

EXHIBIT AA

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FILE: Z04-0015/S01-0011/P08-0036

PROJECT NAME: Springs Equestrian Center

NAME OF APPLICANT: Dennis Graham

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 115-410-05

SECTION: 19&30 T: 10N R: 9E

LOCATION: The subject property is located on the south side of Green Valley Road at the intersection with Deer Valley Road in the Rescue area

- GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT:** FROM: TO:
- REZONING:** FROM: RE-10/RE-5 TO: Recreational Facilities (RF)
- TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP** **SUBDIVISION TO SPLIT 146 ACRES INTO 2 LOTS**
SUBDIVISION (NAME):
- SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW:** Special Use Permit for an equestrian facility with two covered arenas 45,000 square feet each, stall barns for 420 horses, five fenced riding areas, 12,000 square-foot equestrian retail store/office/clubhouse, camping for horse trailers during events, special events with up to 250 spectators, and an eight foot tall by nine foot wide monument sign with 48 square feet of display area.
- OTHER:**

REASONS THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

- NO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS WERE IDENTIFIED DURING THE INITIAL STUDY.**
- MITIGATION HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED WHICH WOULD REDUCE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.**
- OTHER:**

In accordance with the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), State Guidelines, and El Dorado County Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, the County Environmental Agent analyzed the project and determined that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment. Based on this finding, the Planning Department hereby prepares this MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION. A period of thirty (30) days from the date of filing this mitigated negative declaration will be provided to enable public review of the project specifications and this document prior to action on the project by COUNTY OF EL DORADO. A copy of the project specifications is on file at the County of El Dorado Planning Services, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667.

This Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on _____.

Executive Secretary



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

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Project Title: Rezone Z04-0015/Special Use Permit S01-0011/Parcel Map P08-0036/Springs Equestrian Center

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

Contact Person: Aaron Mount, Project Planner

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Project Owner's Name and Address: Dennis Graham, 2400 Green Valley Road, Rescue, CA 95672

Project Applicant's Name and Address: TSD Engineering, 31 Natoma Street, Suite #160, Folsom, CA 95630

Project Location: The subject property is located on the south side of Green Valley Road at the intersection with Deer Valley Road in the Rescue area, Supervisorial District 1.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 115-410-05 **Parcel Size:** 146.42 acres

Zoning: Estate Residential (RE-10)/Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) **Section:** 30 **T:** 10N **R:** 9E

General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential (LDR)

Description of Project: A Rezone, Tentative Parcel Map, and Special Use Permit for the parcel currently identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 115-410-05 as follows:

Rezone: The rezone shall change the zone district from Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) & Estate Residential (RE-10) to Recreational Facilities (RF) for proposed Parcel 1 only. Parcel 2 of the site would remain RE-5 and no development is proposed at this time.

Tentative Parcel Map: The Tentative Parcel Map shall create two parcels:

Parcel No.	Acres
1	45.77
2	100.65
Total Project Acres	146.42

Special Use Permit: The Special Use Permit shall allow an equestrian center on Parcel 1 with the following features:

- a. Boarding/grooming stalls for 420 horses.
- b. Two covered arenas 45,000 square feet each.
- c. One 45,000 square-foot fenced arena.
- d. One 37,500 square foot fenced arena.
- e. One 31,250 square foot fenced arena.
- f. Three 80-stall barns; one 40-stall barn; seven 20-stall barns. Horses are kept in 12 x 12 foot box stall barns or in 12 x 24 foot pipe stall barns with a total of 280 box stalls and 140 pipe stalls. Barn stalls will be painted aluminum with a composite panel interior. Concrete pier footing will be provided on all construction. Architectural metal roofing will be coated in hunter green paint and the barn siding will be coated in beige color paint.
- g. One 13,000 square foot dressage arena.
- h. One 111,000 square foot grassed arena.
- i. One 12,000 square-foot clubhouse consisting of an equestrian retail store/office/clubhouse/fitness center. First floor: Retail store and fitness center approximately 3,000 square feet each; Second Floor: Office/conference rooms comprising approximately 6,000 square feet.
- j. One eight foot tall by nine foot wide unlit monument sign with approximately 48 square feet of display

area.

- k. Camping spaces for trailers and recreational vehicles (RV) equipped with electrical and water hook-up outlets. These facilities would be an extension of the horse shows and are not intended to be a full time public campground. Maximum occupancy would be 90 people and maximum length of stay would be ten days to coincide with the length of horse shows. Forty trailer and RV spaces are identified. No generators will be allowed, and no sewer connection will be provided.
- l. The main entrance will encroach off Deer Valley Road and be gated. The internal circulation will extend from the main entrance to the east side of the property where a second vehicle exit will be provided onto Green Valley Road. This exit will serve as an emergency, RV and trailer, horse show, and event exit.
- m. Interior circulation is typically closed to car and truck traffic, except for equipment loading and unloading. Some interior driveways will be provided for car access to the barns. Speed limit is 5 MPH.
- n. A total of 165 parking spaces and overflow parking for approximately 86 vehicles.
- o. An existing 3,600 square-foot single family home to be used as a management residence and office, 1,058 square-foot second residence to be used as a residence for employees, 5,000 square-foot storage building, hay storage service area, and three other minor accessory structures are currently located on the subject property and will remain as part of this project.
- p. The equestrian center will be fenced with ranch fencing around its entire exterior perimeter. White rail PVC fencing will outline many working areas within the equestrian center. Horse arenas will be made from three-rail white PVC fencing.
- q. Interior lighting within the covered arenas will be directed downward. Uncovered arenas will not contain lighting.
- r. Annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District is proposed to connect the site to public water.
- s. Septic systems currently on the property will provide for waste water disposal at the main house and second residence. A new septic system will be installed for the clubhouse and horse wash stalls.
- t. A monument sign or plaque may be placed identifying special species of plants and non-sensitive artifacts throughout the property.

The following uses:

1. The proposed equestrian facility will include approximately 32 staff members, as follows:
Management: The facility management team will oversee all accounting, boarding agreements, horse shows, and general operations. The facility management will oversee all care and maintenance of the facility and will reside at the facility to provide a 24-hour presence, seven days per week. The management team will include clerical staff, retail store staff, show staff, safety and ground inspection staff. A point of contact will be provided and published. A 24-hour phone answering service will be provided with a live person contact, for immediate or emergency communication. An email address will be provided for written contact and communication.
Staff: One stall hand for every 40 stalls boarded to provide the twice daily stall mucking and removal and general cleaning. One person per 100 horses for feeding two times per day. Two grounds personnel for general maintenance and security. Additional facility personnel will be employed as conditions warrant. The number of administration and staff employees will vary as conditions warrant. Seasonal staff will be employed for horse shows, weddings, and special events.
2. Hours of operation for the equestrian center are 7:00 AM to 9:30 PM seven days a week.
3. The retail store and fitness facility will be for members only and shall not be available to the public without membership. The members and boarders will have immediate access to purchase equine care products, feed, vitamins, supplements, grooming products, tack, apparel, and riding equipment. Hours of operation will be within the equestrian center hours.
4. The fitness facility to provide for physical strengthening will be for members only and not available to the public without a membership. The facility will not contain a salon, spa, nor a shower area. Hours of operation will be within the equestrian center hours and will be closed during horse shows.
5. Offices will provide space for administration, accounting, and management. Office hours are 6 am to 6 pm Monday through Friday and closed on weekends.
6. Seminars will be conducted and located in the conference rooms of the clubhouse office area and will provide for continuing education, conferences, and meetings. The conference rooms may be made available to local clubs and community organizations for meetings and events in support of special

- needs. The size of each class will not exceed 30 people and be generally held in the evenings from 6 pm to 9 pm.
7. Horse Shows:
Twelve to 18 regular shows per year, plus two annual shows per year.
Regular shows run two days, typically Saturday and Sunday 8 am to 6 pm.
Annual shows run four to eight days (Two shows maximum per year), typically Saturday through the following Sunday from 8 am to 6 pm.
Horse Shows will consist of English, Equitation/Pleasure, Dressage, and others. Sound announcement will be conducted as soft non-horse alarming and simple commands for Equitation/Pleasure Classes such as “turn your horses”, pause then, “jog your horses”, etc. All other Shows do not require sound announcement during their performances.
The required workers would be up to four show judges and administrative staff of four to six people.
Attendees will include primarily those with boarded horses.
Horse shows will be narrated by microphone and speaker system within the covered and open arenas.
8. Weddings:
To be held Friday 5 pm to 9:30 pm, Saturday 10 am to 9:30 pm, and Sunday 10 am to 9 pm, so that guests will have left the premises by 10 pm.
Weddings shall be prohibited during horse shows and events.
Maximum: Two weddings per day, four per week, and a maximum 150 people per wedding.
Wedding ceremonies will be conducted on the grass in front of the existing main house and in the covered arena. The reception will be held at the main residence and/or deck, or in the covered arena.
Amplified music and speech will be provided.
Weddings will be seasonal as they will normally be held outdoors.
9. Special events:
Events to be held during facility hours will end no later than 9:30 pm, so that attendees will have left the facility by 10 pm.
A maximum of six special events per year.
Events will not be held during weddings or horse shows.
10. Maximum occupancy of the site will be 300 people at any one time.
11. Open or uncovered arenas are groomed daily to keep the footing (sand base footing) workable for the rider and eliminate dust within the arena. Proper grooming consists of watering the arena area in the morning (6 am to 8 am). During summer months, arena will be watered an additional time at mid-day.
12. Feed delivery is two to three times per month to the existing hay storage barn.
13. Trash clean-up is a minimum of twice per day. A commercial carrier will pick up the trash containers as scheduled, or at a minimum of once per week.
14. Horse stalls are cleaned twice per day, seven days per week. The manure and soiled bedding is gathered together along with any waste and placed into a 45 yard commercial bin. The bin is covered and keeps the manure in a sealed environment. Common areas are cleaned daily of any droppings and placed into the manure containers.
15. All box stall barns will be equipped with an automatic fly control system from which a fly control solution is automatically sprayed. Barns will also have large agricultural air movement fans.
16. An air system is installed in each barn to retain and discard odors.
17. Equipment used daily at the equestrian center will consist of simple farm and ranch implements.
18. All speakers will be designed and placed to direct all sounds away from the neighboring residential uses and will utilize less power in the speaker output. The facility staff shall measure and monitor all noise levels during the horse shows, weddings, and events to ensure compliance with noise standards under General Plan Policy 6.5.1.7.

Phasing of facility development is as follows:

Equestrian Facility Phases:

- 1st year – Complete required common area improvements.
2nd year – Complete two arenas, and boarding for 40 horses.
3rd year – Complete one arena, and boarding for 80 new horses.

4th year – Complete one arena, and boarding for 120 new horses
 5th year – Complete one arena, and boarding for 100 new horses.
 6th year – Complete one arena, and boarding for 80 new horses.

Clubhouse:
 Commence in 2nd year, complete in 3rd year.

The project shall require annexation of the subject site into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) for the provision of public water. A water line extension is required from the existing water line in Green Valley Road. Sewage disposal will be by individual septic systems.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	RE-5/RE-10	LDR	Agricultural/Residential
North	RE-5/RE-10	RR	Single-Family Residences
South	RE-5	LDR	Single-Family Residences
East	RE-5	LDR	Middle School Site/Undeveloped
West	RE-5	LDR	Single-Family Residences

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site lies at an elevation of approximately 1,100 feet above mean sea level and is comprised of gently rolling terrain. Vegetation communities present on-site include Valley oak woodland, valley/foothill riparian, annual grassland, wet meadow and mixed chaparral. Adjacent land uses include single-family rural residences, a middle school, undeveloped lands and paved roadways. Proposed project access would involve the improvement of the existing driveway into the site from Deer Valley Road to Standard Plan 103D that requires a minimum width of 24 feet. The project site contains two single family residences and several agricultural buildings.

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

El Dorado County Resource Conservation District-Grading permit review.
 State Water Resources Control Board: Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)
 El Dorado Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO): Annexation into EID service boundary
 El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading/Encroachment Permit
 El Dorado County Building Services: Building Permits
 Rescue Fire Protection District: Building Permit Review/Fire Inspections
 Air Quality Management District-Fugitive Dust Plan.
 US Army Corps of Engineers
 California Department of Housing and Community Development

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature:  Date: 9/16/14

Printed Name: Aaron Mount, Project Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature:  Date: 9/16/14

Printed Name: Lillian Macloed, Principle Planner For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed equestrian center and parcel map project.

Project Description

The project is a request for a rezone from RE-10/RE-5 to Recreational Facilities (RF) for proposed parcel 1, Special Use Permit for the equestrian facility, and Tentative Parcel Map to create two parcels.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The 146.42 acre site is located on the south side of Green Valley Road at the intersection with Deer Valley Road in the Rescue area, and is located within the Cameron Park Community Region Planning Concept Area. The project parcel is bounded on the west and south by residential land uses, to the east by a middle school, and to the north by residential/agricultural uses. The project is an area of transition from rural uses to higher density residential and educational uses. The project parcel is separated from the El Dorado Hills Community Region by five residential parcels to its west.

Adjacent projects either approved or processing but not developed:

East: TM97-1330, 244 lots, approved
North: TM07-1440, 29 lots, approved
West: TM11-1505, 714 lots, processing

Project Characteristics

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

The primary access to the site would be from Deer Valley Road, a private road, that connects to Green Valley Road which is County maintained. The project would also include an exit-only encroachment from the project site on to Green Valley Road. The Rescue Fire Protection District (Fire District) and the El Dorado County Transportation Division have reviewed the proposed on-site and off-site access and circulation proposed for the project. The Fire District found the proposed circulation plans to be adequate for safe emergency ingress/egress and access width and surfacing. The Transportation Division has recommended conditions of approval to assure the encroachments and off site improvements would be constructed to County standards for size, line-of-sight, turn-lane safety, and surfacing.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site is currently connected to electrical service. Domestic water service is available adjacent to the site and would require upgrading by the El Dorado Irrigation District and the Fire District when connected. Annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) water district is required by LAFCO. Sewage disposal would be by individual septic systems as it is not economically feasible to connect to public sewer.

3. Population

The project would not be anticipated to impact population as it is not a growth inducing use.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of on-site road encroachment and site fill and grading improvements, utility installation, trenching, and construction of structures.

5. CEQA Section 15152. Tiering- El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR

This Mitigated Negative Declaration tiers off of the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR (State Clearing House Number 2001082030 in accordance with Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines. The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR is available for review at the County web site at <http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm> or at the El Dorado County Development Services Department located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. All determinations and impacts identified that rely upon the General Plan EIR analysis and all General Plan Mitigation Measures are identified herein. The following impact areas are tiering off the General Plan EIR:

Aesthetics and Air Quality.

6. CEQA Section 15183. Projects Consistent with a Community Plan or Zoning:

15183. Projects Consistent with a Community Plan or Zoning

- a. CEQA mandates that projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. This streamlines the review of such projects and reduces the need to prepare repetitive environmental studies.
- b. In approving a project meeting the requirements of this section, a public agency shall limit its examination of environmental effects to those which the agency determines, in an initial study or other analysis:
 1. Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located,
 2. Were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent,
 3. Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or
 4. Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.

Project Schedule and Approvals

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

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

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for building from Building Services, grading and encroachment permits from the Transportation Division, and an approved Dust Mitigation Plan from the Air Quality Management District. California Department of Housing and Community Development would provide a permit for the RV/trailer camping area, if necessary.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where

it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a. Scenic Vista: The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). There would be no impacts anticipated.
- b. Scenic Resources: The project site is not located near any roadway that is classified as a State Scenic Highway (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/scenic_hwy.htm). There were no trees or historic buildings found that have been identified by submitted biological report or cultural resources study as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site. There would be no impacts anticipated.
- c. Visual Character: The Draft EIR for the General Plan had identified and examined the potential impacts that implementation of the General Plan would have to the visual character of the areas of the County. Section 5.3-2 states that the County mitigate the potential significant impacts by designing new streets and roads within new developments to *minimize visual impacts, preserve rural character, and ensure neighborhood quality to the maximum extent possible consistent with the needs of emergency access, on-street parking, and vehicular and pedestrian safety.* The proposed project is designed and conditioned to provide the General Plan designated LDR land with improved access for emergency safety and on and off-site roads to facilitate on-site parking. In addition, the project clusters the development area to permit open space areas to partially buffer the facility from public view.

The proposed project would not be anticipated to degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings in ways not anticipated for lands designated by the General Plan for low density residential land uses. The recreational center is proposed for an area of the parcel that is currently partially graded. The proposed development would avoid impacts to riparian and wetland features. The property would continue to provide the natural visual character and quality that currently exist by keeping the scenic areas of the property essentially intact post construction. The project design, proposed constructions materials, and colors of the physical elements, are consistent with the rural character of the area.

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

General Plan polices have been adopted to mitigate aesthetic impacts to less than significant levels. Cumulative impacts were previously considered and analyzed. With full review for consistency with General Plan Policies and as designed and conditioned, impacts for the rural recreational use would be less than significant.

- d. Light and Glare: Section 5.3-3 of the Draft EIR for the General Plan states the potential significant impacts would be mitigated by including *design features, namely directional shielding for street lighting, parking lot lighting, and other significant lighting sources, that could reduce the effects from nighttime lighting.* If approved as proposed, the project would allow new lighting. A lighting plan and photometric evaluation have been submitted by the applicant (Exhibit Y1-7). All lighting would be fully shielded and the photometric plan shows that lighting will not negatively impact adjacent properties and is consistent with County lighting policy. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation in the form of General Plan polices have been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels for impacts associated with lighting resources. Cumulative impacts were previously considered and analyzed. As designed and conditioned, impacts from outdoor lighting would be anticipated to be less than significant.

FINDING: For the “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. As conditioned and with adherence to County Code, no significant aesthetic impacts not anticipated by the General Plan for commercial uses would be anticipated from the project.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

a&c)

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

Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that no areas of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected by the project. However, the project site is designated as farmland of local importance. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay for those lands conducive to agricultural use. Review of the General Plan Land Use Map for the project area indicates that the project site is designated for residential uses and is not located within or adjacent to lands designated with the (A) General Plan Land Use Overlay. As such, no existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

- b) The proposed project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning in the project vicinity, and would not adversely impact any properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract.

FINDING: It has been determined that the project would not result in any impacts to agricultural lands, or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is developed with rural residential development. For this "Agriculture" category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

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

- a) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NOx, and O3). The applicant provided *Air Quality Impact Analysis The Springs Equestrian Center El Dorado County, California*, prepared by EIP Associates, May 2002. According to the analysis, “the proposed project would not generate air quality emissions or exceed County’s recommended thresholds.” Therefore, the potential impacts of the project would be less than significant. The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed this analysis and concurred with this determination.
- b) The AQMD reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of five standard conditions of approval and the mitigation measure identified below, the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality. As part of the conditions, an asbestos dust mitigation plan application must be prepared and submitted to the AQMD prior to the beginning of project construction. These measures are included as conditions of approval and would reduce any impacts in this category to a level of less than significant.

MM AQ-1 To control dust, all unpaved roadway, parking and arena surfaces shall be watered a minimum of two times per day during the operation of the equestrian center. During peak facility operation times, such as horse shows, such surfaces shall be watered a minimum of three times per day.

Monitoring: The AQMD shall spot-check watering efforts in response to any complaints from the public.

- c) As stated above under Section (a) construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in cumulative impacts to the air basin. This conclusion was reached in the submitted air quality analysis and reviewed and confirmed by the AQMD.
- d) Sensitive Receptors: The El Dorado County AQMD reviewed the project and identified that sensitive receptors exist in the area at the adjacent Pleasant Grove Middle School. The school would be approximately 2,000 feet from the proposed equestrian facility. AQMD Rules 214 (Architectural Coatings), 223.1 (Fugitive Dust-Construction, Bulk Material Handling, Blasting, Other Earthmoving Activities and Carryout and Trackout Prevention), 224 (Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials), 300 (Open Burning), and Fugitive Dust Plan, as well as regulations and standards related to pollution concentrations would be required to be implemented during project development. The site was tested for Naturally Occurring Asbestos and the six test trenches tested negative (Attachment 13). As conditioned by the AQMD, and with adherence to County Codes required during the grading, encroachment and building permit processes, the proposed project would not be anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) Because of the amount of waste generated by 420 horses and the proximity of the proposed project to a school, an approved subdivision, and existing residential uses, the project has the potential to create objectionable odors affecting these neighboring land uses. Although odors generally do not pose a health risk, they can be quite unpleasant and often lead to citizen complaints to the AQMD and to the County. For projects locating near existing receptors, the determination of significance should be based on the distance and frequency at which odor complaints from the public have occurred in the vicinity of a similar facility. There are no similar facilities of the size proposed in the County however; implementation of the mitigation measures identified below would reduce any impacts in this category to a level of less than significant.

MM AQ-2 To control objectionable odors created by animal waste generated from the proposed project, the following manure management principles shall be adhered to at all times during project operation:

- Each horse stall be cleaned twice per day, seven days per week by facility staff;

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

- The manure and soiled bedding shall be gathered along with any waste, bedding or feed that might be in the barn aisle or pathways and hauled to the manure storage bins for haul-out;
- Storage bins shall be erected on concrete pads with a fenced perimeter and located at the site specified on the submitted site plan;
- Storage bins shall be covered at all times; and
- Storage bins shall be removed and emptied by a commercial manure removal company no less than three times per week. During peak facility operation times, such as horse shows, the storage bins shall be removed and emptied daily.

Monitoring: The AQMD shall spot-check the manure management program in response to any complaints from the public.

MM AQ-3

The applicant shall prepare an odor control plan which outlines the potential odor sources and mitigations measures to be taken, both during special events and normal operation, to ensure the operation is compliant with Rule 205 Nuisance.

Monitoring: The AQMD shall review and approve the odor control plan prior to initiation of any uses associated with the special use permit.

FINDING: Although the project has the potential to create significant impacts to air quality, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project design to reduce the potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project in that no sensitive receptors would be adversely impacted, objectionable odors would be controlled, and the project would not obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan. Based on the inclusion of mitigation measures proposed, no significant adverse air quality impacts would result from the project.

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

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X

Discussion:

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

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;
- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species; or
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

a) A rare plant survey was completed for the subject site on June 11, 2001 to inspect the site for the presence of regionally occurring special-status species. A subsequent survey report was completed March 8, 2011. The listed species that have the potential to be located on the project site are Layne’s butterweed, Big-scale balsam root, Stebbins’ morning glory, Roderick’s buckbrush, Red Hills soaproot, Pine Hill flannelbush, El Dorado bedstraw, Bisbee Peak rush-rose, Parry’s horkelia, and El Dorado County mule-ears. The results of the plant surveys indicate that none of the above listed rare plant species occur within the Springs proposed project site. (*The Springs - Rare Plant Survey*. ECORP Consulting, Inc. August 16, 2001 and *Spring Ranch Jurisdictional Delineation and Special Status Species Assessment*, Michael Brandman Associates, March 8, 2011)

According to a biological resources report completed by ECORP Consulting, Inc. on January 5, 2001, “several elderberry shrubs were observed on-site during this field survey (Figure 3). All elderberry shrubs in the area represent potentially suitable habitat for the federally threatened Valley elderberry longhorn beetle and would require mitigation if impacted.” (*The Springs – Wetland Delineation and Special-Status Species Assessment*. ECORP Consulting, Inc. January 5, 2001.) Both studies determined there would be no impact special status species. Review of the proposed site plan confirms that these areas within the project site would not be impacted. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse effects to special status species.

b&c)

According to a wetland delineation conducted by ECORP Consulting, Inc and Michael Brandman Associates, “potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. mapped include wetlands (31.67 acres) and other waters (2.61 acres). Other waters include the seasonal creek (0.74 acre) and intermittent drainages (1.87 acre).” (*The Springs – Wetland Delineation and Special-Status Species Assessment*. ECORP Consulting, Inc. January 5, 2001.) An updated jurisdictional delineation was produced on March 8, 2011 (*Spring Ranch Jurisdictional Delineation and Special Status Species Assessment*, Michael Brandman Associates, March 8, 2011). The updated report shows a total 10.9161 acres of jurisdictional wetland features. The difference in wetland acreages is the subject of a violation discussed below that is outside of the development area. No wetland features would be directly impacted by this project because the applicant submitted a revised site plan demonstrating compliance with General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 which requires a 50-foot setback from wetlands and intermittent streams. As such, the delineated jurisdictional features and potential riparian

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

habitat would not be impacted and compliance with General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 would reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant.

A notice of violation was issued by the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) on August 30, 2012 stating that fill had been discharged into waters of the US on proposed Parcel 2. A letter was issued by the USACE on April 24, 2013 stating that the project may proceed, as development on proposed Parcel 1 does not propose any impacts to wetlands. The cease and desist order would still be in place for Parcel 2 as shown on the proposed parcel map.

- d) Review of the most recent Planning Services GIS *Deer Ranges Map* (January 2002) indicates that there are no mapped deer migration corridors within the project site. The project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites with implementation of the following mitigation measure:

MM BIO-1:

Pre-construction Survey Required: If construction begins outside the February 1 to August 31 breeding season, there will be no need to conduct a preconstruction survey for active nests. If construction is scheduled to begin between February 1 and August 31 then a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for active nests at the construction site. In order to avoid take (Fish and Game Code (FGC) Section 86) of protected birds and raptors (FGC Section 3503, 3503.5, 3511, and 3513), a pre-construction bird and raptor nest survey shall be conducted within 10 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) approved biologist in order to identify active nests in the project site vicinity. The results of the survey shall be submitted to CDFW. If active raptor nests are found, a quarter-mile (1320 feet) initial temporary nest disturbance buffer shall be established. If active passerine nests are found, a two hundred foot (500 feet for special status species) initial temporary nest disturbance buffer shall be established. If project related activities within the temporary nest disturbance buffer are determined to be necessary during the nesting season, then an on-site biologist/monitor experienced with the species' behavior shall be retained by the project proponent to monitor the nest, and shall, along with the project proponent, consult with the CDFW to determine the best course of action necessary to avoid nest abandonment or take of individuals. Work may be allowed to proceed within the temporary nest disturbance buffer if birds/raptors are not exhibiting agitated behavior such as defensive flights at intruders, getting up from a brooding position, or flying off the nest. The designated on-site biologist/monitor shall be on-site daily if necessary while construction related activities are taking place and shall have the authority to stop work if birds/raptors are exhibiting agitated behavior. In consultation with the CDFW and depending on the behavior of the birds/raptors, over time it may be determined that the on-site biologist/monitor may no longer be necessary due to the birds/raptors' acclimation to construction related activities.

Monitoring Responsibility: Planning Services.

Monitoring Requirement: The applicant shall conduct all construction activities outside the nesting season or perform a pre-construction survey and obtain all necessary permits prior to initiation of construction activities. This requirement shall be placed on all grading plans. Planning Services shall review the surveys prior to issuance of a grading permit and/or removal of any trees within the entire project parcel.

- e) The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

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

Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes the native oak tree canopy retention and replacement standards. Impacts to oak woodlands have been addressed in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR, available for review online at <http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm> or at El Dorado County Planning Services offices located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667. Mitigation in the form of General Plan policies has been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels. In this instance, adherence to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and measures contained within the Interim Interpretive Guidelines would mitigate impacts to oak woodland to less than significant levels.

The submitted revised *Proposed Oak Tree Mitigation Plan for the Springs Ranch Equestrian Center*, (Kurt Stegen, March 7 2012), reported that the oak woodland canopy currently covers approximately 19.05 percent of the project site (27.9 acres). Under General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, Option A, 90 percent of the existing canopy must be retained. The project requires that the applicant submit and implement an oak tree survey preservation and replacement plan retaining 90 percent of the healthy oak canopy on site and demonstrating that any healthy oak canopy that has been removed has been replaced at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1 in accordance with the Interim Interpretive Guidelines adopted on November 9, 2006 and as revised October 12, 2007. The project proposes to retain 94.52 percent of the existing oak canopy. Consistency with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and measures contained within the Interim Interpretive Guidelines would mitigate impacts to oak woodland to less than significant levels.

- f) The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. No conflicts from the project to these plans would occur.

FINDING: Based on the information discussed above, potential impacts to biological resources are considered to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure MM BIO-1 and standard conditions of approval regarding replacement of oak canopy and adherence to the wetland and intermittent stream setbacks required under General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4. Therefore, the established thresholds for significance in the “Biological Resources” category would not be exceeded.

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

Discussion:

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

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property of historic or cultural significant to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study;

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

- Affect a landmark of cultural/historical importance;
- Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.

a, b, & d)

The applicant submitted *Cultural Resources Assessment For The Springs Equestrian Center El Dorado County, California* prepared by Peak & Associates, Inc. July 8, 2005. The project area contains two prehistoric period resources, first recorded in 1988 by Peak and Associates and identified as PA-88-50 and PA-88-51: a village site with a home constructed on the site, and a complex of bedrock mortar stations. As proposed, no development would occur within these two areas. One of the two sites is significant and requires a notice of restriction to be placed on the property to ensure that any disturbance within the identified resource area is inspected by an archaeologist. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified below would reduce any impacts in this category to a level of less than significant.

MM CR-1 To ensure protection of archaeological site identified as PA-88-51, the following measures shall be adhered to at all times during project operation and prior to filing of the map:

- The site shall be identified on the recorded Parcel Map as it is shown on the Tentative Parcel Map;
- The site shall be labeled as a non-disturbance area on the recorded Parcel Map;
- Any access routes for construction, and staging areas, need to be determined in advance as well as any direct impact areas. All access and staging should be limited to the delineated areas to avoid any impact to the resources;
- Short term measures shall include the installation of orange fencing during any grading or construction near the resources.; and
- A notice of restriction shall be recorded noting the site and have the following restrictions: No subsurface excavations should be allowed for any reason within the deposit: no new landscaping or building alterations or features should be permitted, as further excavations could damage the site and expose human remains. If subsurface work is required for maintenance of the home such as replacing a utility line, the replacement should only occur within an existing trench line with monitoring to ensure that no new portion of the site is disturbed.

Monitoring: Planning Services shall review the final Parcel Map and notice of restriction before recording and shall review any grading or building plans before issuance to ensure protection of the archaeological site.

MM CR-2 To ensure protection of archaeological site identified as PA-88-50, the following measures shall be adhered to at all times during project operation and prior to filing of the map:

- The site shall be identified on the recorded Parcel Map as it is shown on the Tentative Parcel Map;
- The site shall be labeled as a non-disturbance area on the recorded Parcel Map;
- Any access routes for construction, and staging areas, need to be determined in advance as well as any direct impact areas. All access and staging should be limited to the delineated areas to avoid any impact to the resources;
- Short term measures shall include the installation of orange fencing during any grading or construction near the resources.; and
- Long term protection for the bedrock mortar site should include permanent fencing to deter access. A split rail or post and cable fence might be most effective for this purpose.

Monitoring: Planning Services shall review the final Parcel Map before recording and shall review any grading or building plans before issuance to ensure protection of the archaeological site.

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

Public comment was received at the July 26, 2012 Planning Commission hearing that there was a possibility of a cemetery located on the project parcel. A recently published book on the history of Rescue contains a map showing a theoretical location of the Green Springs Cemetery within the project parcel. The potential for the cemetery was investigated by the archaeologist that produced the cultural resource report for the project. The applicant submitted *The Green Springs Cemetery, Proposed Springs Equestrian Center, El Dorado County, California*, (Peak & Associates, Inc., August 7, 2013). The report concludes that “There were some early burials somewhere on the Green Springs property. It is not known if the burials totaled six, making the site a cemetery under California State law. The specific location of the cemetery within the project boundaries cannot be discerned. There is no physical evidence of the cemetery apparent.” The following recommendation was proposed:

“There is a possibility that graves related to the burials of the Hitchcock family members and possibility also for graves of patrons of the Green Springs House who died at the site. There is no way to discern a specific location within a ranch that totaled 320 acres at one point. As a result, care must be taken during any excavation work related to the project. Construction personnel should be advised that the discovery of graves or a cemetery is possible; an active plan should be provided to all personnel on the site. The plan should describe the actions to be undertaken by the crew in the event of a discovery of bone or possible bone: including work stoppage; notification of the El Dorado County Coroner for an on-site investigation; and possible re-design or formal excavation and removal of the burials by an archeologist or anthropologist.”

- MM CR-3** To ensure protection of possible grave sites, the following measures shall be adhered to at all times during project operation and prior to filing of the map:
- The area shown on Attachment 15 shall be shown on the recorded Parcel Map as designated by the project’s archaeologist as having the highest potential for a cemetery;
 - A note shall be placed on the map that an archaeologist must be on-site if grading is to take place within the defined area;

Monitoring: Planning Services shall review the final Parcel Map before recording and shall review any grading or building plans before issuance to ensure protection of the potential cultural resource.

- c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site is underlain by ultramafic, gabbroic, and metasedimentary, metamorphic rocks that do not contain fossils, and are not geologically significant or unique. There would be no impact.

FINDING: Although the project has the potential to impact sub-surface cultural or historic resources, or disturb human remains located outside of a designated cemetery, the application of the mitigation measures proposed, no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
 - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) According to the Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas (Jennings, 1994) and the Peak Acceleration from Maximum Credible Earthquakes in California (CDMG, 1992), no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones (Special Studies Zones) are located on the project site and as shown in the Division of Mines and Geology’s publication, *Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California*, there are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones mapped in El Dorado County. In addition, the geotechnical engineering study did not find any evidence of Holocene faulting on the project site. (*Springs Equestrian Center 2400 Green Valley Road Rescue, El Dorado County, California Geotechnical Engineering Study*. Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. November 30, 2004). The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating structures in the project area would be offset by compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.

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

- b-d) The geotechnical study found that the site is suitable for the proposed improvements. (*Springs Equestrian Center 2400 Green Valley Road Rescue, El Dorado County, California Geotechnical Engineering Study*. Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. November 30, 2004). Construction activities associated with the proposed project may result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Vegetation removal, grading, and excavation would expose barren soil and, therefore, create the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil. However, all grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which will reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. Additionally, project construction activities would be required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Construction Activities issued to the State Water Resources Control Board. To obtain coverage, the project applicant would be required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which identifies BMPs to control erosion to the maximum extent feasible. The development area contains Rescue series soils which have a low shrink-swell potential. Adherence to the applicable sections with the Uniform Building Code would reduce any potentially significant impacts from expansive soils to less than significant.
- e) The proposed project would be served by septic systems as it was determined that a connection to a sewer system would be cost prohibitive. A septic analysis was submitted by the applicant and concluded that there are feasible sites for septic systems required for the office/retail building and horse washing stations (Attachment 12). The County Environmental Management Department has reviewed the applicant’s proposal and has determined that the site is suitable for septic systems. No impacts would occur.

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

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X

a-b. Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Policy:

Background/Science

Cumulative greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions are believed to contribute to an increased greenhouse effect and global climate change, which may result in sea level rise, changes in precipitation, habitat, temperature, wildfires, air pollution levels, and changes in the frequency and intensity of weather-related events. While criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants are pollutants of regional and local concern (see Section III. Air Quality above); GHG are global pollutants. The primary land-use related GHG are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxides (N₂O). The individual pollutant’s ability to retain infrared radiation represents its “global warming potential” and is expressed in terms of CO₂ equivalents; therefore CO₂ is the benchmark having a global warming potential of 1. Methane has a global warming potential of 21 and thus has a 21 times greater global warming effect per metric ton of CH₄ than CO₂. Nitrous Oxide has a global warming potential of 310. Emissions are expressed in annual metric tons of CO₂ equivalent units of measure (i.e., MTCO₂e/yr). The three other main GHG are Hydroflourocarbons, Perflourocarbons, and Sulfur Hexaflouride. While these

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

compounds have significantly higher global warming potentials (ranging in the thousands), all three typically are not a concern in land-use development projects and are usually only used in specific industrial processes.

GHG Sources

The primary man-made source of CO₂ is the burning of fossil fuels; the two largest sources being coal burning to produce electricity and petroleum burning in combustion engines. The primary sources of man-made CH₄ are natural gas systems losses (during production, processing, storage, transmission and distribution), enteric fermentation (digestion from livestock) and landfill off-gassing. The primary source of man-made N₂O is agricultural soil management (fertilizers), with fossil fuel combustion a very distant second. In El Dorado County, the primary source of GHG is fossil fuel combustion mainly in the transportation sector (estimated at 70 percent of countywide GHG emissions). A distant second are residential sources (approximately 20 percent), and commercial/industrial sources are third (approximately 7 percent). The remaining sources are waste/landfill (approximately 3 percent) and agricultural (<1 percent).

Regulation

In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the *California Climate Solutions Act of 2006* (Stats. 2006, ch. 488) (Health & Safety Code, Section 38500 et seq.). AB 32 requires a statewide GHG emissions reduction to 1990 levels by the year 2020. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to implement and enforce the statewide cap. When AB 32 was signed, California’s annual GHG emissions were estimated at 600 million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent (MMTCO₂e) while 1990 levels were estimated at 427 MMTCO₂e. Setting 427 MMTCO₂e as the emissions target for 2020, current (2006) GHG emissions levels must be reduced by 29 percent. CARB adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan¹ in December 2008 establishing various actions the state would implement to achieve this reduction. The Scoping Plan recommends a community-wide GHG reduction goal for local governments of 15 percent.

In June 2008, the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) issued a Technical Advisory² providing interim guidance regarding a proposed project’s GHG emissions and contribution to global climate change. In the absence of adopted local or statewide thresholds, OPR recommends the following approach for analyzing GHG emissions: Identify and quantify the project’s GHG emissions, assess the significance of the impact on climate change; and if the impact is found to be significant, identify alternatives and/or Mitigation Measures that would reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels.³

Analysis Methodology

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDCAQMD) prefers the use of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) for quantification of project-related GHG and criteria pollutant emissions. CalEEMod is a statewide model providing a uniform GHG analysis platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals. It quantifies direct emissions from construction and operation (including vehicle use), and indirect emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use. The software incorporates the most recent vehicle emission factors from the Emission Factors (EMFAC) model provided by CARB, and average trip generation factors published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The model uses and quantifies mitigation measures reduction benefits found in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association’s (CAPCOA) document *Quantifying*

¹ AB 32 Scoping Plan: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/adopted_scoping_plan.pdf

² OPR Technical Advisory: CEQA and Climate Change: <http://opr.ca.gov/docs/june08-ceqa.pdf>

³ California Energy Commission. 2006. *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004*. (Staff Final Report). <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-600-2006-013/CEC-600-2006-013-SF.PDF>

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

*Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*⁴, and is accepted by CARB. However, CalEEMod Version 2011.1.1 only accounts for energy efficiency requirements in Title 24 Building Code, year 2008. Therefore, estimated GHG emissions may be overstated.

Impact Significance Criteria

CEQA does not provide clear direction on addressing climate change. It requires lead agencies identify project GHG emissions impacts and their “significance,” but is not clear what constitutes a “significant” impact. As stated above, GHG impacts are inherently cumulative, and since no single project could cause global climate change, the CEQA test is if impacts are “cumulatively considerable.” Not all projects emitting GHG contribute significantly to climate change. CEQA authorizes reliance on previously approved plans (i.e., a Climate Action Plan (CAP), etc.) and mitigation programs adequately analyzing and mitigating GHG emissions to a less than significant level. “Tiering” from such a programmatic-level document is the preferred method to address GHG emissions. El Dorado County does not have an adopted CAP or similar program-level document; therefore, the project’s GHG emissions must be addressed at the project-level.

Unlike thresholds of significance established for criteria air pollutants in EDCAQMD’s *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* (February 2002) (“CEQA Guide”),⁵ the District has not adopted GHG emissions thresholds for land use development projects. In the absence of County adopted thresholds, EDCAQMD recommends using the adopted thresholds of other lead agencies which are based on consistency with the goals of AB 32. Since climate change is a global problem and the location of the individual source of GHG emissions is somewhat irrelevant, it’s appropriate to use thresholds established by other jurisdictions as a basis for impact significance determinations. Projects exceeding these thresholds would have a potentially significant impact and be required to mitigate those impacts to a less than significant level. Until the County adopts a CAP consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, and/or establishes GHG thresholds, the County will follow an interim approach to evaluating GHG emissions utilizing significance criteria adopted by the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) to determine the significance of GHG emissions.

These thresholds are summarized below:

Significance Determination Thresholds	
GHG Emission Source Category	Operational Emissions
Non-stationary Sources	1,150 MTCO ₂ e/yr OR 4.9 MT CO ₂ e/SP/yr
Stationary Sources	10,000 MTCO ₂ e/yr

SP = service population, which is resident population plus employee population of the project

Project Emissions Analysis

Development of the equestrian facility, would result in uses typically associated with a recreational development located within a Community Region Planning Concept area.

The proposed project’s short-term construction-related GHG emissions and long-term operational project GHG emissions were estimated using CalEEMod. The assumed project operational year used in the model is 2015.

⁴ CAPCOA Guide (August 2010): <http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf>

⁵ EDCAQMD CEQA Guide: http://edcgov.us/Government/AirQualityManagement/Guide_to_Air_Quality_Assessment.aspx

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

Short-Term (Construction) GHG Emissions

Construction emissions were computed for an approximate four year construction period starting in 2015. Construction phases in CalEEMod include demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. The various construction emissions default values provided by CalEEMod were used unless stated otherwise.

The CalEEMod results show the project will have Operational emissions of 505.5 metric tons of CO2 equivalent per year (MTCO2e/yr). Additionally, the project would have Construction emissions of 1,529.9 MTCO2e/yr over 4 years.

Long-Term (Operational) GHG Emissions

The long-term project operational GHG emissions estimate incorporates potential area source and vehicle emissions, utility, water usage, wastewater and solid waste generation emissions. In order to present a worst-case scenario, the proposed project's construction-related GHG emissions have been amortized over the lifetime of the project (in this case, 20 years) and included with the operational GHG emissions results in 582 MTCO2e/yr total project. The interim threshold the County is using is 1,150 MTCO2e/yr, so the project is well under that. Therefore, project GHG impacts would be less than significant, and no further mitigations would be required.

Conclusion

Short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHG and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of the proposed project. Construction emissions have been included with the operational emissions in order to present a worst-case scenario. While the project does not require GHG emissions mitigation, the project does incorporate various features consistent with those mitigation measures suggested by the Office of the Attorney General and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) such as providing open space. Finally, future structural development of the site will be required to comply with the 2014 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), which includes measures to increase the energy efficiency of buildings. Therefore, the proposed project's GHG emissions would be less than significant.

FINDING: For this "Greenhouse Gas Emissions" category, as conditioned, and with adherence to County Code, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

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

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

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X	
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		X	

Discussion:

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
 - Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
 - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a) The project may involve transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as construction materials, paints, fuels, landscaping materials, and building cleaning supplies. The majority of the use of these hazardous materials would occur primarily during construction. Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials. Prior to any use of hazardous materials, the project would be required to obtain a Hazardous Materials Business Plan through the Environmental Management-Hazardous Materials and Solid Waste Division of El Dorado County. The project includes conditions of approval required by the Division to insure the project follows proper procedures for any materials considered to be hazardous. The impact would be anticipated to be less than significant.
- b) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be utilized for the project. Although the project site is located within a designated naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) area, a preliminary NOA evaluation conducted by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc on October 25, 2004 indicates that in general, exposures were limited to roadcuts around the site perimeter and rare outcrops on the project site. Altered gabbro containing visible fibrous minerals was observed in the Green Valley Road roadcut immediately north of the project site. (*Preliminary Evaluation for the Potential For Naturally Occurring Asbestos Letter Report*. Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. October 25, 2004). Six test trenches

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

were excavated within the development area and samples tested were negative for NOA. Should NOA be encountered during project construction, the project would be required to immediately adhere to the two asbestos conditions of approval identified within the staff report, reducing potential project impacts from asbestos to a less than significant level. Additionally, El Dorado County Air Quality Management Rule 223-2 requires activities to reduce asbestos dust created from earth moving activities. An Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan must be prepared, submitted, approved and implemented when more than 20 cubic yards of earth will be moved at all sites identified as being in an Asbestos Review Area. The project would not result in any reasonably foreseeable accidents involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment with the incorporation of the two conditions of approval.

- c) The project is within one-quarter mile of Pleasant Grove School. However, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there would be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.

e&f)

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. There would be no impact to the project site resulting from public airport operations and the over-flight of aircraft in the vicinity of the project. No private airstrips exist within the vicinity of the project site.

- g) The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. This is based upon the location of the nearest fire station, availability of multiple access points to the project site, availability of water for fire suppression and provisions within the County emergency response plan. The County emergency response plan is located within the County Office of Emergency Services in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.
- h) The Rescue Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and concluded that the project would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area with the implementation of several standard conditions of approval contained within the staff report. Fire District conditions include the provision of fire safe access roads to all structures a minimum of 20-feet in width, minimum fire flow of 2,875 gallons per minute with 20 pounds per square inch as determined by EID, installation of new fire hydrants, installation of fire sprinklers for all structures greater than 3,600 square feet, and the installation of an approved fire alarm system.

FINDING: The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, nor expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed project.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

a&f)

Water Quality Standards: Any grading, encroachment, and improvement plans required by the Transportation Division and Development Services would be required to be prepared and designed to meet the County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. These standards require that erosion and sediment control be implemented into the design of the project. Project related construction activities would be required to adhere to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance requiring the implementation and execution of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize degradation of water quality during construction. The project is conditioned for review and permitting by the California Water Quality Control Board. Boarding of 420 horses increases the potential for horse manure to impair water quality. The applicant has agreed to construct a grassy swale to be placed between the equestrian center and the stream that runs through the property. Additionally, mitigations pertaining to manure management will lessen the amount of manure that may lead to run off into water bodies. In order to ensure that the horse waste produced on-site will not be a significant impact to water quality, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

MM HWQ-1: Prior to operation of the facility, baseline chemical testing of the stream water nearest the horse stables for nitrates and coliforms shall be conducted by an independent lab. Results will be provided to U.S. Department of Agriculture-Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS), Development Services and Environmental Management for review.

Thereafter, annual chemical testing of the stream water nearest the horse stables for nitrates and coliforms will be required. Increases in nitrates and coliforms over baseline conditions will require modification of management practices to be reviewed by USDA-NRCS, Development Services and Environmental Management. Any modified management practices will be subject to approval of the Planning Department and Environmental Management Divisions.

Monitoring: Annual chemical testing of the stream water nearest the horse stables for nitrates and coliforms will be required subsequent to the baseline test being performed prior to operation of the facility.

As conditioned and mitigated, and with adherence to County Code, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

- b) There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The proposed project would obtain potable water from EID, after approval of annexation. A naturally occurring spring may be used for agricultural and landscaping uses. The County has determined that it has no jurisdiction over non-potable uses of a spring that the property owner has water rights to. Additionally, an insignificant amount of impervious surface would be created by the proposal as much of the 153 acre site would remain undeveloped.

c & d)

There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The applicant submitted a drainage study (*Springs Equestrian Center, Preliminary Hydrological Report*, TSD Engineering, November 6, 2013) that concluded the project as proposed is consistent with the County of El Dorado Drainage Manual and the existing natural swale has more than enough capacity to handle the 100 year peak flow rate of 45 cubic feet a second. The four acres of impervious improvements represent 6.5 percent of the total watershed area, so the increase runoff from the site is minimal and considered insignificant. According to the preliminary grading plan, proposed grading for the equestrian facility would result in the fill of approximately 31,000 cubic yards and cut of approximately 66,500 cubic yards at the subject site. The applicant intends to leave excess material on the site. Conditions of approval address

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

drainage issues identified by the Transportation Division. The project would be consistent with General Plan Policy 7.1.2.1 as no slopes in excess of 30 percent would be disturbed. Substantial drainage pattern alteration or runoff would not occur; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Drainage issues are addressed within the geotechnical engineering study (*Preliminary Evaluation for the Potential For Naturally Occurring Asbestos Letter Report*. Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. October 25, 2004) (Attachment 13) and the hydrological report (*Springs Equestrian Center, Preliminary Hydrological Report*, TSD Engineering, November 6, 2013) (Attachment 10). The studies provide recommendations for addressing water run-off both before and after site development. Based on the implementation of these recommendations as well as compliance with the Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, the project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Manure management issues are addressed within MM HWQ-1 above.

g & h)

The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panels 06017C0725E, 09/26/2008) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.

- a) The subject property within the Rescue/Cameron Park area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters. No impact would occur.
- b) The pond on the project site is not large enough to be susceptible to a seiche. The proposed project is not located near a coastal area, and therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to tsunamis. No volcanoes or other active volcanic features or steep sustained slopes are near the project site and, therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to mudflows. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: No significant hydrological impacts would result from development of the project. For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

- Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
 - Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
 - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a) The project would not result in the physical division of an established community. As proposed, the project is compatible with the surrounding residential and educational land uses and would not create land use conflicts with surrounding properties. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) As proposed, the project is consistent with the applicable specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use goals, objectives, and policies of the 2004 General Plan. The proposed rezone to RF is consistent with the LDR land use designation. The proposed project would be consistent with those uses permitted within the requested RF zone district with an approved Special Use Permit. This project meets the land use objectives established for the property. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) Habitat Conservation Plan: The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, or a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other conservation plan. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted conservation plan. There would be no impact anticipated.

FINDING: With an approved rezone, the proposed uses of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan designations. There would be no significant impact anticipated from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			X

Discussion:

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- a) The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan. No impacts would occur.
- b) The Western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been

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

measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value. No impacts would occur.

FINDING: No impacts to any known mineral resources would occur as a result of the project.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & c)

A noise analysis was conducted for the proposed project to review potential impacts from special events and amplified speech and music (*Environmental Noise Assessment Springs Ranch Equestrian Center El Dorado County, California*. Bollard Acoustical Consultants. February 2014). The assessment concluded that noise generated during equestrian events and outdoor receptions, including amplified speech and music, and sound generated by guests speaking or cheering in raised voices, is generally predicted to comply with the El Dorado County noise standards at the property lines of the nearest existing residences and the school to the southeast. While the data for the covered arena indicate that the County's evening noise level standards were exceeded during the event simulation, it should be noted that the

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

measurement results were defined primarily by traffic on Green Valley Road. In the absence of traffic, observed noise levels due to the event simulation were noted as being less than 50 dB Leq. Given the setback to the nearest residential property lines to the northeast, the shielding of event noise in the direction of those residences by intervening topography, and the masking of event noise in that direction by Green Valley Road traffic, no noise impacts are anticipated at those nearest residences to the northeast. Because the speakers would be pointed away from the nearest residences to the south and west (over 500 feet from the center of the arena area), amplified speech and music noise levels at those locations are predicted to be well within compliance of the County noise standards. Noise testing conducted at the nearest residence following the requirements resulting in sound levels that were in full compliance with County noise standards.

However, amplified music played at the outdoor reception area on the deck of the existing residence could potentially exceed the County’s noise standards at the property line directly south of that reception area. The analysis of amplified music played at the outdoor reception area on the deck of the existing residence indicate that measured maximum noise levels were at or below County noise standards. To ensure compliance with the County noise standards, the level of amplified speech or music should be maintained at or below 90 dB Lmax and 75 dB Leq at a 50 foot reference distance from the speakers and all reception activities should be completed by 10 pm. The following mitigation measure is recommended to reduce noise levels generated during events at this facility to a state of compliance with County requirements and reduce the potential for adverse public reaction at the nearest residences.

MM NOI-1 To ensure noise impacts are reduced to less than significant, the following measures shall be adhered to at all times during project operation of the equestrian facility:

1. All events and on-site activities shall be completed by 9:30 p.m., including amplified speech and music, and guests departing the premises.
2. Background music played in the ranch house deck shall not exceed maximum sound levels of 90 dBA Lmax at a position 50 feet in front of the speakers.
3. The speakers at the ranch house deck shall be oriented to the southeast, facing away from the nearest residences to the south and west.
4. The speakers at the proposed covered arena area shall be oriented in an easterly direction, away from the nearest residences to the northeast and west.
5. If complaints about noise emanating from the equestrian facility are received from multiple property owners adjacent to the equestrian facility, the applicant shall be required to submit an acoustical analysis to Development Services for review. If the analysis shows that noise levels within the active use areas are not consistent with the General Plan Noise Element the applicant shall be required to modify the amplified noise sources in order to meet the required decibel levels.

Monitoring: Development Services shall receive noise-related complaints and determine if additional acoustical analysis shall be required by the Development Services Division for consistency with County-adopted noise standards. If noise-generated uses are inconsistent, then required modification to amplified noise source(s) shall be implemented, as confirmed by the Director, prior to continuation of the use.

The potential noise from the project will not exceed the CEQA threshold for a significant impact subject to compliance with MM NOI-1.

b & d)

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

The noise analysis concluded that persons adjacent to the project vicinity would not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of minor grading and improvement activities or upon completion of the project. Therefore, the potential impacts of the project would be less than significant.

- e) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards contained within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport.
- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport.

FINDING: For the “Noise” category, subject to the proposed mitigation measure MM NOI-1, the impacts within this category would remain at a less than significant level.

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a) The proposed project would not cause direct population growth as no residential development is proposed with the zone change and special use permit for the equestrian center. The project does not include any school or large scale employment centers that would lead to indirect growth. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) No existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project.
- c) No persons would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

FINDING: The project would not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project would not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or expanding infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

- a) **Fire Protection:** The Rescue Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Fire District from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. Prior to occupancy, the Rescue Fire Protection District would verify that all applicable conditions of approval have been satisfied. Building Services would review any future requests for building permits to ensure that proper Fire Safe Standards for access and fire safety are included for future structures.
- b) **Police Protection:** The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80 percent of the population within Community Regions. Development of the equestrian center would not significantly impact current response times to the project area.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Rescue Union School District. The project was sent to the school district for review and comment. No specific comments or mitigation measures were received or included for this project. Impacts would be less than significant. The proposed equestrian center would potentially provide a facility for equestrian-related activities to the nearby Pleasant Grove School as well as other schools within the project vicinity.

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

- d) **Parks:** The proposed project would be considered a recreational/commercial development. As such, it would not generate a substantial increase in the local population requiring development of new park facilities. Parkland dedication or in-lieu fees are not applicable as no residential units are proposed. The equestrian center would provide additional recreational opportunities and space to its users and guests. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project.

FINDING: Adequate public services would be available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact on public services due to the development of an equestrian center at the subject site.

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

Discussion:

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of five acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
 - Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- a) The proposed equestrian facility would not increase the use of area wide neighborhood or regional parks. The equestrian center would provide additional recreational opportunities and space to its users and guests. As such, there would be no potential for a substantial physical deterioration of neighboring or regional recreational facilities.
- b) The equestrian center would provide additional recreational opportunities and space to its users and guests. Impacts from project implementation are analyzed in this document and would be less than significant with the incorporation of the specified mitigation measures and standard conditions of approval.

FINDING: No significant impacts to recreation or open space would result from the project.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & b)

The *Traffic Impact Assessment for the Springs Equestrian Center in El Dorado County* (Traffic Study) was originally prepared in December 2003 by K.D. Anderson and Associates (KDA). This was subsequently revised in September of 2011 to consider changes to the project. In November of 2013, KDA prepared an Addendum to the Traffic Study to consider further changes to the project, as well as to evaluate access to the project. In May of 2014, KDA prepared a Supplement that addressed weekend traffic, and in August of 2014 another Addendum was completed to bring the traffic counts up to current measures.

The traffic study concluded that the project would be expected to generate 71 AM peak hour trips and 47 PM peak hour trips. The project will increase the daily traffic volume on surrounding roadways resulting in Level of Service (LOS) C in the AM peak hour and LOS D at the PM peak hour. These Levels of Service (LOS C and LOS D) for the forecast conditions fall within the County minimum LOS D standard in rural area and LOS E standard in Community Regions. The May 20, 2014 supplement analyzed special events that would take place on weekends and concluded that service

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

would remain at LOS C. As a result, the project’s impacts are not significant, and no mitigation is required. Capital Improvement Project #76114 Green Valley Road/Deer Valley Road Turn Lanes providing left turn pockets located at the intersection of this project and Green Valley Road has been completed. The Transportation Division has applied standard conditions of approval to the project including the widening of Deer Valley Road from Green Valley Road to the project site to a 24-foot wide paved roadway per Standard Plan 101C and improvement of the exit-only encroachment onto Green Valley Road in accordance with Standard Plan 103C. Based on these standard conditions of approval, traffic impacts would be less than significant.

- c) The project would not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity. No impact would occur as no aviation-related components are part of the proposed project.
- d) The proposed project’s internal roadway system would comply with the County’s design standards as well as fire safe standards, including those related to minimum width, traffic control devices and the location of the access point. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that no roadway hazards are created by design features. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The proposed project’s circulation system would connect to Deer Valley Road via Green Valley Road. This point of access would allow emergency responders to enter the project site. In addition, as noted above, the project’s internal roadways would comply with fire safe standards, including those related to minimum width, traffic control devices and the location of the access point. An exit only access would connect directly to Green Valley Road at the southern portion of the old Green Valley Road alignment allowing an additional exit for horse shows and an additional entry for emergency services. Therefore, the proposed project would provide adequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) Parking requirements for the proposed use are not specifically addressed within Section 17.18.060 of the *El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance*. However, the applicant operated the Coto Valley Equestrian Center with 300 boarded horses in Southern California. This existing facility is similar in size to the proposed center in El Dorado County. Based on the parking demands for this similar existing facility plus the additional boarding proposed, 165 total parking spaces are proposed along with 40 trailer spaces. The applicant has also proposed 86 additional overflow parking spaces as shown on the site plan (Attachment 3). The greatest impact would be special events with a maximum attendance of 250 persons and at a conservative ratio of 1 space per two attendees there would be adequate parking. Staff believes that as proposed the project would provide sufficient parking for the proposed use. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- g) The proposed project would not have any characteristics that would adversely affect El Dorado Transit bus service in the project area. A trail system would link various parts of the project site. The proposed project would provide on-site pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: No significant traffic impacts are expected for the project and mitigation is not required with the implementation of standard conditions of approval from the Transportation Division. For the “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
- Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
- Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.

a & e)

Wastewater: As discussed below, the applicant is requesting the use of septic systems to be allowed for the project's wastewater disposal. The El Dorado County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the current application requests along with the submitted septic study and found they were adequate for the proposal. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) EID provided a letter dated December 3, 2012 indicating that it has adequate existing water and wastewater capacity and supplies to serve the proposed project. A 12-inch water line exists in Green Valley Road approximately 900 feet

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

southeast of the project site. The Pioneer Place sewer lift station serving the project area is located on the southeastern edge of the site as well. Connection to these EID facilities would require an off-site water extension to the existing line in Green Valley Road as well as offsite sewer main to the 10-inch gravity main at the Pioneer Place lift station or to the 4-inch sewer force main located near the intersection of Green Valley Road and Silver Springs Parkway. The applicant has submitted an engineer's opinion of cost for gravity sewer improvements. The cost is estimated to be \$555,185 which would make the proposed project infeasible. As the equestrian center is a transitional land use, the applicant has requested to utilize septic systems for the project until such time as another more intensive land use is proposed. On-site and off-site impacts related to connections to public water facilities have been analyzed in this document. Impacts from these expanded water and wastewater facilities would be less than significant.

- c) Potential drainage impacts are discussed in detail under Section VIII, Hydrology and Water Quality, and are anticipated to be less than significant. No offsite drainage improvements would be necessary.
- d) EID provided a letter dated December 3, 2012 indicating that it has adequate existing potable water supplies and transmission facilities to serve the proposed project. EID indicated that the proposed project would demand an estimated 12 equivalent dwelling units (EDU) of water and that 2,000 EDUs were currently available as of January 1, 2012. EID stated that there is adequate transmission capacity within Green Valley Road to serve the proposed project. The project parcel is not within the EID district boundary and will require annexation before service can be obtained. If annexation is not approved, other sources of potable water may be available based on the size of the proposed parcels. The existing residences obtain water from an on-site spring. Potential environmental impacts for the on-site and off-site improvements have been analyzed and are expected to be less than significant as they would involve minor grading and trenching. Therefore, the proposed project would be served by adequate water supplies and transmission capacity if annexation is approved. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

After July of 2006, El Dorado Disposal began distributing municipal solid waste to Forward Landfill in Stockton and Kiefer Landfill in Sacramento. Pursuant to El Dorado County Environmental Management Solid Waste Division staff, both facilities have sufficient capacity to serve the County. Recyclable materials are distributed to a facility in Benicia and green wastes are sent to a processing facility in Sacramento. A majority of the waste generated at the facility would be compostable waste. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting and loading of solid waste and recyclables. Onsite solid waste collection would be handled through the local waste management contractor. The El Dorado County Hazardous Materials and Solid Waste Division has recommended a condition of approval that requires the applicants to provide sufficient space for both trash and recycling dumpsters. The containers would be required to be located within a fenced enclosure area. Adequate space for the trash enclosures required for the proposed project has been demonstrated on the submitted site plan for solid waste collection. Additionally the project is required to have a manure management plan. The plan must address collection, storage, and disposal of manure from stables, arenas, and all other impacted areas. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: No significant impacts to utility and service systems would result from the project.

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

Discussion:

- a) No substantial evidence contained in the project record has been found that would indicate that this project would be anticipated to have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, with the exception of potential impacts on cultural resources, air quality, and water quality. As conditioned and mitigated, and with adherence to County permit requirements, this project and the typical recreational uses expected to follow, would not be anticipated to have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project would be anticipated to be less than significant due to the design of the project and required standards that would be implemented with the grading and building permit processes and/or any required project specific improvements on or off the property.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as two or more individual effects that when considered together would be considerable or would compound or increase other environmental impacts.

The project would not involve development or changes in land use that would result in an excessive increase in population growth. Impacts due to increased demand for public services associated with the project would be offset by the payment of fees as required by service providers to extend the necessary infrastructure services. The project would not be anticipated to contribute substantially to increased traffic in the area and would not require an increase in the wastewater treatment capacity of the County.

The project would result in the generation of green house gasses, which could contribute to global climate change. However, the amount of greenhouse gases generated by the project would be negligible compared to global emissions or emissions in the county, so the project would not substantially contribute cumulatively to global climate change. Further, as discussed throughout this environmental document, the project would not be anticipated to contribute to a substantial decline in water quality, air quality, noise, biological resources, agricultural resources, or cultural resources under cumulative conditions.

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

As conditioned, mitigated, and with compliance with County Codes, the project would have a less than significant environmental impact that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Based on the analysis in this study, it has been determined that the project would have less than significant cumulative impacts.

- c) All impacts identified in this Mitigated Negative Declaration are either less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and do not require mitigation. Mitigations have been implemented for the control of noise, odors, animal waste, and dust impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts are less than significant.

FINDING: It has been determined that the proposed project, as mitigated and conditioned, would not be anticipated to result in significant environmental impacts. The above potentially significant impacts to air quality and cultural resources have been identified within this document and, when appropriate, mitigation measures have been applied which reduce these impacts to less than significant. The project would not be anticipated to exceed applicable environmental standards, nor significantly contribute to cumulative environmental impacts.

INITIAL STUDY ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Location Map
Attachment 2 U.S.G.S. 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Map
Attachment 3 Preliminary Site Plan dated September 10, 2014
Attachment 4 Tentative Parcel Map dated January 22, 2014
Attachment 5 Environmental Noise Assessment, Bollard Acoustical Consultants,
February 25, 2014
Attachment 6 El Dorado Irrigation District Facility Improvement Letter, FIL1212-
022, December 3, 2012.
Attachment 7 Spring Ranch Jurisdictional Delineation and Special Status Species
Assessment, Michael Brandman Associates, March 8, 2011
Attachment 8 Traffic Impact Assessment for the Springs Equestrian Center (SUPA
S01-11), KD Anderson, December 4, 2003
Attachment 9 Traffic Impact Assessment for the Springs Equestrian Center (SUPA
S01-11), KD Anderson and Associates, Inc., September 30, 2011
Attachment 10 Addendum to Traffic Impact Assessment for the Springs Equestrian
Center (SUPA S01-11), KD Anderson and Associates, Inc., November
26, 2013
Attachment 11 Supplement to Traffic Impact Assessment for the Springs Equestrian
Center (SUPA S01-11), KD Anderson and Associates, Inc., May 20,
2014
Attachment 12 Addendum to Traffic Impact Assessment for the Springs Equestrian
Center (SUPA S01-11), KD Anderson and Associates, Inc., August 13,
2014
Attachment 13 Proposed Oak Tree Mitigation Plan for the Springs Ranch Equestrian
Center, Kurt Stegen Consulting Arborist, March 7, 2012
Attachment 14 Springs Ranch Equestrian Center, Preliminary Hydrologic Report, TSD
Engineering, Inc., November 6, 2013
Attachment 15 The Green Springs Cemetery, Peak and Associates, Inc., August 7,
2013
Attachment 16 Review of Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Letter Report,
Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc., October 1, 2012
Attachment 17 Geotechnical Engineering Study, Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc.,
November 30, 2004
Attachment 18 US Army Corps of Engineers Letter dated April 24, 2013,

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Development Services Department, Planning Services in Placerville:

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9
Appendix A
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

2004 El Dorado County General Plan A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief. Adopted July 19, 2004.

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170, 4719)

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

PROJECT SPECIFIC REPORTS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Air Quality Impact Analysis The Springs Equestrian Center El Dorado County, California. EIP Associates. May 2002.

Cultural Resources Assessment For The Springs Equestrian Center El Dorado County, California. Peak & Associates, Inc. July 8, 2005.

The Springs – Wetland Delineation and Special-Status Species Assessment. ECORP Consulting, Inc. January 5, 2001.