: _____
PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: _____
PROPOSED UTILITIES: _____
PROPOSED EROSION CONTROL: _____
PROPOSED TRAIL, FIRE FILL, 4" x 4" SAND FILL, FILL, SPECIFIC PLAN APPROXIMATE ALIGNMENT: _____

Charles 4/1/16



PLANNING PLAN NOTES

1. THE PLANNING PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF EL DORADO COUNTY.

2. THE PLANNING PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF EL DORADO COUNTY.

3. THE PLANNING PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF EL DORADO COUNTY.

APPROVED
 EL DORADO COUNTY
 PLANNING COMMISSION
 DATE April 28, 2016
 BY: [Signature]
 SECRETARY

BASS LAKE HILLS PHASE 1A BELL RANCH (E) CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL EXHIBIT


EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
SCALE: 1"=400' JANUARY, 2016

Exhibit L



0 200' 400' 800'
SCALE: 1" = 400'

APPROVED
EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE: April 28, 2016
BY: *Roy Inaba*
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY



ACQUIRE LAND AND IMPROVEMENT PLANS ONLY FOR SPORTS PARK CONTRACT FOR PROJECT STUDY REPORT (PSR)

LEGEND

- BELL RANCH IMPROVEMENTS
- COMMON IMPROVEMENTS

cta Engineering & Surveying
Civil Engineering • Land Surveying • Land Planning

1229 Market Drive, Redwood City, CA 94061
TEL: 650-993-1111 FAX: 650-993-1112

Mitigation Measure(s) Agreement

Project: BELL RANCH – AMENDMENTS TO TENTATIVE MAP AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

As the applicant, owner, or their legal agent, I hereby agree to incorporate all required mitigation measures, as identified in the related Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which are necessary in order to avoid or reduce potentially significant environmental effects that would occur as a result of project implementation.

I understand that by agreeing to incorporate the identified mitigation measures, all potentially adverse environmental impacts will be reduced to an acceptable level and an Addendum to the the 1992 Bass Lake Road Study Area Final Environmental Impact Report will be prepared in accordance with County procedures for implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). I also understand that additional mitigation measures may be required following the review of the Addendum by the applicable advisory and final decision making bodies.

I understand the required mitigation measures incorporated into the project will be subject to the El Dorado County Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted in conjunction with the Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report.

This agreement shall be binding on the applicant/property owner and on any successors or assigns in interest.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Planning Director or his assign, representing the County of El Dorado, and the applicant/owner or his legal agent have executed this agreement on this 2nd day of February 2016.

El Dorado County Planning Services


Signature of Applicant/Owner:

By: 

BL ROAD, LLC
A California limited liability company


Tiffany A. Schmidt, Principal Planner
Print name and title above

By: Winn Communities
A California corporation
Its: Manager

By: 
George M. Carpenter, Jr.
Vice President

APPROVED
EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE April 28, 2016

BY: 
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Print name and address below:

BL Road, LLC
c/o Winn Communities
attn.: George Carpenter
3001 I Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95816

Exhibit O