

**EXHIBIT F**



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** Z05-0010/P05-0015

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

**Contact Person:** Peter N. Maurer

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

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Gale Rossi, 5300 Coyote Pass Road, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

**Project Applicant's Name and Address:** Gale Rossi, 5300 Coyote Pass Road, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

**Project Agent's Name and Address:** Gale Rossi, 5300 Coyote Pass Road, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:** Carlton Engineering, 3883 Ponderosa Road, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

**Project Location:** Project site is located on the east side of Running Deer Road, 1,000 feet south of the intersection with Green Valley Road, in the Shingle Springs area.

**Assessor's Parcel No:** 069-200-37

**Zoning:** Single Family Two-acre Residential (R2A)

**Section:** 24      **T:** 10N **R:** 9E

**General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential (MDR)

**Description of Project:** A parcel map to create four one-acre parcels with design waivers and zone change.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	R2A	MDR	Single Family Residential
North:	R20K/R2A	MDR	Single Family Residential
East:	R2A	LDR/MDR	Single Family Residential
South:	RE-5	LDR	Single Family Residential
West:	R20K/RE-5	LDR	Single Family Residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site consists of 4.02-acres, with one residential dwelling unit, garage/barn, carport and septic system. The project site consists of California annual grassland a mixture of native and introduced grass and forb species such as wild oats, bromes, medusa grass, yellow star thistle, mullein and klamathweed. Scattered trees include blue oak, interior live oak, Valley oak, black oak and black walnut. Five elderberry shrubs are also present on the property as well as a row of pines located along the south and east boundaries. The project site is located in the western slope of the central Sierra Nevada Mountains at an elevation approximately 1,150 feet average mean sea level and contains habitat for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle – *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*.

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

1. El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Grading permit for off site road improvements.
2. Environmental Management Department: Delineate on the final map for parcels 1, 3, and 4 the minimum sewage disposal area and accurately locate the septic system for parcel 2 prior to map recording.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

**DETERMINATION**

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

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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: October 6, 2006

Printed Name: Peter N. Maurer 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 a proposed parcel split creating four one-acre parcels from a 4.02-acre parcel located at 2411 Running Deer Road in the Shingle Springs area.

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

The 4.02-acre project site is located at 2411 Running Deer Road, approximately 1,000 feet south of the intersection Green Valley Road in the Shingle Springs area. The project area lies at an elevation of approximately 1,150 feet above mean sea level. The surrounding properties contain single-family residential units and accessory structures. Access to the site is from Running Deer Road in the Shingle Springs area of El Dorado County.

### **Project Characteristics**

This proposal is to create four one-acre parcels, rezone the property from R2A to R1A and request two design waivers. The existing residential unit and garage/barn will be removed from the property as part of the parcel map. New residential development will be required to comply with all Fire Codes and regulations, UBC Codes and the El Dorado County Department of Transportation.

#### 1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the site is provided by Running Deer Road which is an existing paved road. New driveways to future residential dwelling units will be required to be a minimum of 10-feet wide approved pursuant to fire safe regulations, maintain a minimum 15-feet vertical clearance above the driveway and to support a 40,000 pound load. The project has been conditioned to comply with these requirements. Please see Item XV in the Initial Study checklist for a discussion of traffic impacts.

#### 2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site will require public water service improvements and will contain septic systems. Power utilities and telephone service have been extended to the site by local utility companies.

#### 3. Population

The four one-acre parcel map will add three new residential units and replace an existing residential unit. The addition of the residential units will not add significantly to the population in the vicinity.

#### 4. Construction Considerations

Construction would consist of off-site road improvements including driveway grading. Construction access to the site would be from Running Deer Road.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from the Department of Transportation and obtain an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan from the Air Quality Management District if construction activities exceed established thresholds.

### **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.

## **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**

<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> <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. The project is to create four one-acre parcels from a 4.02-acre parcel. The surrounding land uses are predominantly residential.

- a. **Scenic Vista.** The project site is and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.<sup>1</sup> There would be no impact as a result of the parcel split.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is not adjacent or visible from a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site.<sup>2</sup>
- c. **Visual Character.** The proposed parcel split and the existing residential unit on the property will not be readily visible from an off-site public view (Running Deer Road).
- d. **Light and Glare.** There will be no additional light and glare produced from the proposed lot split or from the future residential development. Therefore, the impacts of existing light and glare as seen from Running Deer Road would be no impact.

**Finding**

No impacts to aesthetics are expected with the parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> <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. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not within an Agricultural zone or Agricultural overlay. However, the site is classified as farming – other lands. The 2004 General Plan EIR defines other land as not included in any other mapping category. There would be no impact.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The property is not located within a Williamson Act Contract and the project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. There would be no impact.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The site is classified as farming – other lands under the Farmland Mapping Program and the soil type has been classified as per the USDA Soil Survey as:

Soil classification for the project site:

AxD: Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30% slopes. This soil is gently sloping to moderately steep. Outcrops of bedrock cover 5 to 25% of the surface. Permeability is moderate, surface runoff is slow to medium, and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. This soil is used for range with a few small areas used for irrigated pasture. Capability unit VI-1 (18); range site 1; woodland suitability group not assigned.

SuC: Sobrante silt loam, 3 to 15% slopes. This soil is gently sloping to strongly sloping. Permeability of this soil is moderate, surface runoff is slow to medium, and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. This soil is mainly for range.

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

Small areas are used for pasture and deciduous orchards. Capability unit IIIe-8(18); range site 2; woodland suitability group not assigned.

Based on the latest aerial photograph and the amount of tree canopy on the project site and in the vicinity, there is no indication of agricultural or grazing present or conducted on the property. A few parcels in the area have cleared the property for agricultural pursuits, however, are located more than 1,000 feet away to the west. There are no agricultural operations or lands designated for agricultural uses present.<sup>3</sup> There would be no impact.

**Finding**

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the parcel map either directly or indirectly. For this “Agriculture” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			<b>X</b>	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			<b>X</b>	
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)?			<b>X</b>	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			<b>X</b>	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			<b>X</b>	

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

a-c.

**Air Quality Plan and Standards.** Improvements to the onsite and off site road improvements could generate short-term fugitive dust and exhaust from construction equipment. Short-term air quality impacts result from emissions generated by construction related equipment. Emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG from construction equipment are the primary pollutants. However, short-term thresholds for these will most likely not exceed 82 pounds per day as

<sup>3</sup> State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map, 2002.

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

identified as a significant threshold for air quality impacts for El Dorado County and will require conformance to District Rule 523. Furthermore, Construction fugitive dust emissions will be considered not significant and estimation of fugitive dust emissions is not required if complete mitigation is undertaken as part of the project (or mandatory condition of the project) in compliance with the requirements of Rule 403 of the South Coast AQMD, such that there will be no visible dust beyond the boundaries of the project. (EDC APCD-CEQA Guide, 1<sup>st</sup> Ed, 2002) In addition, the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District will require road construction activities to be in conformance with District Rules 223, 223.1, and 223.2 for fugitive dust prevention and track out prevention as well as Rule 300 for open burning if applicable. Prior to any road grading and road improvements, an approved Fugitive Dust Plan will be required prior to issuance of a grading permit.

An Air Quality Impact Analysis was conducted for 2411 Running Deer using URBEMIS 2002 modeling program. The analysis concluded that construction activities for both summer and winter were below the significant threshold of 82 pounds per day. (Revised Air Quality Impact Analysis for Running Deer Road-Rossi, Carlton Engineering, Inc. January 2006).

If road improvements meet the requirements of the District Rules, the grading and road improvements would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash or odors.

The parcel split will not create additional vehicle traffic and emissions other than what currently exists for the residential units. Therefore, short-term and long-term air quality impacts would be less than significant.

d-e.

**Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors.** Due to the very low density residential development in the area, and tree coverage, sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, care facilities and high density dwelling units are not located within the immediate vicinity. Common types of facilities known to produce odors include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfill, transfer station, asphalt batch plant and manufacturing plants. The requested parcel split and future residential dwelling units on the property will not generate or produce objectionable odors. Short-term heavy equipment emissions generated by the on-site and off-site road improvements and construction would not involve the creation of significant smoke, ash or odors based upon an approved fugitive dust mitigation plan conforming to District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2 and Rule 300 as applicable. Asphalt surface treatment for Running Deer Road is being required by El Dorado County of Transportation as a condition of approval. The proposed road improvement work will not include any features that would be a source of substantial pollutant emissions that could affect sensitive receptors or generate objectionable odors. Therefore, long-term impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding**

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the proposed project would not impact air quality. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.



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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-f.

**Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities.** The site is located within Plant Mitigation Area 2 and contains sensitive habitats or special-status species.<sup>4</sup> A Biological Resources Evaluation Report was conducted during mid-September 2005. The report concluded that Suitable habitat for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle, a federally-listed threatened insect, was found on the project site. Potential habitat for Lawrence’s goldfinch, Lewis woodpecker, Rufous hummingbird, California horned lizard, small-footed myotis bat, long-eared myotis bat, long-legged myotis bat and Yuma

<sup>4</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7

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

myotis bat, federally-listed species of concern, is present on the project site. In addition, potential habitat for oak titmouse and Nuttall's woodpecker, local species of concern is found on the project site. No suitable habitat exists on the site for any of the nine special-status plant species found in the Shingle Springs area. No Special-status species were observed during field searches conducted August 12 and September 14, 2005. (Biological Resources Assessment Report, R. Wilson, 2005). See attached report.

Special-status Species	Common Name	Legal Status/ Federal State	Other Lists Federal/State/CNPS	Habitat Quality
<b>Plants</b>				
Calystegia stebbinsii	Stebbins's morning-glory	E/E	CNPS 1B	Marginal
Ceanothus roderickii	Pine Hill ceanothus	E/R	CNPS 1B	Marginal
Fremontodendron californicum ssp. decumbens	Pine Hill flannelbush	E/R	CNPS 1B	Marginal
Galium californicum ssp. sierrae	El Dorado bedstraw	E/R	CNPS 1B	Suitable
Senecio layneae	Layne's butterweed	T/R	CNPS 1B	Marginal
Wyethia reticulata	El Dorado mule-ears		Federal SC/1B	Suitable
Chlorogalum grandiflorum	Red Hills soaproot		Federal SC/1B	Marginal
Helianthemum suffrutescens	Amador (Bisbee Peak) rush-rose		CNPS 3	Marginal
Allium jepsonii	Jepson's onion		CNPS 1B	Unsuitable

**Legal Status:** E = Endangered      R = Rare      **Other Lists:** SC = Species of Concern

CNPS = California Native Plant Society's Inventory listing.

1B = Rare or Endangered in California and elsewhere

3 = Plants without sufficient information to assign to a list, or plants having problematic taxonomy.

Special-status Species	Common Name	Legal Status/ Federal State	Other Lists Federal/State/ CNPS	Habitat Quality
<b>Insects</b>				
Desmocerus californicus dimorphus	Valley Elderberry Longhorn beetle	T		Suitable
<b>Amphibians</b>				
Rana aurora drytonii	California red-legged frog	T		Unsuitable
<b>Reptiles</b>				
Phrynosoma coronatum frontale	California horned lizard		Federal SC	Marginal
<b>Birds</b>				
Baeolophus inornatus	Oak titmouse		Local SC	Suitable
Carduelis lawrencei	Lawrence's goldfinch		Federal SC	Suitable
Melanerpes lewis	Lewis' woodpecker		Federal SC	Suitable
Picoides nuttallii	Nuttall's woodpecker		Local SC	Suitable
Selasphorus rufus	Rufous hummingbird		Federal SC	Marginal
Elanus leucurus	White-tailed kite		Federal SC	Marginal
Athene cunicularia hypugea	Western burrowing owl		Federal SC	Marginal

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

Special-status Species	Common Name	Legal Status/ Federal State	Other Lists Federal/State/ CNPS	Habitat Quality
<b>Mammals</b>				
Myotis ciliolabrum	Small-footed myotis bat		Federal SC	Marginal
Myotis yumanensis	Yuma myotis bat		Federal SC	Marginal
Myotis elotis	Long-eared myotis bat		Federal SC	Suitable
Myotis volans	Long-legged myotis bat		Federal SC	Marginal

**Legal Status:** E = Endangered      R = Rare      T = Threatened      **Other Lists:** SC = Species of Concern

General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires 85% of the canopy to be retained. The submitted tree preservation plan indicated 53,855 square feet (1.23-acres) or 31% tree coverage on the 4.02-acre parcel. Up to 26, 266.68 square feet, (1.65-acres) or 15% of the tree canopy can be removed under this General Plan policy. The submitted tree preservation plan indicates 5,940 square feet (0.13-acres) or 11% of tree canopy removal for site development. The number and type of trees to be removed for site development include 1 Maple, 1 Juniper, 3 Walnut and 5 Ponderosa Pine. The number of trees removed is consistent with General Plan policy 7.4.4.4 for retention.

The developer shall comply with General Plan Policy 7.4.1.6 that future residential development shall avoid disturbance of the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.

Avoidance procedures as outlined in the Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. Complete avoidance (i.e., no adverse effects) may be assumed when a 100-foot (or wider) buffer is established and maintained around elderberry plants containing stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level. Firebreaks may not be included in the buffer zone. In buffer areas, construction-related disturbance should be minimized, and any damaged area should be promptly restored following construction. The USFWS must be consulted before any disturbance within the buffer area are considered. In addition, USFWS must be provided with a map identifying the avoidance area and written details describing avoidance measures.

**Protective Measures:**

- A. Fence and flag all areas to be avoided during construction activities. In areas where encroachment on the 100-foot buffer has been approved by USFWS, provide a minimum setback at least 20 feet from the dripline of each elderberry plant.
- B. Brief contractors on the need to avoid damaging the elderberry plants and the possible penalties for not complying with these requirements.
- C. Erect signs every 50 feet along the edge of the avoidance area with the following information: “This area is habitat of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, a threatened species, and must not be disturbed. This species is protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Violators are subject to prosecution, fines, and imprisonment.” The signs should be clearly readable from a distance of 20 feet, and must be maintained for the duration of construction.
- D. Instruct work crews about the status of the beetle and the need to protect its elderberry host plant.

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

**Restoration and Maintenance:**

Restore any damage done to the buffer area (area within 100 feet of elderberry plants) during construction. Provide erosion control and re-vegetate with appropriate native plants.

Buffer areas must continue to be protected after construction from adverse effects of the project. Measures such as fencing, signs, weeding, and trash removal are usually appropriate.

No insecticides, herbicides, fertilizers, or other chemicals that might harm the beetle or its host plant should be used in the buffer areas, or within 100 feet of any elderberry plant with one or more stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level.

The applicant must provide a written description of how the buffer areas are to be restored, protected, and maintained after construction is completed.

Mowing of grasses/ground cover may occur from July through April to reduce fire hazard. No mowing should occur within five (5) feet of elderberry plant stems. Mowing must be done in a manner that avoids damaging plants (e.g., stripping away bark through careless use of mowing/trimming equipment).

**Transplant Elderberry Plants that Cannot Be Avoided:**

Elderberry plants must be transplanted if they can not be avoided by the proposed project. All elderberry plants with one or more stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level must be transplanted to a conservation area, at USFWS's discretion, a plant that is unlikely to survive transplanting because of poor condition or location, or a plant that would be extremely difficult to move because of access problems, may be exempted from transplantation. In cases where transplantation is not possible the minimization ratios in Table 1 may be increased to offset the additional habitat loss.

Trimming of elderberry plants (e.g., pruning along roadways, bike paths, or trails) with one or more stems 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level, may result in take of beetles. Therefore, trimming is subject to appropriate minimization measures as outlined in Table 1 in the Biological Resources Evaluation Report USFWS "Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle."

**MONITORING:** Planning Services shall review the final map prior to recordation to ensure the placement of a 100-foot non-building setback buffer from the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle host plants is indicated and a notice of restriction has been recorded for parcels 3 and 4.

**Finding**

The employment of site-specific mitigations for the project, subject to the recommendations in the biological report and US Fish and Wildlife Service Conservation Guidelines will reduce the potential impacts of the otherwise possible significant impacts also listed in the recommendation section of this report to less than significant.

No Special-status plant species were found on site. For this "Biological" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-d. A cultural resources study was conducted for the subject property, October 2005. The report indicated that the existing single-family residential unit was a remodeled farmhouse that was constructed in the early 1900s. The remodeled house no longer resembles the farmhouse or any of its historic character. The conclusion of the report indicated that “no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts were discovered within the project area, nor were any significant historic buildings, structures, or objects. Therefore, no further cultural resource investigations are recommended.” (Cultural Resource Study of AP# 069-200-37, Historic Resource Associates, Oct. 2005).

As the likelihood of finding subsurface archaeological features or artifacts is very unlikely, during the course of any construction activities within the project area, if a previously unidentified or subsurface archaeological site or feature is discovered, work should stop at that location and a qualified cultural resource professional should be contacted to examine the discovery and determine its significance. In addition, California health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94, 5097.98 and 5097.99 require that if Native American human burials and skeletal remains are discovered inadvertently

1. During all grading and construction activities in the project area, an archaeologist or historian approved by the Planning Director shall be on-call. In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until the on-call archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. If the find is determined to be significant and authenticated, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item. Grading and construction activities may resume after appropriate measures are taken or the site is

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

determined not to be of significance. The project grading plans shall include this mitigation on the plans. The Planning Department shall review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

2. In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The project grading plans shall include this mitigation on the plans. The Planning Department shall review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

**Finding**

Based upon the archaeological survey report prepared for the site, it is determined that all feasible conditions have been incorporated in the project to reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance. For this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				<b>X</b>
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.				<b>X</b>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				<b>X</b>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				<b>X</b>
iv) Landslides?			<b>X</b>	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>	
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?				<b>X</b>

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as ground shaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
  - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
  - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.<sup>5</sup> No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.<sup>6</sup> There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There is a known fault within the project vicinity; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated near East Bear Mountain Fault Zone and located within the fault zone buffer area.
  - b. The project site is approximately 350-feet from the East Bear Mountain Fault zone. The 2004 General Plan EIR addressed seismic hazards. According to the draft EIR, “No active faults have been identified in El Dorado County.” “One fault, part of the Rescue Lineament-Bear Mountains fault zone, is classified as a well located late Quaternary fault (DOC 2000); therefore, it represents the only potentially active fault in the county.” The project site is not located within the area of this well located fault. However, future residential development will be required to comply with the latest adopted Uniform Building Codes regarding seismic loading.

Based on the USGS/CGS Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment (PSHA) Model, revised April 2003), the project site is located in less than 10% Pga (Peak Ground Acceleration) area. Ground motions (10% probability of being exceeded in 50-years) are expressed as a fraction of the acceleration due to gravity (g). (California Geological Survey).

---

<sup>5</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003*, p.5.9-29.

<sup>6</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

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

- c. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.<sup>7</sup>

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 50 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 50 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey.<sup>8</sup> While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located.<sup>9</sup> The project site where the existing dwelling units are located is relatively flat, while the rest of the property is comprised of rolling terrain; and based upon the soil survey and metamorphic rock comprising the site, there would be no risk of landslide. There would be no impact.<sup>10</sup>

The proposed parcel map is situated in an area subject to low to moderate groundshaking effects. The proposed project would not include uses that would pose any unusual risk of environmental damage either through the use of hazardous materials or processes or through structural design that could be subject to groundshaking hazard. There would be no significant impacts that could not be mitigated through proper building design, as enforced through the County building permit process, which requires compliance with the Uniform Building Code, as modified for California seismic conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During site grading and construction of any onsite and off site road improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

<sup>7</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)*, May 2003, p.5.9-5.

<sup>8</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map*, 2002. (<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha>)

<sup>9</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)*, May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.

<sup>10</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030)*, May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.



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

The slope map provided with the application indicated the following slopes and percentages of area on the property.

Slope Percentage	Area Sq. Ft.	Acres	Area Percentage
0-10%	68,129.16	1.56	39.08%
11-20%	66,646.80	1.53	38.20%
21-29%	31,284.84	0.72	17.94%
30-39%	6,991.59	0.16	4.01%
> 40%	1,338.47	0.03	0.78%

Average Slope: 13.62%

The project includes on-site construction activities for the future residential units and off-site road widening to meet El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards and for fire safe standards. The project is requesting a design waiver from the standard 101 B/C road standards width as addressed in the “Design and Improvement Standards Manual. Access to the site is provided from Running Deer Road which is paved. The on-site driveways to the individual residential units will be required to meet fire safe regulations, have a 15’ vertical clearance, and be capable of supporting a 40,000 lb. load.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the proposed project and has placed conditions of approvals onto the proposed parcel map. Impacts would be less than significant.

The El Dorado County Resource Conservation District reviewed the parcel map and did not raise any concerns.

- d. **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high.

The project site has been classified per the USDA Soil Survey as Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30% slopes. This soil is gently sloping to moderately steep. Outcrops of bedrock cover 5 to 25% of the surface. Permeability is moderate, surface runoff is slow to medium, and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. Capability unit VI-1 (18).

Sobrante silt loam, 3 to 15% slopes. This soil is gently sloping to strongly sloping. Permeability of this soil is moderate, surface runoff is slow to medium, and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. Capability unit IIIe-8(18).

Future residential development will be subject to the conditions placed by El Dorado County Department of Transportation for grading and from Building Services. Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. There would be no impact related to the existing septic system and future septic systems.

**Finding**

No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the proposed parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Geology and Soils” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Hazardous Substances.** No hazardous substances are involved with the parcel map. Temporary use of heavy equipment for road improvements will be required. A diesel fuel storage tank may be located on site for the heavy equipment. The potential storage and transport of diesel fuel in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment will require an approved hazardous material business plan issued from the El Dorado County

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

Environmental Management Department. Said hazardous material business plan will identify potential impacts to the environment and require mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Based on the amount of road improvements required and the duration of heavy equipment on site and off site to complete the road improvements, and that fuel storage will most likely not occur, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant with an approved hazardous materials business plan.

- b. **Creation of Hazards.** No.
- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>11</sup> There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There is no private airstrip(s) in the immediate vicinity that is identified on a U.S. Geological Survey Topography Map. There would be no impact.
- g. **Emergency Response Plan.** The parcel is accessed from Running Deer Road. Fire response and fire safety issues have been reviewed by the Rescue Fire Protection District. The Fire District will require a new fire hydrant and all future residential development to meet all of the California SRA Fire Safe Regulations and California Fire Code 2001 Edition as applicable. Based upon the conditions of approval for on-site and off-site improvements, there would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.
- h. **Fire Hazards.** The project site located in an area classified as having a high fire hazard.<sup>12</sup> The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan Policy 6.2.2.2 requires development in areas of high wildland fire hazard areas to provide and demonstrate that the area can be adequately protected from wildland fire hazard as demonstrated in a Fire Safe Plan prepared by a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) and approved by the local Fire Protection District and/or California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. General Plan Policy 6.2.3.2 requires the applicant to demonstrate that adequate access exists or can be provided to ensure that emergency vehicles can access the site and private vehicles can evacuate the area. General Plan Policy 6.2.4.1 requires discretionary development within high fire hazard areas to be conditioned to designate fuel break zones and comply with fire safe requirements to benefit the new and, where possible, existing development. As part of the conditions of approval for the parcel map, the applicants will be required to provide a new fire hydrant and improve portions of Running Deer Road. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

<sup>11</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), [http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese\\_List](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List), accessed September 23, 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004.

<sup>12</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.8-4.

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

**Finding**

No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical storm water pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

a & f. **Water Quality Standards.** The project is of limited scope and would not involve disturbance to water bodies, however will require public water service, and would therefore have no effect on surface or groundwater quantity or quality in the vicinity. The parcel map and future residential dwelling units will utilize septic systems and would not involve any uses that would generate wastewater. Therefore, there would be no impact on existing water quality standards.

b. **Groundwater.** The future residential development will require connections to public water. Therefore, there would be no impact on groundwater resources within the vicinity of the project site.

c. **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit storm water runoff and discharge from a site. The Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed project and finds that an erosion control plan is not warranted for the proposed parcel map. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** Based on current topography and slopes for the property, it appeared that no drainage corridors exist on the project site. The existing drainage most likely percolates into the ground onsite. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed parcel map project and has determined that drainage, erosion control and grading plans are not warranted. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e. **Storm Water Run-off.** Based on the soil types, surface runoff has been characterized as being slow to moderate. Erosion control plans have not been warranted at this time by the appropriate reviewing agencies. The proposed project would not involve any operations that would be a source of polluted water. Therefore, there would be no impact on drainage patterns, flooding, drainage systems, or water quality.

g, h, & i. **Flooding.** The level project site is situated in an area of undulating terrain at an elevation of approximately 1,150 feet above sea level. There are no 100-year flood hazard areas at or adjacent to the site. The site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is not in an area subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. There would be no impact.

**FIRM.** The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 725 C, last updated December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

**Finding**

No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Hydrology” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

<b>IX. LAND USE PLANNING.</b> <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;
- 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. **Established Community.** The project site is surrounded by residential uses and is located within Rescue’s Rural Center Boundary. The proposed parcel split, existing dwelling unit and future residential dwelling units would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact.

b. **Land Use Plan.** The parcel is zoned for Single Family Two-Acre Residential District (R2A) and allows single family residential use as well as a secondary residential unit. The combined project request is to rezone the R2A to R1A. To the north of the project site is predominantly zoned R20,000. The project site and three additional properties to the south are zoned R2A while the rest of the surrounding properties are zoned RE-5. The R20,000 and R2A parcels are within the Rural Center Boundary of Rescue and are designated Medium Density Residential (MDR). The remaining RE-5 zoned properties are out side of the Rural Center Boundary of Rescue and are designated Low Density Residential (LDR).

The requested rezone from R2A to R1A is consistent with the 2004 General Plan Policy for MDR and is considered a transition from R20,000 and R2A.

Since the proposed rezone is consistent with the MDR General Plan Designation and lands within the Rescue Rural Center Boundary, there would be no impact.

c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is located in an area identified as Important Biological Corridor (IBC) and within the Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2. Mitigation Area 2 means “lands outside of Mitigation Area 0 and 1 (areas inside the ecological preserve), but within the EID service area, excluding those parcels served by wells, shown officially on maps on file in the County Planning Services Department.” The biological report for the project site did not find special-status plant species and the proposal will

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

not conflict with the ecological preserve mitigation area established for the Pine Hill rare plants or red-legged frog core area. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

The proposed use of the land will be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan policies for residential uses. There will be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property. No significant impacts are expected. For this “Land Use” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> <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 & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present.<sup>13</sup> Approximately 0.5 miles to the north from the proposed parcel map is an MRZ-2-classified area<sup>14</sup>, (Weber Creek Quarry) and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.<sup>15</sup> There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect existing and proposed residential uses. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the proposed parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this “Mineral Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<sup>13</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.*

<sup>14</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.*

<sup>15</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.*

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-d. **Noise Standards.** The on-site construction activities and off-site road improvements would generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment, trucks, bulldozer) at a potentially significant level (greater than 60 dB L<sub>eq</sub> and 70 dB L<sub>max</sub> between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 GP table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in rural regions-construction noise). However, the site is located on a 4.02-acre parcel in a rural area with existing residential sensitive receptors located within the project vicinity. Construction operations for road improvements will require adherence to construction hours between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during weekdays and will require the heavy construction equipment to install the latest noise reduction technologies available. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant. The long-term noise impacts would be related to current vehicle traffic along Running Deer Road and Dunnings Road which would be under the maximum noise level thresholds in the 2004 General plan table 6-1 of 60 dB L<sub>dn</sub>/CNEL or less. The road improvement activities would occur weekdays during daylight hours and would not involve extensive use of heavy equipment that would be a substantial source of noise or vibration at the residence or adjacent residences. No known changes in traffic-generated noise levels along Running Deer Road will occur. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.



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

e & f. **Airport Noise.** The project site is not within the airport land use plan. There would be no aircraft-related noise impacts.

**Finding**

No impacts to noise are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth.** The project site is in an area zoned for residential use and is designated as Medium Density Residential land use under the 2004 General Plan and within the Rescue Rural Center boundary. The maximum allowable density is one dwelling unit per 1 to 5-acres and the population growth for the County has been analyzed within the 2004 General Plan EIR. The proposed parcel map will create four one-acre parcels consistent with both the General Plan and General Plan EIR. No further land division would occur without both a General Plan and Zoning amendment. Utility services are available at the project site. No housing or people would be displaced, however, improvements to the public water facilities will be required. There would be no impact.

The following table lists the recorded subdivisions along Dunnings Road and Running Deer Road with zoning designation, number of acres and residential densities. The table was created to assist in clarifying the net residential density along both roads that receive access onto Dunnings Road and Running Deer Road including the density increase from the proposed parcel map request. The table does not address potential future second residential dwelling units on each parcel.

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

Subdivision	Zoning	Acres	DU's/Acre	# of DU's
PM 45-114 (P94-24) west side-Dunnings Rd. (portion of PM 40-31)	R20K	2.0	1	2
PM 40-31 (P86-209) west side Dunnings Rd.	R20K	3.22	0.93	3
PM 33-16 (P83-02) west side Dunnings Rd.	R20K	6.34	0.63	4
Cavalry Meadows Subdivision (H-56) east side of Dunnings Rd.	R20K	11.56	0.86	10
PM 37-28 (P86-92) east side of Running Deer Rd. Parcels 2-4 receive access directly onto N. Shingle Rd. Parcel 1 directly accesses Running Deer Rd.	R2A	10.049	0.4	4
PM 46-102 (BLA 98-0003) both sides of Running Deer Rd.	RE-5	14.662	0.14	2
PM 29-70 (P79-459) both sides of Running Deer Rd.	RE-5	10.01	0.2	2
PM 35-144 (P85-24) east side of Running Deer Rd.	RE-5	13.47	0.22	2 with 1 2 <sup>nd</sup> DU. 3 total
<b>Total</b>		<b>71.31</b>	<b>0.547</b>	<b>30</b>
P05-0015/Z05-0010 (portion of PM37-28) east side of Running Deer Rd.	R2A to R1A	4.017	0.74	3
<b>Change</b>			<b>0.568</b>	<b>33</b>

- DU's = Dwelling Units
- Residential Density is calculated as the number of DU's divided by the number of acres.
- P05-0015 – parcel 1 of PM 37-28 has an existing house on the 4.02 ac.

The proposed parcel map will increase the number of dwelling units along Running Deer Road by three. (One existing dwelling unit to be replaced and three additional dwelling units added.) The change in dwelling units per acre if P05-0015 (combined with PM 37-28) is approved will be 0.02 du's/acre or doubling the current residential density from one dwelling unit per two acres to one dwelling unit per acre.

**Finding**

The project will not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed parcel split either directly or indirectly. For this "Population and Housing" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

**Fire Protection.** The parcel is within the Rescue Fire Protection District. The project site is approximately 1.2 miles from the Rescue Fire Protection District Station. General Plan Policy 5.1.2.2 indicates minimum levels of public services. Fire District response time in rural centers and regions is 15 to 45 minutes. The proposed parcel split is located within the minimum response time for rural regions and is consistent with this policy. As a condition of the parcel map will require a new fire hydrant to be installed, and future residential development will be subject to the Fire Safe Regulations and Fire Codes. The project will be conditioned to comply with Department of Transportation and Fire District requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection.** No new or expanded law enforcement services would be required. There would be no impact.

c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** The proposed parcel split is not located within existing Community Service Districts, however, is located within the Rescue Union School District Boundaries. Future residential development will be subject to school impact fees at time of building permit issuance. There are no components of the proposed project that would include any permanent population-related increases that would substantially contribute to increased demand on schools, parks, or other governmental services that could, in turn, result in the need for new or expanded facilities. There would be no impact.

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

**Finding**

As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-b. **Parks and Recreation.** The proposed parcel split will increase population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. In lieu park fees will be required to be collected as part of the map recordation process in accordance to Chapter 16 Sections 16.12.090(A-H) of the Subdivision Ordinance. The park in lieu fees will be used for park improvements within the County. There would be less than significant impact.

**Finding**

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Recreation” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> <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. **Capacity and Level of Service.** Running Deer Road and Dunnings Road are not listed in the 2004 General Plan for roads needing level of service improvements. General Plan Policy TC-Xd of the Transportation and Circulation Element addresses Level of Service (LOS) thresholds. For County maintained roads within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS D in Rural Regions. Policy TC-Xe: Worsen is defined as a 2% increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or the addition of 100 or more daily trips, or the addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.

In providing a cursory analysis on anticipated traffic impacts associated with the parcel map, staff reviewed traffic counts along the major roads in the vicinity and utilized national average vehicle trip rates. DOT conducts average daily vehicle trip (ADT’s) counts throughout the County. The national ADT standard for a single family residential unit is 10 vehicle trips per house. DOT collected vehicle trip rates for both rural area subdivisions and urbanized subdivisions and have indicated that a typical rural area subdivision ranges 8.3 to 12.2 trips per dwelling unit per

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

day. Based on the national ADT's, the proposed parcel map and future residential units would increase an average of 30 daily trips. (This calculation excludes the existing residential unit's national ADT average).

DOT vehicle count summary for August 23, 2005 for North Shingle Road 400-yards east of Ponderosa Road combined directions, is 8,662 ADT's. For North Shingle Road 100-feet south of Green Valley Road combined directions is 6,547 ADT's. The average weekly 8:00 a.m. peak hour trips along North Shingle Road 400-yards east of Ponderosa Road are 595. The average weekly p.m. peak hour trips are 708. The average weekly 8:00 a.m. peak hour trips 100-feet south of Green Valley Road is 471. The average weekly 6:00 p.m. peak hour trips are 554.

The vehicle count summary for July 14, 2005 for Green Valley Road 500-feet east of Deer Valley Road East - eastbound is 5,290 ADT's. For Green Valley Road 100-feet west of Greenstone Road - westbound are 4,273 ADT's. The average weekly 12:00 a.m. peak hour trips along Green Valley Road 500-feet east of Deer Valley Road East - eastbound are 154. The average weekly 6:00 p.m. peak hour trips are 316. The average weekly 12:00 a.m. peak hour trips 100-feet west of Greenstone Road westbound is 102. The average weekly 6:00 p.m. peak hour trips are 162.

Anticipated impacts from Green Valley Road and North Shingle Road onto Running Deer Road and Dunnings Road are unknown at this time without further traffic analysis.

Currently, 30 existing residential units are located along Dunnings Road and Running Deer Road minus 3 parcels that receive direct access onto North Shingle Road. Based on the national ADT of 10 trips per residential unit, approximately 270 average daily vehicle trips occur. With an additional 30 average daily vehicle trips from the proposed project, anticipated ADT's would be 300.

DOT has concluded that the proposed project will not increase traffic pursuant to General Plan Policy TC-Xe by 2% increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or the addition of 100 or more daily trips, or the addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour. Furthermore, Running Deer Road is not a county maintained road and not subject to the Circulation Policies found in the General Plan.

The number of vehicles associated with the parcel split would not substantially change current vehicle trip rates and would not measurably affect traffic volumes or levels of service on a permanent basis such that County standards would be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazards.** The project site is readily accessible from Ponderosa Road and Green Valley Road. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Emergency Access.** The project site receives access off Dunnings road and Running Deer Road which future residential development will require individual driveways onto Running Deer Road. Road improvements are required to increase the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to fire safe regulations and are being placed upon the conditions of approvals for the parcel map. Based upon the required road improvements there would be no disruption of emergency access to the project site or those in surrounding parcels. There would be no impact.

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

- f. **Parking.** No additional parking required for the existing residential units on the subject parcel. There would be no impact.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected because such features are not present at or adjacent to the project site. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				<b>X</b>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				<b>X</b>
h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.				<b>X</b>

**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;

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

- 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. **Wastewater.** The creation of four parcels with their own septic systems, would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. Storm water runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). There would be no impact.

b., d., e. **New Facilities.** The proposed parcel map will require public water. A 6-inch line exists in Running Deer Road and a 10-inch water line runs along the north property line of the project site. El Dorado Irrigation (EID) will require two additional equivalent dwelling units of water supply for the proposed project and will require hydraulic water pressure improvements to maintain minimum fire flows of 2,000 gallons per minute for a 2-hour duration.

The proposed project will require an additional fire hydrant and improved hydraulic water pressure. However pursuant to General Plan Policy 5.2.1.9, prior to the first grading permit or building permit is issued in connection with the approval, the applicant will have received sufficient water meters or a comparable supply guarantee to provide adequate water supply to meet the projected demand associated with the entire approval. There would be no impact.

c. **Storm Water Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the project proposal and has concluded that the provisions of the drainage manual will not be required. There would be no impact.

f & g. **Solid Waste.** No anticipated increases of solid waste generated from the existing residential units and proposed residential unit once the parcel is divided into two or affect recycling goals. There would be no impact.

h. **Power.** Power and telephone facilities are currently in place and utilized at the project site. Power and telephone connections will be required for each dwelling unit at time of occupancy. No further expansion of power or telephone facilities anticipated from proposed project. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

No significant utility and service system impacts are expected either directly or indirectly. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.



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

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

**Discussion**

- a. As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have no significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources as mitigated. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be no significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV).
- b. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant.
- c. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly.

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

**SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Biological Resources Evaluation Report for Parcel Number 069-200-37 prepared September 2005, Ruth Wilson, Consulting Biologist.

Cultural Resources Study for Parcel Number 069-200-37 prepared October 2005, Historic Resources Associates. On file in Planning Services Department.

Air Quality Impact Analysis for Running Deer Road - Rossi, prepared January 2006. Carlton Engineering Inc.

Wastewater Disposal Study for Parcel Number 069-200-37, prepared October 2005. Carlton Engineering Inc.