

(Addendum to 2006 Initial Study/Mitigated Neg Dec for WS Animal Shelter – 90600 P)

# CONTRACT ROUTING SHEET

**PROCESSING DEPARTMENT:**

Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dept. Contact: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department Head Transportation  
Signature: Janel Gifford  
x5974

**CONTRACTOR:**

**Addendum to 2006 Initial Study/Mitigated Neg Dec for West Slope Animal Shelter**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

*Janel Gifford (routing slip)*  
Janel Gifford, P.E.  
Office Engineer/Contract Services Unit

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

**CONTRACTING DEPARTMENT:** Transportation

Service Requested: Review and comment  
Contract Term: N/A Contract/Amendment Amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Compliance with Human Resources Requirements? Yes: X No: \_\_\_\_\_  
Compliance verified by: NA – Environmental Docs

**COUNTY COUNSEL:** (must approve all contracts and MOUs)

Approved: X Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 7/20/11 By: Paul J. Hunt  
Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_

Addendum to the 2006 Initial Study/MND for the Western Slope Animal Shelter.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED  
COUNTY COUNSEL  
01 JUN 22 AM 7:00

**Please return directly to DOT.**

Index Code: <u>303210</u>	User Code: <u>90600 P</u>
---------------------------	---------------------------

**RISK MANAGEMENT:** (All contracts and MOUs except boilerplate grant funding agreements)

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_

**NOT REQUIRED**

**OTHER APPROVAL** (Specify department(s) participating or directly affected by this contract).

Department(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED  
DOT  
20 JUL 15 PM 3:54

Addendum  
to the  
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration  
for the El Dorado County  
Western Slope Animal Shelter  
(SCH #2006092070)

Relocation of Access Road Alignment

El Dorado County, California

July 2011

## 1.1. Purpose of the Addendum

The El Dorado County Western Slope Animal Shelter Project and associated Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was approved by the Board of Supervisors in October, 2006. While the project remains the same, the access road from Pleasant Valley Road to the project site been relocated eastward. This Addendum is intended to provide additional information necessary to make the 2006 MND adequately apply to the project as modified. Any relevant information and analyses in the 2006 MND are briefly summarized or described, rather than repeated.

This document has been prepared to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (PRC §21000, et seq.). El Dorado County is the lead agency for the project for purposes of environmental review under CEQA.

### 15164. Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration

*(a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.*

*(b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.*

*(c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.*

*(d) The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.*

*(e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.*

Pursuant to §15164 (e) set forth above, the following is a brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent MND pursuant to §15162.

*(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:*

*(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*

Discussion: As demonstrated in the CEQA Checklist below no new significant environmental effects or increase in the severity of previously identified effects will occur as a result of the modifications to the project.

*(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or*

Discussion: As demonstrated in the attached CEQA Checklist, no substantial changes have occurred that require major revisions to the 2006 MND.

*(3) New information of substantial importance not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:*

*(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;*

*(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;*

*(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or*

*(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but project proponents decline to adopt mitigation measure or alternative.*


Discussion: As demonstrated in the attached CEQA Checklist, no new information occurred or was discovered as a result of this analysis and no new mitigation measures are warranted.

## **1.2. Project Background and Description**

This section describes the changes made to the Project Description.

On July 20, 2010, the Board of Supervisors directed DOT staff to return to the Board to re-establish the location of the access road to help accommodate surrounding land uses. The original project need, objectives, location, and existing environmental setting have not changed. As directed, DOT realigned the access road eastward resulting in a slight expansion of the original project area than originally analyzed. Figure 1 demonstrates the revised location of the access road compared to the original location, as well as the slight expansion of the temporary construction road easement, slope and drainage easements. This expanded project area also includes the encroachment necessary for access onto Pleasant Valley Road, pursuant to County encroachment standards, that was not within the 2006 IS/MND Project Description.

As shown on Figure 1, Road A extends from Pleasant Valley Road south to a hammerhead turnaround and to Road B. Road B turns eastward from Road A and ends in a cul-de-sac at the Animal Shelter property. Road A is proposed to be 40-feet wide and Road B is 36 feet.



- LEGEND**
- ORIGINAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY AREA
  - ARTIFICIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY AREA
  - ORIGINAL ROAD ALIGNMENT
  - REVISED ROAD ALIGNMENT

PROJECT SITE  
BOUNDARY

FIGURE 1

	<p><b>EL DORADO COUNTY</b> DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</p>	<p>ACCESS ROAD RELOCATION ADJACENT TO AIRMAIL SERVICES FACILITY M&amp;D</p>
<p>DATE: 10/20/11 BY: [Signature]</p>	<p>SHEET ES-1 1 of 1</p>	

## 1.4 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures from the 2006 ARE/MND are still applicable to the revised project. No additional mitigation measures are required. MM 3.4.2 is updated as reflected below to be consistent with the 2008 El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan.

**MM 3.3.1:** All grading activities shall comply with EDCAQMD's Best Management Practices (BMP's), sufficient to prevent visible emissions beyond the property lines of the project site, pursuant to EDCAQMD Rule 223. The El Dorado County AQMD shall be consulted, prior to finalization of the Dust Mitigation Plan, to ensure that all feasible measures deemed necessary to reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level have been incorporated.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION: Less than significant.

**MM 3.4.1** If proposed construction activities are planned to occur during the nesting seasons for local avian species (typically March 1st - August 31st), the County shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a focused survey for active nests of raptors and migratory birds within and in the vicinity of (no less than 100' outside project boundaries, where possible) the construction area no more than 30 days prior to ground disturbance or tree removal. If active nests are located during preconstruction surveys, USFWS and/or DFG shall be notified regarding the status of the nests. Furthermore, construction activities shall be restricted as necessary to avoid disturbance of the nest until it is abandoned or a biologist deems disturbance potential to be minimal (in consultation with USFWS and/or DFG). Restrictions may include establishment of exclusion zones (no ingress of personnel or equipment at a minimum radius of 100' around the nest) or alteration of the construction schedule. No action is necessary if construction will occur during the non-breeding season (generally September 1st through February 28th).

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION: Less than Significant

**MM 3.4.2 (Revised to reflect the 2008 El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan adopted to enforce General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and Policy 7.4.5.2(A).)** The County shall mitigate the removal of native oaks consistent with Policy 7.4.5.2 (A) and Policy 7.4.4.4 of the County General Plan. The replacement requirement shall be calculated based upon an inch for inch replacement of removed oaks. The total of replacement trees shall have a combined diameter of the tree(s) removed. Replacement trees may be planted onsite or in other areas to the satisfaction of the County Planning Department.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION: Less than Significant

**MM 3.4.3** The following protective measures are recommended to avoid damage during construction to trees proposed for preservation:

1) A circle with a radius measurement from the trunk of the tree to the tip of its longest limb shall constitute the dripline protection area of each tree. Limbs must not be cut back in order to change the dripline. The area beneath the dripline is a critical portion of the root zone and

defines the minimum protected area of each tree. Removing limbs that make up the dripline does not change the protected area.

- a) Temporary protective fencing shall be installed at least one foot outside the driplines of the protected trees prior to construction in order to avoid damage to the trees and their root systems. This fencing may be installed around the outermost dripline of clusters of trees, rather than individual trees. Fencing shall be shown all project plans.
  - b) No vehicles, construction equipment, mobile home/office, supplies, materials or facilities shall be driven, parked, stockpiled or located within the driplines of protected trees. A laminated sign indicating such shall be attached to fencing surrounding trees on-site.
  - c) No grading (grade cuts or fills) shall be allowed within the driplines of protected trees.
  - d) Drainage patterns on the site shall not be modified so that water collects or stands within, or is diverted across, the dripline of any protected tree.
  - e) No trenching shall be allowed within the driplines of protected trees. If it is absolutely necessary to install underground utilities within the dripline of a protected tree, the utility line shall be bored and jacked under the supervision of a certified arborist.
  - f) The construction of impervious surfaces within the driplines of protected trees shall be stringently minimized. When it is absolutely necessary, a piped aeration system shall be installed under the supervision of a certified arborist. Wherever possible, pervious concrete shall be used as an alternative to traditional concrete, when required under tree driplines.
  - g) No sprinkler or irrigation system shall be installed in such a manner that sprays water or requires trenching within the driplines of protected trees. An above ground drip irrigation system is recommended.
  - h) Landscaping beneath protected trees may include non-plant materials such as bark mulch or wood chips. The only plant species that shall be planted within the driplines of protected trees are those that are tolerant of the natural environs of the trees. Limited drip irrigation approximately twice per summer is recommended for the understory plants.
- 2) Any protected trees on the site, which require pruning, shall be pruned by a certified arborist prior to the start of construction work. All pruning shall be in accordance with the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A300 pruning standards and the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) "Tree Pruning Guidelines."
- 3) No signs, ropes, cables (except those which may be installed by a certified arborist to provide limb support) or any other items shall be attached to the protected trees.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION: Less than significant

**MM 3.8.1** Drainage and water quality facilities shall be constructed concurrent with site development activities. The drainage and water quality facilities shall comply with the standards established in the El Dorado County Drainage Manual and shall meet County requirements to ensure no increase in existing run-off volumes.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION: Less than significant

## CEQA Checklist

The following CEQA Checklist provides the supporting documentation demonstrating that no additional impacts or mitigation measures are required for the relocated access road related to the Western Slope Animal Shelter project

### CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project title:** ADDENDUM TO THE EL DORADO COUNTY ANIMAL SHELTER PROJECT INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

2. **Lead agency name and address:**

El Dorado County Department of Transportation  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667

3. **Contact person:** Janet Postlewait: (530) 621-5993: janet.postlewait@edcgov.us

4. **Project location:** South of the intersection of Pleasant Valley Road and Mother Lode Drive in the Township of El Dorado, which is located in the unincorporated area of El Dorado County

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

El Dorado County Department of Transportation  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667

6. **General plan designation:** Rural Residential (RR) and Commercial (C)

7. **Zoning:** Residential Agriculture 20-acre (RA-20) and General Commercial (CG)

8. **Description of project:** The Project will construct and operate an animal control facility for the western slope of El Dorado County. This Addendum addresses the eastward realignment of the access road to the animal shelter. The project is otherwise unchanged from the project set forth in Chapter 2 of the IS/MND approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2006.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The land surrounding the site primarily grazing land, with rural residential parcels, a storage facility and CDF Fire Station. Various other commercial facilities are located nearby along Pleasant Valley Road.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing, or participation agreement):** El Dorado Irrigation District; Diamond Springs Fire District.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this addendum:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and<br>Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/<br>Water Quality        | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |



**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation: (choose appropriate one)

- 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 on 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 other than this addendum to the 2006 Western Slope Animal Shelter Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

  
Signature

  
Date

Janet Postlewait  
Printed Name

El Dorado County Department of Transportation  
For

**CEQA Environmental Checklist**

**ADDENDUM TO THE 2006 EL DORADO COUNTY ANIMAL SHELTER IS/MND**  
**TO INCLUDE THE RE-ALIGNMENT OF THE ACCESS ROAD**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS:</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: a) through d): No additional impacts would occur with the re location of the access road than those identified in the original IS/MND. Therefore impacts remain less than significant impacts to aesthetics, light and glare.				
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation & Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by California Dept. of Conservation as model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: a) through c): The realignment of the access road further east would not result in any different impacts than those identified in the original IS/MND and therefore would result in no impacts to agricultural resources.				
<b>II. AIR QUALITY:</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Addendum to the 2006 *Western Slope Animal Shelter Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration*  
To include the Relocation of the Access Road Realignment

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable fed or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Create greenhouse gas emissions and contribute to global climate change   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The re-alignment of the access road slightly eastward would require implementation of existing 2006 mitigation measures. No additional impacts will occur, and no new mitigation measures are required.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, 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 DFG or U.S. F&WS. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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 CA DFG or USF&WS?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources e.g. tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) Conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: b-f) The expanded study area was surveyed for any wetlands, waters of the U.S, or any other biological impacts in June 2011. Trees that were proposed to be removed with the original road alignment will no longer be removed. Instead, any trees located within the new alignment will be removed to accommodate the revised road location. Additionally, since the approval of the 2006 MND, the County adopted the Oak Woodland Management Plan in 2008 to enforce General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 referenced in Mitigation Measure 3.4.2. As a result, MM 3.4.2 is updated as follows:

MM 3.4.2 The County shall comply with the El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan, May 2008 (OWMP), by mitigating for oak woodland canopy removed in accordance with either Option A (On-Site Mitigation, Replanting and Replacement), Option B (Conservation Fund In- Lieu Fee), or a combination of these.

No wetlands or Waters of the U.S. or migratory fish or wildlife exist within the new areas surveyed. No additional mitigation is required beyond that set forth in the original 2006 IS/MND and the updated version of MM3.4.2. All other existing mitigation still applies.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Addendum to the 2006 *Western Slope Animal Shelter Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration*  
To include the Relocation of the Access Road Realignment

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: In June 2010, a cultural resources records search at the North Central Information Center, located at Sacramento State University, was conducted by Schwitalla Consulting in support of the Western Slope Animal Shelter Project for El Dorado County. The expanded APE of the project area does not contain any previously recorded archaeological resources. This records search examined the inventory of previously recorded archaeology and built environment resources near the project property.

The area reviewed included a ½ mile radius beyond the boundaries of the Project Area. The literature review identified two previously recorded sites (APN 331-620-01 and 331-620-02) within a ¼ mile of the current project. However, these cultural resources are south and southwest of the current project and on an adjacent parcel that will not be impacted by the current project under consideration.

An intensive pedestrian survey of the project area was also conducted by Schwitalla Consulting in June 2011, using systematic transects 5 meters apart within the entire project area. The ground was closely examined for archaeological materials and features. Spoils from ground burrowing animal holes were also inspected for midden soil and artifacts. All boulders and bedrock within the project area that contained flat or near flat surfaces were scraped of leaves and debris with a trowel and inspected for possible bedrock mortars or milling surfaces. The pedestrian survey failed to identify any cultural resources within the expanded APE. No archaeological sites have been previously recorded within project area. No additional mitigation measures are required. Existing mitigation still applies.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the UBC (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: No additional impacts relative to geology and soils have been identified and no additional mitigation measures are required.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Gov. Code § 65962.5 and, result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a-d) The project would not involve routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Safety measures will be implemented to prevent accidental release of hazardous material if it were to occur,

e-f) the project is not located near an airport

g) The project will not impair implementation of or interfere with any adopted emergency response plan, nor will it create any additional risk of wildland fires.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., production rate of pre-existing nearby wells drop to a level that would not support existing or planned permitted land uses)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Addendum to the 2006 *Western Slope Animal Shelter Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration*  
To include the Relocation of the Access Road Realignment

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The re-alignment of the access road slightly eastward would require implementation of the same mitigation measures as those set forth and approved in the original IS/MND. No additional impacts will occur, and no new mitigation measures are required.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (i.e.: general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ord) adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The re-alignment of the access road slightly eastward would not result in any new impacts or require additional mitigation measures with regard to Land Use Planning.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state?                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

No known mineral resources are available on the site.

**XI. NOISE:** Would the project result in:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Addendum to the 2006 *Western Slope Animal Shelter Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration*  
To include the Relocation of the Access Road Realignment

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?

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 levels?

Discussion: The re-alignment of the access road slightly eastward does not result in any changes to the original analysis with regard to Noise. No additional impacts will occur, and no new mitigation measures are required.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:** Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g. extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion; The re-alignment of the access road slightly eastward does not result in any changes to the original analysis with regard to Population and Housing. No additional impacts will occur, and no new mitigation measures are required.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES:**

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of or 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:

Fire protection?

Police protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Other public facilities?

Discussion: All standards regarding public services will be adhered to. The re-alignment of the access road slightly eastward does not result in any changes to the original analysis with regard to Public Services. No additional impacts will occur, and no new mitigation measures are required.

**XIV. RECREATION:**

a) Would the project increase the use of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur?

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?

Discussion: This project will not affect recreation.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, volume to capacity ratio, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including increase in traffic levels or change in location resulting in safety risks?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The re-alignment of the access road slightly eastward is more conducive to efficient circulation and is therefore an improvement to the original alignment in terms of safety and traffic flow. No additional impacts will occur, and no new mitigation measures are required.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, that could cause or result in significant environmental effects?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The re-alignment of the access road slightly eastward does not result in any additional impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**



Addendum to the 2006 *Western Slope Animal Shelter Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration*  
To include the Relocation of the Access Road Realignment

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Cumulatively considerable means that incremental effects are considerable when viewed in connection with effects of past projects, effects of other current projects, and effects of probable future projects)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The re-alignment of the access road slightly eastward does not result in any additional impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.