NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FILE: TM08-1477-R

PROJECT NAME Ridgeview Village Unit No. 9

NAME OF APPLICANT: Pacific States Development

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 120-010-01 **SECTION:** 34 **T:** 10N **R:** 8E, MDM

LOCATION: The project is approximately 160 feet south from the intersection of Powers Drive and Beatty Drive, in the El Dorado Hills area.

☐ **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT:** **FROM:** **TO:**

☐ **REZONING:** **FROM:** **TO:**

☐ **TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP** ☒ **SUBDIVISION:** Revisions to the approved tentative Subdivision Map (see below)

SUBDIVISION (NAME): Ridgeview Village Unit No.9

☐ **SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW:**

☒ **OTHER:**

1) Addition of a Phasing Plan (two phases) in accordance El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinance Section 120.28.010 and Subdivision Map Act Section 66456.1 for financing and phasing purposes. Phase 1 consists of 21 residential lots and Phase 2 with 23 residential lots;
2) Re-alignment of the off-site sewer line through an off-site property APN 120-610-18; and
3) Revisions to and replacement of Condition of Approval Nos.7 through 9 with the provisions of the Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP) under El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.39 (Oak Resource Conservation).

REASONS THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

☒ **NO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS WERE IDENTIFIED DURING THE REVISED INITIAL STUDY.**

☐ **MITIGATION HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED WHICH WOULD REDUCE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.**

☐ **OTHER:**

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

This Negative Declaration was adopted by the _____on _____.

_____

Executive Secretary

EXHIBIT O

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

REVISED INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Project Title/Application No.: Ridgeview Village Unit No. 9/TM08-1477-R

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

Contact Person: Mel Pabalinas, Planning Manager | **Phone Number:** (530) 621-5363

Property Owner's Name and Address: Pacific States Development, 991 Governor Drive, Suite 103 El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Applicant's/Agent's Name and Address: Pacific States Development, 991 Governor Drive, Suite 103 El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Engineer's Name and Address: CTA Engineering and Surveying, 3233 Monier Circle , Rancho Cordova 95742

Project Location: The project is approximately 160 feet south from the intersection of Powers Drive and Beatty Drive in the El Dorado Hills, El Dorado County (Attachment 1)

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 120-010-01 (Attachment 2) | **Size:** 22.4 acres

Zoning: Single-Unit Residential (R1) (Attachment 4)

Section: 34 **T:** 10N **R:** 8E

General Plan Designation: High Density Residential (HDR) (Attachment 3)

Description of Project:
The project consists of the following revisions to the approved Ridgeview Village Unit No. 9 Tentative Subdivision Map:

1) Addition of a Phasing Plan (two phases) in accordance El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinance Section 120.28.010 and Subdivision Map Act Section 66456.1 for financing and phasing purposes. Phase 1 consists of 21 residential lots and Phase 2 with 23 residential lots;
2) Re-alignment of the off-site sewer line through an off-site property APN 120-610-18; and
3) Revisions to and replacement of Condition of Approval Nos.7 through 9 with the provisions of the Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP) under El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.39 (Oak Resource Conservation).

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The project site is within the El Dorado Hills Community Region. The site is the remaining undeveloped property within the existing Ridgeview Village development. As detailed in Table 1, the site is surrounded by existing residential development on all sides.

Table 1. Land Use Information

	General Plan	Zoning	Land Use/Improvements
Site	High Density Residential (HDR)	Single-Unit Residential (R1)	Undeveloped
North	Adopted Plan (Promontory Specific Plan)	Adopted Plan (AP-PSP)	Residential
South	High Density Residential (HDR)	Single-Unit Residential (R1)	Residential
East	High Density Residential (HDR)	Single-Unit Residential (R1)	Residential
West	High Density Residential (HDR)	One-Acre Residential/Planned Development (R1A-PD)	Residential

Briefly Describe the setting

The 22.4-acre property is located in the Community Region of El Dorado Hills near the western county border with the City of Folsom. The vacant site is surrounded by existing residential development in Ridgeview Village, Ridgeview West (Villadoro), and Promontory Village Specific Plan. The site is dominated by annual grassland mixed with oak woodland predominantly Blue Oaks and Live Oaks species. The site has an average elevation of 850 feet with the majority of the slopes below 30 percent. Portions of the site has been previously disturbed and improved (such as roads) in association with the original, expired tentative map and development of an adjacent village within the Promontory Specific Plan. A total 0.46 acre of wetland (0.25 acre of seeps and 0.21acre of channel) borders along the southern portion of the site. The current approved map includes provisions for buffer that would ensure protection of these wetland features.

Beatty Drive, a major residential collector in this residential area of El Dorado Hills, bisects the project site into two areas (northern and southern) and provides direct and indirect accesses to all of the proposed subdivision lots. Julie Ann Way, which minor residential road connects to Beatty Drive to the southeast, provides access to the southeastern portion of the subdivision.

The off-site portion of the project is located on a 7.98-acre parcel (APN 120-610-18), which is a designated as Open Space Lot B of the Ridgeview West (Villadoro) Tentative Subdivision and Planned Development that was approved in the 1996 (Attachment 5). The steep site, which range in elevation (west to east) from approximately 665 feet to 755 feet, contains variety of oak tree species mixed with California Buckeye. Portions of the site have been previously identified for disturbance associated with locating and construction of utility (such as sewer and water) connections in the surrounding development.

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

1. Planning and Building Department: Improvement Plan, Grading Permit, Final Map, Building Permits
2. Transportation Department: Improvement Plan, Grading Permit, Final Map, Building Permits, Encroachment Permit
3. El Dorado Irrigation District (EID): Facility Plan Report, Improvement Plan, Meter Award Letter
4. El Dorado Hills Fire Department: Improvement Plan, Building Permit
5. U.S. Army Corp of Engineer: Nationwide Permit (if needed)

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 and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		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: 9/18/19

Printed Name: Mel Pabalinas, Planning Manager For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Revised Initial Study for the proposed revisions to the approved Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 Tentative Subdivision Map has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) evaluating the potential environmental impacts resulting from the project proposal. As discussed below, the revisions do not affect the originally approved residential subdivision design, improvements, or lot quantity, but is limited to the addition a phasing plan for financing purposes, re-alignment of the approved off-site sewer line, and application of the oak resource impact mitigation in conformance with the Oak Resource Management Plan (ORMP). As such, the analysis is limited to select resource sections that correspond to the project that may potentially result in environmental effects, in particular, involving the construction of the off-site sewer line (except for Tribal Resources, which also includes analyses of the on-site residential subdivision). These sections include Aesthetics, Biology, Cultural Resources, Tribal Resources, and Utilities. Edits to these sections are reflected with double underlines (addition) and ~~strikethroughs~~ (deletion). The original Mitigation Measures BIO-4, 5 and 6 (Oak Resource Impacts) of the currently approved map, have been replaced with application of a standard condition of approval in compliance with the ORMP. The balance of the environmental analysis of other resource sections and Mitigation Measures, including Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and 2 for Air Quality Construction Impacts, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 through 3 for Biological (Raptor, Migratory Bird, Wetland) Impacts, in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study remains applicable to this proposed project. A copy of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration, based on the Initial Study for the original approved project, is attached as Attachment 6.

This revised study also references the adopted Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the Ridgewest Village, an existing residential development adjacent to the project to the west. This development contains the property through which the off-site sewer line is proposed. The applicable information from this Negative Declaration/Initial Study on the proposed project involves Cultural Resource and Biological (oak trees).

Background

Ridgeview Village No.9 is the last phase of the series of villages in Ridgeview Village development. The original map for the site was approved in the late 1980's under application Tentative Subdivision Map application TM88-1125 but was never developed or recorded and eventually expired. Under Tentative Subdivision Map application TM08-1477, Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 Tentative Subdivision Map was conditionally approved by the Planning

Commission on July 11, 2013 and has a current expiration date of July 11, 2024 (Attachment 7). A Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted with the approved map and its mitigation measures incorporated as conditions of approval.

The current approved tentative subdivision map would divide the 22-acre property into a residential subdivision totaling 44 R1-zoned lots ranging in size from 12,004 to 51,257 square feet. No specific phasing plan was originally approved with the map. The project's oak tree impacts was based on the previous oak tree preservation/replacement standards under Option A of Policy 7.4.4.4 and its Interim Interpretive Guideline of the 2004 General Plan that was in effect at that time. These standards have since been superseded and implemented by the Oak Resource Management Plan (ORMP), which is codified under Chapter 130.39 (Oak Resource Conservation) of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, the map features an off-site sewer line through an adjacent, privately owned and maintained Open Space Lot B (APN120-610-18) as part of Ridgeview West (Villadoro), which was approved in 1996. Specifically, impacts to oak trees on this off-site property were subject to the Oak Canopy Retention/Replacement provisions from the 1996 General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4.

Project Description

1. Addition of Phasing Plan

In accordance with El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinance Section 120.28.010 and Subdivision Map Act Section 66456.1, a Phasing Plan is proposed to supplement the approved Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 tentative subdivision map for phasing and financing purposes (Attachment 8). Phase 1 of the development would encompass a total of 23 residential lots and Phase 2 with 21 lots. This Phasing Plan would coincide with the sanitary sewer shed plan for the development with Phase 1 proposing to connect to an existing sewer connection along Via Fiori, a minor residential road that serves Ridgeview West and connects to Beatty Drive, while Phase 2 would be served by an off-site sewer connection to the west. The phasing plan may be further implemented with the creation of large lots through the Final Map process, creating two large lots, which could then implement the creation of the residential lots through a subsequent small-lot Final Map.

2. Re-alignment Off-Site Sewer Line

The project includes a proposal to re-align the off-site sewer line for the approved Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 tentative subdivision map. As shown in Attachment 9, the approved off-site sewer line, which is approximately 592 feet in total length, originates from Beatty Drive via an easement between Lots 498 and 499 extending directly and linearly due west through the off-site property (APN 120-610-18) into an existing sewer manhole. This off-site sewer line would utilize a gravity force system design.

The revised sewer infrastructure would accommodate a 6-inch sewer line in a meandering configuration (Attachment 10). Construction of this realigned sewer line, which is approximately 1,270 linear feet, would be confined within a 20-foot wide easement and consists of 2-foot wide underground trench and 12-foot wide paved maintenance access road. The resulting ground disturbance is estimated to be approximately 1.20 acres and would involve the removal of oak trees, which is further discussed below. The location and configuration of this sewer line in consistent with the alignment approved by El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) and would connect to the lines currently serving the development in the Promontory Village Specific Plan. The applicant has secured a written consent from the Homeowner's Association of Ridgeview West/Villadoro development for locating and constructing the proposed sewer infrastructure. The approved sewer design and improvements within the residential subdivision remains unchanged, which is depicted in Attachment 7.

3. Revision to Condition of Approval Nos. 7 and 8 (Oak Tree Impacts)

The project includes a request to apply the current provisions of the Oak Resource Management Plan (ORMP) for mitigating impacts to the existing oak woodland on-site (residential subdivision area) and off-site (sewer line) through lot APN 120-610-18. The approved tentative subdivision map was designed in conformance with the oak tree canopy retention/replacement standards under Option A of Policy 7.4.4.4 of the 2004 General Plan and its Interim Interpretive Guideline that was in effect at that time of approval. The currently approved map's oak resource impact consists of 4.29 acres of impacted canopy within the residential subdivision area and 0.07 acre of canopy within the off-site area (Attachment 11). This previous policy standard did not provide an option for mitigating oak resource impact through payment of in-lieu fee. Accordingly, Condition of Approval Nos. 7 [illegible] were

Mitigation Measures MM BIO-4, 5, and 6 from the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the approved project, were applied requiring the submittal of a Final Oak Tree Preservation Plan and Conservation Easement for the impacted oak resources. Applying the current provisions of the ORMP, which is codified under Chapter 130.39 (Oak Resource Conservation) of the Zoning Ordinance, provides options for mitigating for oak resource impacts, including payment of an in-lieu fee, and flexibility in the design and development of the subdivision.

The project's oak woodland impacts and mitigation efforts are summarized in the Arborist Report, which was prepared in accordance with the provisions of the ORMP (Attachment 12). Within the on-site residential subdivision area portion of the project, a total oak woodland area of 20.66 acres was identified, consisting of 39 trees measuring 24 inches in diameter or greater and three (3) trees measuring 36 inches or greater, which are considered Heritage trees per the ORMP. Implementation of the project would impact 13.25 acres of the woodland, which equates to 64% of the oak woodland area, while preserving the remaining 7.41 acres. Per the ORMP, the required mitigation ratio for the project's impact is 1.5:1 equating to 19.88 acres (13.25 acres multiply by 1.5). The three Heritage trees consists of two trees, Tree Nos. 909 and 917, which are in poor condition, are not proposed to be removed, but may be pruned, while Tree No. 164 was determined to be dead, but could be removed or managed for a habitat tree. If removed no mitigation was recommended by the Arborist.

The applicant's proposed mitigation for the on-site oak resource impacts consists of one of the following options: 1) a combination of off-site conservation easement and partial payment of in-lieu fee for oak woodland impact; or 2) full payment in-lieu fee. The conservation easement component of the combined mitigation option consist of preserving a 9-acre area of the existing woodland on off-site parcel identified as APN 120-166-29 located east of Ridgeview Drive and south of Patterson Way in El Dorado Hills. The parcel, which is owned by the applicant, is part of and surrounded by an existing residential development in Ridgeview Village Unit No.1. The site includes a variety of oak tree species such as Valley Oak, Live Oak mixed with California Buckeye and Gray Pines. The partial in-lieu fee payment portion consist of the remaining 10.88 acres multiplied by the per acre cost of $8,285.00 in the ORMP, equating to approximately $90,140.88. The full in-lieu payment based on the total impacted area of 19.88 acres is $164,664.00.

The Arborist Report also preliminarily analyzed the oak resource impacts within the off-site (sewer line) portion of the project through APN 120-610-18 (Attachment 10). Despite the constraints associated with the steep terrain of the property and meandering configuration of the easement, the report identified a total of 12 oak trees, measuring 24 inches in diameter or greater, within the easement of the sewer line. No heritage trees were identified within the impacted area. Given that the final sewer design plan is subject to EID's formal approval, the tentative subdivision map, in accordance with Chapter 130.39.070.C (Oak Tree and Oak Woodland Removal Permit-Discretionary Projects-Mitigation Requirement) shall be conditioned to submit a Final Arborist Report further analyzing the extent of the impacted oak resources associated with the off-site sewer infrastructure and identifying the appropriate mitigation in accordance with the ordinance. The report shall also include the final plan detailing the selected option for the impacted oak resource within the residential subdivision area. The report shall be submitted prior to approval of subdivision Improvement Plans

As discussed above, the project's oak impacts were also compared with the approved Ridgeview West oak resource preservation plan. Based on the Off-Site Sewer Analysis prepared by the applicant (Attachment 13), the project's oak resource impacts is below the oak canopy removal approved for Ridgeview West, and is therefore consistent with the oak canopy retention/replacement standards for the development.

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. 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.

6. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

7. 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.

8. 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.

Initial Study Schedule

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 conclusion of the 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.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	~~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	

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal regulations are applicable to aesthetics in relation to the proposed project.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

In 1963, the California State Legislature established the California Scenic Highway Program, a provision of the Streets and Highways Code, to preserve and enhance the natural beauty of California (Caltrans, 2015). The state highway system includes designated scenic highways and those that are eligible for designation as scenic highways.

There are no officially designated state scenic corridors in the vicinity of the project site.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The County has several standards and ordinances that address issues relating to visual resources. Many of these can be found in the County Zoning Ordinance (Title 130 of the County Code). The Zoning Ordinance consists of descriptions of the zoning districts, including identification of uses allowed by right or requiring a special-use permit and specific development standards that apply in particular districts based on parcel size and land use density. These development standards often involve limits on the allowable size of structures, required setbacks, and design guidelines. Included are requirements for setbacks and allowable exceptions, the location of public utility distribution and transmission lines, architectural supervision of structures facing a state highway, height limitations on structures and fences, outdoor lighting, and wireless communication facilities.

Visual resources are classified as 1) scenic resources or 2) scenic views. Scenic resources include specific features of a viewing area (or viewshed) such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. They are specific features that act as the focal point of a viewshed and are usually foreground elements. Scenic views are elements of the broader viewshed such as mountain ranges, valleys, and ridgelines. They are usually middle ground or background elements of a viewshed that can be seen from a range of viewpoints, often along a roadway or other corridor.

A list of the county's scenic views and resources is presented in Table 5.3-1 of the El Dorado County General Plan EIR (p. 5.3-3). This list includes areas along highways where viewers can see large water bodies (e.g., Lake Tahoe and Folsom

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

Reservoir), river canyons, rolling hills, forests, or historic structures or districts that are reminiscent of El Dorado County's heritage.

Several highways in El Dorado County have been designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic highways or are eligible for such designation. These include U.S. 50 from the eastern limits of the Government Center interchange (Placerville Drive/Forni Road) in Placerville to South Lake Tahoe, all of SR 89 within the county, and those portions of SR 88 along the southern border of the county.

Rivers in El Dorado County include the American, Cosumnes, Rubicon, and Upper Truckee rivers. A large portion of El Dorado County is under the jurisdiction of the USFS, which under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act may designate rivers or river sections to be Wild and Scenic Rivers. To date, no river sections in El Dorado County have been nominated for or granted Wild and Scenic River status.

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

a. **and c. Scenic Vista and Visual Character:** The site is not located in any areas identified as scenic or containing visual significance. The project site is surrounded by existing residential development in the community of El Dorado Hills. The proposed subdivision would conform to the design and density of the surrounding neighborhood. ~~No significant impact.~~

Construction of the off-site sewer line would result ground disturbance of a property designated as Open Space Lot B of the Ridgeview West development, which borders the project site to the west. Similarly, this property is not identified as scenic or contains visual significance; however, oak trees have been identified for removal as part of the approved development. These oak trees part of the oak woodland area located on the western slope side of this ridge that compliments the residential development in the area. As discussed above and below, with a more defined utility plan associated the proposed project, the impacted oak trees has been determined to be consistent with approved canopy removals for Ridgeview West development and would be mitigated based on the ORMP standards applied as a condition of approval of the project. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

b. **Scenic Resources and Historic Buildings.** The site is currently vacant. There are no significant existing cultural or historical resources on-site as described in the Cultural Resource Report. As discussed in Section IV *Biological Resources*, ~~4.29~~ 13.25 acres of the existing ~~14.37~~ 20.66 acres oak woodland would be impacted with implementation of the on-site subdivision portion of the project. The off-site sewer line construction would also result in the removal of 12 oak trees. These anticipated impacted trees would be mitigated with application of the ORMP standards via a condition of approval in accordance with the implementing standards codified under Chapter 130.39 (Oak Resource Conservation) of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. ~~A Tree Preservation Plan for Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 has been prepared to mitigate the canopy impacts in accordance with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A and its Interim Interpretive Guideline. Mitigation Measures BIO-3 through 5 shall be implemented in order to mitigate the identified impacts.~~ Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

d. **Light and Glare**. Common residential lighting and glare effects would blend and conform to the existing residential development in the area. Though insignificant, lighting effects, such as patio and garage entrance lights, would minimized via shielding provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and use of low intensity type of lighting. Proposed landscaping and retained oak tree canopy would provide additional shielding of the glare. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

FINDING: For this "Aesthetics" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by California Department of forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forrest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
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. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal regulations are applicable to agricultural and forestry resources in relation to the proposed project.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), administered by the California Department of Conservation (CDC), produces maps and statistical data for use in analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources (CDC 2008). FMMP rates and classifies agricultural land according to soil quality, irrigation status, and other criteria. Important Farmland categories are as follows (CDC 2013a):

Prime Farmland: Farmland with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long-term agricultural production. These lands have the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. Prime Farmland must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the 4 years before the FMMP's mapping date.

Farmland of Statewide Importance: Farmland similar to Prime Farmland, but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture. Farmland of Statewide Importance must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the 4 years before the FMMP's mapping date.

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

Unique Farmland: Farmland of lesser quality soils used for the production of the state's leading agricultural crops. These lands are usually irrigated but might include non-irrigated orchards or vineyards, as found in some climatic zones. Unique Farmland must have been cropped at some time during the 4 years before the FMMP's mapping date.

Farmland of Local Importance: Land of importance to the local agricultural economy as determined by each county's board of supervisors and a local advisory committee.

California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act)

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (commonly referred to as the Williamson Act) allows local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of preventing conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses (CDC 2013b). In exchange for restricting their property to agricultural or related open space use, landowners who enroll in Williamson Act contracts receive property tax assessments that are substantially lower than the market rate.

Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act

Logging on private and corporate land in California is regulated by the 1973 Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act. This Act established the Forest Practice Rules (FPRs) and a politically-appointed Board of Forestry to oversee their implementation. The California Department of Forestry (CALFIRE) works under the direction of the Board of Forestry and is the lead government agency responsible for approving logging plans and for enforcing the FPRs.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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-e. **Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.** The site is not identified to be within any mapping associated for farmland or lands containing prime farmland. No impact.

Williamson Act Contract. The property is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract nor is agriculturally zoned. The rezone would maintain the residential use of the property consistent with the High Density Residential land use designation. No impact.

Non-Agricultural Use. No conversion of agriculture land would occur as a result of the project. No impact.

Loss of Forest land or Conversion of Forest land. No forest land exists on site. No impact.

Conversion of Prime Farmland or Forest Land. No prime farmland exists on site. No impact.

FINDING: For this "Agriculture" category, there would be no impact.

III. AIR QUALITY. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X		
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The Clean Air Act is implemented by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and sets ambient air limits, the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), for six criteria pollutants: particulate matter of aerodynamic radius of 10 micrometers or less (PM10), particulate matter of aerodynamic radius of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM2.5), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), ground-level ozone, and lead. Of these criteria pollutants, particulate matter and ground-level ozone pose the greatest threats to human health.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) sets standards for criteria pollutants in California that are more stringent than the NAAQS and include the following additional contaminants: visibility-reducing particles, hydrogen sulfide, sulfates, and vinyl chloride. The proposed project is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin, which is comprised of seven air districts: the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (AQMD), Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), Amador County APCD, Calaveras County APCD, the Tuolumne County APCD, the Mariposa County APCD, and a portion of the El Dorado County AQMD, which consists of the western portion of El Dorado County. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District manages air quality for attainment and permitting purposes within the west slope portion of El Dorado County.

USEPA and CARB regulate various stationary sources, area sources, and mobile sources. USEPA has regulations involving performance standards for specific sources that may release toxic air contaminants (TACs), known as hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) at the federal level. In addition, USEPA has regulations involving emission criteria for off-road sources such as emergency generators, construction equipment, and vehicles. CARB is responsible for setting emission standards for vehicles sold in California and for other emission sources, such as consumer products and certain off-road equipment. CARB also establishes passenger vehicle fuel specifications.

USEPA and CARB designate regions as "attainment" (within standards) or "nonattainment" (exceeds standards) based on their respective ambient air quality standards. The County is in nonattainment of both federal and state ozone standards and for the state PM10 standard, and is in attainment or unclassified status for other pollutants (California Air Resources Board 2017).

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

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDCAQMD) is responsible for developing and administering programs to reduce air pollution levels below the health-based ambient air quality standards established by the state and federal governments. EDCAQMD is responsible for enforcing district rules, regulating stationary source emissions, approving permits, maintaining emissions inventories, issuing burn permits, administering grant programs, and reviewing air quality-related sections of environmental documents required to comply with CEQA. EDCAQMD regulates air quality through the federal and state Clean Air Acts, district rules, and its permit authority.

EDCAQMD has developed a Guide to Air Quality Assessment (2002) to evaluate project specific impacts and help determine if air quality mitigation measures are needed, or if potentially significant impacts could result. The Guide provides quantitative and qualitative significance criteria for both construction and operational emissions from a project.

A project would have a significant impact on air quality if quantified emissions exceed the following:

- Emissions of ROG and NO_x will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day;
- Emissions of PM_{10}, CO, SO_2 and NO_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

A project would have a significant impact on air quality if a qualitative analysis indicates:

- The project triggers any of the air quality significance criteria in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.
- The project results in excessive odors, as defined under the Health & Safety Code definition of an air quality nuisance.
- The project results in land use conflicts with sensitive receptors, such as schools, elderly housing, hospitals or clinics, etc.
- The project, as proposed, is not in compliance with all applicable District rules and regulations.
- The project does not comply with U.S. EPA general and transportation "conformity" regulations.

A project would have a cumulatively significant impact if:

- The project requires a change in the land use designation (e.g., general plan amendment or rezone) that increases ROG and NOx emissions compared to the prior approved use, and the increase in emissions exceeds the "project alone" significance levels shown above for ROG or NOx.
- Project CO emissions, if combined with CO emissions from other nearby projects, result in a "hotspot" that violates a state or national AAQS.
- The project is primarily an industrial project and a modeling analysis indicates that the project's impacts would exceed Class III Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) increments (Class II in Lake Tahoe) for PM10, SO2, or NO2; or, the project is primarily a development project, and the emissions of ROG, NOx, or CO exceeds the "project alone" significance criteria for those three pollutants noted above.
- The project causes the risk analysis criteria above for "project alone" Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) to be exceeded when project emissions of TACs are considered in conjunction with TACs from other nearby projects.

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

For Fugitive dust (PM10), if dust suppression measures will prevent visible emissions beyond the boundaries of the project, further calculations to determine PM emissions are not necessary. All proposed development must comply with District Rule 223-1 Fugitive Dust.

Naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) is also a concern in El Dorado County because it is known to be present in certain soils and can pose a health risk if released into the air. The AQMD has adopted an El Dorado County Naturally Occurring Asbestos Review Area Map that identifies those areas more likely to contain NOA (El Dorado County 2005). All proposed development in a NOA area must comply with District Rule 223-2 Fugitive Dust – Asbestos Hazard Mitigation.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);

- Emissions of PM_{10}, CO, SO_2 and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or

- Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.

An air quality analysis has been prepared by Tim Rimpo and Associates evaluating the potential impacts to air quality with project implementation. The study evaluates impacts from the anticipated generated emissions associated with the construction associated with grading, building, and paving of the development and the operation of the proposed residential uses (such as vehicular use) in accordance with the applicable regulations. The study also evaluated the potential presence and development effects from asbestos. The analysis below provides the results of the study. Though the study is outdated and reduction of lot count, based on the review and determination by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD), the District concluded that the analysis, results, and recommended measures to mitigate the identified project impacts to be adequate and supportable.

a. **Air Quality Plan.** El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NOx, and O3). Any activities associated to the grading and construction of this project would pose a less than significant impact on air quality because the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) would require implementation of Fugitive Dust Mitigation (FDM) plan during grading and construction activities. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions, anticipated to be below a level of significance.

b. **Air Quality Standards.** The project would generate emission which may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction. Construction activities associated with the project include site grading improvements and building construction. The following discussion relates to the potential air quality effects from implementation of the project.

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

- Construction Dust Threshold

Construction-related emissions are generally short term in duration, but may still cause adverse air quality impacts. Inhalable Particulate Matter PM10 (particles less than 10 microns in diameter) is the pollutant of greatest concern with respect to construction activities. PM10 emissions can result from a variety of construction activities, including excavation and grading. Because PM2.5 air quality standards are relatively recent, the EDCAQMD's Guide to Air Quality Assessment (El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District 2002) focuses on PM10 rather than PM2.5.

According to the guide, mass emissions of PM10 fugitive dust need not be quantified, and may be assumed not significant, if the project includes mitigation measures that will prevent visible dust beyond the property lines. However, without mitigation, uncontrolled fugitive dust would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation measures can reduce fugitive dust emissions by approximately 50-75%. Because the proposed project does not include the implementation of PM10 construction mitigation measures, construction emissions could have a potentially significant temporary air quality impact. The construction activities associated with site construction would generate PM10 dust emissions that could exceed either the state or federal ambient air quality standards for PM10. This would be a potentially significant impact during construction. Implementation of the following mitigation measure will reduce emissions to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure MM AIR-1: The applicant shall implement EDCAQMD's Rule 223-1 regulations.

Method of Verification: Incorporate as Notes on Improvement Plan and Grading Plan

Monitoring Requirement: Prior to Approval of Improvement Plan and Issuance of Grading Permit

Monitoring Agency: Air Quality Management District (AQMD) and Planning Services

- Construction-Related Asbestos Dust

Certain areas of El Dorado County contain ultramafic rocks and faults where serpentine rock and naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) can occur. Any project that is located in an area that includes ultramafic rock, which often contains NOA, could potentially release asbestos during construction. When this rock is broken or crushed, asbestos may be released and become airborne, causing a potential health hazard. Consequently, any project located in an area of known ultramafic rock is considered potentially significant with respect to the release of asbestos during construction.

Construction of the proposed project would involve grading, excavating, and trenching. The proposed project is located at the edge of areas with potentially occurring NOA according to the Asbestos Review Map of El Dorado County Western Slope. Development impacts could be considered significant; however, in the event that NOA is found on the project site during construction, compliance with the mitigation measure below will reduce the exposure of workers and residents living in the project vicinity to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure AIR-2: The applicant shall implement EDCAQMD's Rule 223-2 regulations.

Method of Verification: Incorporate as Notes on Improvement Plan and Grading Plan
Monitoring Requirement: Prior to Approval of Improvement Plan and Issuance of Grading Permit

Monitoring Agency: Air Quality Management District (AQMD) and Planning Services

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

- Construction-Related Criteria Pollutant

The EDCAQMD has established maximum daily and construction period diesel fuel use thresholds designed to ensure that criteria pollutant emissions are less than the mass emission significance thresholds. A project's emissions of all criteria pollutants are deemed to be less than significant if its maximum daily fuel use is less than 337 gallons diesel fuel used for all equipment of 1995 model year or earlier or 402 gallons per day for all equipment of model year 1996 or later. Table 3 (Page 12) of the Air Quality Analysis shows estimates of the quantity of diesel fuel that would be consumed during project construction. The project would increase diesel fuel use by a maximum of 336 gallons per day (during site grading) and 20,307 gallons over the construction period. This increase in diesel combustion would result in insignificant generation of ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 combustion emissions. No mitigation is required.

- Operational Ozone Precursor

The EDCAQMD has established significance thresholds of 82 pounds per day for Reactive Organic Gas (ROG) and Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) associated with project operation. Emissions from sources that are below these levels are considered less than significant. The URBEMIS 2007 model (appendix in Air Quality Analysis) was used to estimate the increase in ROG and NOx emissions. Table 4 (page 14) of the Air Quality Analysis shows the estimated increase in ROG and NOx associated with project operations for the summer and winter periods. On-road operational emissions are based on the trip generation rates provided in the traffic impact analysis. Winter emissions are higher because of area source emissions, especially those associated with fuel combustion from wood stoves and fireplaces.

Project operations will generate vehicle trips traveling to and from the proposed project along with area source emissions associated with water and space heating, landscape maintenance, and consumer products. These emission sources will generate emissions of the ozone precursors, ROG and NOx. However, as shown in Table 4, the emissions of ROG and NOx would be less than the significance thresholds established by the EDCAQMD. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

For the other criteria pollutants, CO SO_2, NO_2, and PM_{10} significance is based on whether a project would cause or contribute to violations of the California or federal ambient air quality standards. However, if a project's ROG or NOx emissions are below the 82 pounds per day thresholds, then the project's emission impacts of CO, SO2, NO2, and PM10 are also considered less than significant. Based on less than significant effects from ROG and NOx, the anticipated emissions from CO, SO_2, NO_2 and PM_{10} are also less than significant.

The EDCAQMD has identified the following criteria to be used in determining whether a land use project has a potentially significant Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) impact:

- the project generates heavy duty truck trips (from project operations) of 10 or more per day.
- the project uses more than 3,700 gallons of diesel fuel during construction if toxic-best available control technology (T-BACT) is not applied or 37,000 gallons if T-BACT is applied.

The residential project is unlikely to generate heavy-duty truck trips. The evaluation of construction related TAC emissions found that, with implementation of T-BACT, construction emissions of TAC would be less than significant.

c. **Cumulative Impacts.** Based on the insignificant project specific emission impacts from Ozone Precursors, Carbon Monoxide, Particulate Matter (PM 10), Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2), and Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) discussed above, the project's cumulative operational and area emissions impacts are considered less than significant.

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

d. **Sensitive Receptors.** CEQA Guidelines identifies sensitive receptors as facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others that are especially sensitive to the affects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools and convalescent hospitals are examples of sensitive receptors. There are no hospitals or convalescent hospitals in the immediate area. The proposed residential subdivision would conform to the existing use in the immediate area.

Standard AQMD Rules 214 (Architectural Coatings), 223.1 (Fugitive Dust-Construction, Bulk Material Handling, Blasting, Other Earthmoving Activities and Carryout and Trackout Prevention), 224 (Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials), 300 (Open Burning), Fugitive Dust Plan, as well as implementing typical conditions for the development of the site as it relates to pollutant concentrations based on Environmental Management rules, regulations, and standards, would be required to be implemented during project development. Implementation of these AQMD standards and mitigation measures above, and adherence to County Codes required during the site grading, encroachment, and building permit processes, the proposed project is not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

e. **Objectionable Odors.** Residential use is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County AQMD CEQA Guide. The proposed project is not anticipated to create significant levels of odors as measured with current standards. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

FINDING: The proposed project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The project would result in insubstantial increase in emissions due to construction and operation. Standard conditions of approval, as required by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) shall be required of the project. As such, the project would create less than significant impacts in this category if the identified mitigation measures are implemented.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
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		

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:

- Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS;
- Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS;
- Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means;
- 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;
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; and
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional or state

The site is dominated primarily by foothill oak woodland, which consists of live oak, blue oak and valley oak, with a mixture of herbaceous understory such as soft chess and dog tail. These communities provide potential habitat to a number of common species of wildlife and may provide suitable habitat for breeding, foraging, and shelter habitat for several species of wildlife. Species observed or expected to occur in this habitat include silver-haired bat, Cooper's hawk, and tricolored blackbird. None of the Pine Hill rare plants indigenous to the County have been identified in the project area.

The existing oak woodland canopy encompasses ~~14.37 13.25 acres of the~~ ~~22.4~~ 20.6 acres of the project site, which equates to 64% of the site.~~0.08 acre of this canopy has been identified as unhealthy~~. The existing oak canopy provides breeding and foraging habitat to a variety of wildlife species identified above.

The site is also supported by a small riparian area. A total of 0.46 acre of existing intermittent wetland has been formally delineated on the property along the southern portion of the property. This wetland feature consists of 0.25 acre of seeps and channel 0.21 acre. Portions of the wetland features eventually empties into an unnamed tributary of Willow Creek, Lake Natoma and American Riverwater and would be regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act enforced by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers.

a. **Special Status Species.** The biological reports evaluated the existence of the biological communities within the project site. Specifically, the site consists of biological communities including Interior live and blue oak woodland and California Grassland. Within these communities, varying types of species including raptors and hawks could potentially inhabit the site. Project implementation would result in the removal of oak trees (discussed below) which these migratory bird species could potentially inhabit for foraging and nesting purposes. The following mitigation measure shall be incorporated which would minimize the impact to less than significant:

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

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: The applicant shall submit a pre-construction survey for active bird and raptor nests conducted within the nesting period for most migratory bird species and nesting raptor species (between February and September) by a qualified biologist. No known active nests shall be disturbed without a permit or other authorization from USFWS or CDFW.

Method of Verification: Submittal of Pre-Construction Survey

Monitoring Requirement:: Prior to Approval of Improvement Plan and Issuance of Grading Permit

Monitoring Agency: Planning Services

The site was also evaluated for potential presence of sensitive status plants including the Rare Plants or Pine Hill Endemic Plants. The study concluded that no special status plants were observed within the project area. However, given that the site is within the Ecological Preserve Area 2, in accordance with Chapter 17.71 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 205-98, payment of standard mitigation fee for impacts to rare plant would be required and collected prior to issuance of building permits. This requirement shall be incorporated as a standard condition of approval.

b.-c. **Riparian Habitat/Wetlands.** The design of the subdivision would preserve the existing wetland with the application of reduced setbacks in accordance with the Interim Interpretive Guideline to General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4. The wetlands are sited within several lots (Lots 467, 499, 503-505) and have a minimum setback of 20-foot from development. Impacts to these wetland features would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: A 20-foot setback line shall be shown on the Final Map from all high-water marks or the outer boundary of the identified wetland. No development shall occur within the setback area. A Notice of Restriction (NOR) shall be recorded with the Final Map against each lot encumbered with the modified setback which shall provide construction notice of the setback to future lot owners. The notice shall be reviewed and be subject to approval by Planning Services.

Method of Verification: Review of Final Map

Monitoring Requirement:: Prior to Final Map

Monitoring Agency: Planning Services

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: The applicant shall implement the following Standard Best Management Practices (BMP) measures during site construction.

A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) will be required by a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction permit. To protect the channel and wetlands, the following Best Management Practices (BMP's) will be incorporated into the SWPPP.

A. Silt fences and /or waddles will be installed to prevent sediments from entering the creek and wetlands.

B. Orange construction fencing will be placed outside the identified buffers for the creek and all protected wetlands to avoid impacts from construction equipment. Buffers will not be used to store construction equipment or temporary stockpiling.

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

C. Drip pans will be placed under all work vehicles.

D. Fuel waste will be contained throughout the site during construction.

E. The construction site will be winterized utilizing the distribution of straw and/or hydroseeding.

Method of Verification: The above provisions shall be incorporated as a note on Grading and Improvement Plan

Implementation Timing: Prior to approval of Grading and Improvement Plan

Monitoring Agency: Planning Services

Application of the above mitigation measures would minimize said impacts to a less than significant level.

d. **Migration Corridor.** Wildlife movement zones are important for the movement of migratory wildlife populations. Corridors provide foraging opportunities and shelter during migration. Generally, wildlife movement zones are established migration routes for many species of wildlife. Movement corridors often occur in open areas or riverine habitats that provide a clear route for migration in addition to supporting ample food and water sources during movement. The site does not contain specific habitat that would make it suitable for wildlife migration corridor and is not identified within the Important Biological Corridor (-IBC) of the General Plan. The site is surrounded by existing and planned residential development on all sides which further limits the suitability for migration corridor. Impact to wildlife migration corridor is anticipated to be less than significant.

e. **Local Plans.** General Plan Policies 7.4.4.4, 7.4.4.5, and 7.4.5.2 govern the removal of oak tress within El Dorado County. Specifically, Policy 7.4.4.4 contains two options to mitigate for the loss of oak woodlands: 1) Option A requires conformance to on-site tree canopy retention and replacement standards; and 2) Option B provides for in-lieu payment of mitigation fees in accordance with ~~an Oak Woodland Management Plan (OWMP)~~ the Oak Resource Management Plan. ~~With the invalidation of the OWMP as a result of the Third District Court of Appeals ruling in the case of Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation v. County of El Dorado, mitigation via in-lieu fee payment (Option B) is not available.~~

~~An Oak Tree Preservation Plan is proposed for the affected and preserved oak canopy consistent with Option A of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and its Interim Interpretive Guideline (Exhibit I).~~ Implementation of the project would result in ~~The affected~~ removal of on-site ~~canopy~~ oak woodlands amountng to a total ~~4.29~~ of 13.25 acres, ~~which consist of the 3.01 acres of combined canopies designated for removal in each lot and 1.28 acres associated with infrastructure construction~~ while the off-site impact would remove 12 oak trees. These impacts would be mitigated through application of condition of approval in accordance of the standards of ORMP as codified under Chapter 130.39 of the Zoning Ordinance. The anticipated mitigation provision may include either an establishment of a conservation easement or payment of in-lieu fee, or a combination of both options. Implementation of the ~~following measures~~ of the standard condition of approval would minimize said impacts to a less than significant level.

~~*Mitigation Measure BIO-4: The applicant shall submit a Final Oak Tree Preservation Plan for Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 depicting the removed and preserved oak tree canopy in accordance with General Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A and Interim Interpretive Guideline.*~~

~~*Method of Verification: Review of Final Oak Tree Preservation Plan during review of Grading Plan*~~

~~*Monitoring Responsibility: Planning Services*~~

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

~~*Monitoring Requirement: Prior to approval of Grading Permit or recording of Final Map, whichever occur first*~~

~~*Mitigation Measure BIO-5: The applicant shall establish and submit proof of executed Conservation Easement as part of the Final Oak Tree Preservation Plan for Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 in accordance with General Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A and Interim Interpretive Guideline.*~~

~~*Method of Verification: Review of Conservation Easement and documentation during review of Final Map*~~

~~*Monitoring Responsibility: Planning Services*~~

~~*Monitoring Requirement: Prior to recordation of Final Map*~~

~~*Mitigation Measure BIO-6: The applicant shall a record a Notice of Restriction (NOR) requiring submittal of a Development Notebook with the residential building permit. The Development Notebook shall detail the extent of the impacted and preserved oak tree canopy in accordance with Final Oak Tree Preservation Plan for Ridgeview Village No.9.*~~

~~*Method of Verification: Review of Notice of Restriction*~~

~~*Monitoring Responsibility: Planning Services*~~

~~*Monitoring Requirement: Prior to recordation of Final Map*~~

f. **Adopted Plans.** This project, as designed, would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impact.

FINDING: For the "Biological Resources" category, the site contains area of sensitive biological resources that would be impacted as part of the project. As analyzed, conditioned, and mitigated, these impacts would be minimized to less than significant.

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

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

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-c. **Historic, Pre-historic, and Archeological Resources.** General Plan Policy 7.51.3 requires discretionary projects for new development to be analyzed for potential presence of sensitive cultural and archeological resources. Numerous cultural and archeological studies have been conducted on the site and the immediate area (See Supporting Information List, page 42). A recent cultural study was conducted in 2008 by Historic Resource Associates verified absence of potentially significant resources. Additionally, review of the Cultural Resource section of adopted Negative Declaration for the Ridgeview West development concluded that the off-site property does not include any historic, pre-historic or archeological resources. Based on the analysis and conclusions in the cultural and archeological reports, no significant resources exist on site therefore any anticipated impacts are less than significant.

d. **Human Remains.** In addressing the potential of presence of human remains during construction, standard conditions of approval, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5, Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 and Public Resources Code §§ 5097.94 and 5097.98, would be incorporated. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

FINDING: Based on the study, no sensitive cultural and historical resources were identified on the site. However, a possibility of previously unknown resources or human remains could be discovered during construction. Specific conditions would be incorporated to ensure any potential discoveries. This project would have a less than significant impact within the Cultural Resources category.

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.				**X**
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			**X**	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			**X**	
iv) Landslides?			**X**	

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act

The National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-124) and creation of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) established a long-term earthquake risk-reduction program to better understand, predict, and mitigate risks associated with seismic events. The following four federal agencies are responsible for coordinating activities under NEHRP: USGS, National Science Foundation (NSF), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Since its inception, NEHRP has shifted its focus from earthquake prediction to hazard reduction. The current program objectives (NEHRP 2009) are to:

1. Develop effective measures to reduce earthquake hazards;
2. Promote the adoption of earthquake hazard reduction activities by federal, state, and local governments; national building standards and model building code organizations; engineers; architects; building owners; and others who play a role in planning and constructing buildings, bridges, structures, and critical infrastructure or "lifelines";
3. Improve the basic understanding of earthquakes and their effects on people and infrastructure through interdisciplinary research involving engineering; natural sciences; and social, economic, and decision sciences; and
4. Develop and maintain the USGS seismic monitoring system (Advanced National Seismic System); the NSF-funded project aimed at improving materials, designs, and construction techniques (George E. Brown Jr. Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation); and the global earthquake monitoring network (Global Seismic Network).

Implementation of NEHRP objectives is accomplished primarily through original research, publications, and recommendations and guidelines for state, regional, and local agencies in the development of plans and policies to promote safety and emergency planning.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act

The Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Public Resources Code Section 2621 *et seq.*) was passed to reduce the risk to life and property from surface faulting in California. The Alquist–Priolo Act prohibits construction of most types of structures intended for human occupancy on the surface traces of active faults and strictly regulates construction in the

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

corridors along active faults (earthquake fault zones). It also defines criteria for identifying active faults, giving legal weight to terms such as "active," and establishes a process for reviewing building proposals in and adjacent to earthquake fault zones. Under the Alquist-Priolo Act, faults are zoned and construction along or across them is strictly regulated if they are "sufficiently active" and "well defined." Before a project can be permitted, cities and counties are required to have a geologic investigation conducted to demonstrate that the proposed buildings would not be constructed across active faults.

Historical seismic activity and fault and seismic hazards mapping in the project vicinity indicate that the area has relatively low potential for seismic activity (El Dorado County 2003). No active faults have been mapped in the project area, and none of the known faults have been designated as an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

Seismic Hazards Mapping Act

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act of 1990 (Public Resources Code Sections 2690–2699.6) establishes statewide minimum public safety standards for mitigation of earthquake hazards. While the Alquist–Priolo Act addresses surface fault rupture, the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act addresses other earthquake-related hazards, including strong ground shaking, liquefaction, and seismically induced landslides. Its provisions are similar in concept to those of the Alquist–Priolo Act. The state is charged with identifying and mapping areas at risk of strong ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, and other seismic hazards, and cities and counties are required to regulate development within mapped seismic hazard zones. In addition, the act addresses not only seismically induced hazards but also expansive soils, settlement, and slope stability.

Mapping and other information generated pursuant to the SHMA is to be made available to local governments for planning and development purposes. The State requires: (1) local governments to incorporate site-specific geotechnical hazard investigations and associated hazard mitigation, as part of the local construction permit approval process; and (2) the agent for a property seller or the seller if acting without an agent, must disclose to any prospective buyer if the property is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone. Under the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, cities and counties may withhold the development permits for a site within seismic hazard zones until appropriate site-specific geologic and/or geotechnical investigations have been carried out and measures to reduce potential damage have been incorporated into the development plans.

California Building Standards Code

Title 24 CCR, also known as the California Building Standards Code (CBC), specifies standards for geologic and seismic hazards other than surface faulting. These codes are administered and updated by the California Building Standards Commission. CBC specifies criteria for open excavation, seismic design, and load-bearing capacity directly related to construction in California.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or

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

- 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. **Seismic Hazards.**

i) According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, there are no Alquist-Priolo active fault zones within El Dorado County. The nearest such faults are located in Alpine and Butte Counties. There would be no impact.

ii) The potential for seismic ground shaking in the area would be considered less than significant. Any potential impacts due to seismic impacts would be addressed through compliance with the Uniform Building Code. All residential structures would be built to meet the construction standards of the UBC for the appropriate seismic zone. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii) El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity. The potential areas for liquefaction on the project site would be the swale and ephemeral drainage area, which would be avoided. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) All future grading activities would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Compliance with the Ordinance would reduce potential landslide impacts to less than significant.

b.-d. **Soil Erosion/ Geologic Hazards/Expansive Soils.** According to the Soils Survey of El Dorado County, the soil composition consists of Auburn Series, specifically Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxD) and Auburn very rocky silt loam (AxE). Auburn silt loam is characterized to occur within slopes between 5 to 25% rock outcrops, well drained, and is typically utilized for range, irrigated pasture. Auburn very rocky slit loam also occurs within the 30 to 50% slope. Both types of soils have moderate permeability, medium to rapid surface runoff, and erosion hazard is moderate to high and shrink-swell potential is considered low.

As part of project implementation, potential for erosion would be mitigated through Best Management Practices subject to conformance with provisions of the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Development of the site would require submittal of a formal construction permit application which includes submittal of a Geotechnical Reports. These reports would be subject to review by the County and affected agencies for implementation of measures minimizing erosion hazards. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Geologic Hazards.** Onsite soil types have a medium to rapid runoff potential with medium to high erosion potentials. All future grading activities would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance and building construction would comply with applicable building codes. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Septic Capability.** The residential development project would be served by EID for sewage services. There would be no impacts related to septic systems.

FINDING: A review of the soils and geologic conditions on the project site determined that the soil types are suitable for the future residential development, subject to applicable construction and building standards. All grading activities would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would address

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

potential impacts related to soil erosion, landslides, and other geologic impacts. For this 'Geology and Soils' category impacts would be less than significant.

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

Background/Science

Cumulative greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions are believed to contribute to an increased greenhouse effect and global climate change, which may result in sea level rise, changes in precipitation, habitat, temperature, wildfires, air pollution levels, and changes in the frequency and intensity of weather-related events. While criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants are pollutants of regional and local concern (see Section III. Air Quality above); GHG are global pollutants. The primary land-use related GHG are carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxides (N_2O). The individual pollutant's ability to retain infrared radiation represents its "global warming potential" and is expressed in terms of CO_2 equivalents; therefore CO_2 is the benchmark having a global warming potential of 1. Methane has a global warming potential of 21 and thus has a 21 times greater global warming effect per metric ton of CH_4 than CO_2. Nitrous Oxide has a global warming potential of 310. Emissions are expressed in annual metric tons of CO_2 equivalent units of measure (i.e., $MTCO_2e/yr$). The three other main GHG are Hydroflourocarbons, Perflourocarbons, and Sulfur Hexaflouride. While these compounds have significantly higher global warming potentials (ranging in the thousands), all three typically are not a concern in land-use development projects and are usually only used in specific industrial processes.

GHG Sources

The primary man-made source of CO_2 is the burning of fossil fuels; the two largest sources being coal burning to produce electricity and petroleum burning in combustion engines. The primary sources of man-made CH_4 are natural gas systems losses (during production, processing, storage, transmission and distribution), enteric fermentation (digestion from livestock) and landfill off-gassing. The primary source of man-made N_2O is agricultural soil management (fertilizers), with fossil fuel combustion a very distant second. In El Dorado County, the primary source of GHG is fossil fuel combustion mainly in the transportation sector (estimated at 70% of countywide GHG emissions). A distant second are residential sources (approximately 20%), and commercial/industrial sources are third (approximately 7%). The remaining sources are waste/landfill (approximately 3%) and agricultural (<1%).

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

At the federal level, USEPA has developed regulations to reduce GHG emissions from motor vehicles and has developed permitting requirements for large stationary emitters of GHGs. On April 1, 2010, USEPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) established a program to reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel economy standards for new model year 2012-2016 cars and light trucks. On August 9, 2011, USEPA and the NHTSA announced standards to reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel efficiency for heavy-duty trucks and buses.

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

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the *California Climate Solutions Act of 2006* (Stats. 2006, ch. 488) (Health & Safety Code, Section 38500 et seq.). AB 32 requires a statewide GHG emissions reduction to 1990 levels by the year 2020. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to implement and enforce the statewide cap. When AB 32 was signed, California's annual GHG emissions were estimated at 600 million metric tons of CO_2 equivalent ($MMTCO_2e$) while 1990 levels were estimated at 427 $MMTCO_2e$. Setting 427 $MMTCO_2e$ as the emissions target for 2020, current (2006) GHG emissions levels must be reduced by 29%. CARB adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan in December 2008 establishing various actions the state would implement to achieve this reduction (CARB, 2008). The Scoping Plan recommends a community-wide GHG reduction goal for local governments of 15%.

In June 2008, the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) issued a Technical Advisory (OPR, 2008) providing interim guidance regarding a proposed project's GHG emissions and contribution to global climate change. In the absence of adopted local or statewide thresholds, OPR recommends the following approach for analyzing GHG emissions: Identify and quantify the project's GHG emissions, assess the significance of the impact on climate change; and if the impact is found to be significant, identify alternatives and/or Mitigation Measures that would reduce the impact to less than significant levels (CEC, 2006).

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

The prominent Greenhouse Gas (GHG) contributing to the greenhouse effect as specifically listed in Assembly Bill AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, are carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors; in California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by electricity generation. California Energy Commission. 2006. *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004.* (Staff Final Report). Publication CEC-600-2006-013-SF.

GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria for air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, which are pollutants of regional and local concern. Carbon dioxide equivalents are a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the greenhouse effect. Emitting CO_2 into the atmosphere is not itself an adverse environmental affect. It is the increased concentration of CO_2 in the atmosphere potentially resulting in global climate change and the associated consequences of such climate change that results in adverse environmental affects (e.g., sea level rise, loss of snowpack, severe weather events). Although it is possible to generally estimate a project's incremental contribution of CO_2 into the atmosphere, it is typically not possible to determine whether or how an individual project's relatively small incremental contribution might translate into physical effects on the environment.

In June 2008, the Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) issued a technical advisory (*CEQA and Climate Change)* to provide interim guidance regarding the basis for determining the proposed project's contribution of greenhouse gas emissions and the project's contribution to global climate change. In the absence of adopted local or statewide thresholds, OPR recommends the following approach for analyzing greenhouse gas emissions:

- Identify and quantify the project's greenhouse gas emissions;
- Assess the significance of the impact on climate change; and
- If the impact is found to be significant, identify alternatives and/or Mitigation Measures that would reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels.

Neither El Dorado County nor the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District has established GHG significance thresholds to assess project impacts under CEQA. The only air district in northern California that has established a GHG CEQA significance threshold is the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). BAAQMD has set the significance threshold at 1,100 metric tons CO_2 for operational emissions but has not established a GHG threshold for construction emissions. San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLAPCD) has established a threshold of significance of 1,150 metric tons of CO_2. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), although not specifying CEQA thresholds, has suggested that a project's construction emissions be amortized over the life of the project and added to the project's operational emissions.

a and b. Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions. A Greenhouse Gas analysis for the project was conducted by Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC) dated January 2013. This analysis used 1,150 metric tons CO_{2e} referenced above as the significance threshold for the project. Tables 1 and 2 of the analysis shows that the project's estimated 2013 emissions, which include an amortized construction emissions in the amount 10 tons CO_{2e}, would equal to a total of 893 metric tons CO2e. Since these emissions would be less than the 1,150 metric ton CO_{2e} threshold, the project would have a less than significant GHG impact.

FINDING: The greenhouse gas emission analysis for the project estimated that the project emissions would be below the SLOAPCD standard applicable to the project. For this "Greenhouse Gas Emissions" category, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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	

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

Regulatory Setting:

Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes are subject to extensive federal, state, and local regulations to protect public health and the environment. These regulations provide definitions of hazardous materials; establish reporting requirements; set guidelines for handling, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous wastes; and require health and safety provisions for workers and the public. The major federal, state, and regional agencies enforcing these regulations are USEPA and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA); California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC); California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA); California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES); and EDCAPCD.

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, also called the Superfund Act; 42 USC Section 9601 *et seq.*) is intended to protect the public and the environment from the effects of past hazardous waste disposal activities and new hazardous material spills. Under CERCLA, USEPA has the authority to seek the parties responsible for hazardous materials releases and to ensure their cooperation in site remediation. CERCLA also provides federal funding (through the "Superfund") for the remediation of hazardous materials contamination. The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-499) amends some provisions of CERCLA and provides for a Community Right-to-Know program.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA; 42 USC Section 6901 *et seq.*), as amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, is the primary federal law for the regulation of solid waste and hazardous waste in the United States. These laws provide for the "cradle-to-grave" regulation of hazardous wastes, including generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal. Any business, institution, or other entity
that generates hazardous waste is required to identify and track its hazardous waste from the point of generation until it is recycled, reused, or disposed of.

USEPA has primary responsibility for implementing RCRA, but individual states are encouraged to seek authorization to implement some or all RCRA provisions. California received authority to implement the RCRA program in August 1992. DTSC is responsible for implementing the RCRA program in addition to California's own hazardous waste laws, which are collectively known as the Hazardous Waste Control Law.

Energy Policy Act of 2005

Title XV, Subtitle B of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (the Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act of 2005) contains amendments to Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, the original legislation that created the Underground Storage Tank (UST) Program. As defined by law, a UST is "any one or combination of tanks, including pipes connected thereto, that is used for the storage of hazardous substances and that is substantially or totally beneath the surface of the ground." In cooperation with USEPA, SWRCB oversees the UST Program. The intent is to protect public health and safety and the environment from releases of petroleum and other hazardous substances from tanks. The four primary program elements include leak prevention (implemented by Certified Unified Program Agencies [CUPAs], described in more detail below), cleanup of leaking tanks, enforcement of UST requirements, and tank integrity testing.

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

Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Rule

USEPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Rule (40 CFR, Part 112) apply to facilities with a single above-ground storage tank (AST) with a storage capacity greater than 660 gallons, or multiple tanks with a combined capacity greater than 1,320 gallons. The rule includes requirements for oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response to prevent oil discharges to navigable waters and adjoining shorelines. The rule requires specific facilities to prepare, amend, and implement SPCC Plans.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

OSHA is responsible at the federal level for ensuring worker safety. OSHA sets federal standards for implementation of workplace training, exposure limits, and safety procedures for the handling of hazardous substances (as well as other hazards). OSHA also establishes criteria by which each state can implement its own health and safety program.

Federal Communications Commission Requirements

There is no federally mandated radio frequency (RF) exposure standard; however, pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 USC Section 224), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) established guidelines for dealing with RF exposure, as presented below. The exposure limits are specified in 47 CFR Section 1.1310 in terms of frequency, field strength, power density, and averaging time. Facilities and transmitters licensed and authorized by FCC must either comply with these limits or an applicant must file an environmental assessment (EA) with FCC to evaluate whether the proposed facilities could result in a significant environmental effect.

FCC has established two sets of RF radiation exposure limits—Occupational/Controlled and General Population/Uncontrolled. The less-restrictive Occupational/Controlled limit applies only when a person (worker) is exposed as a consequence of his or her employment and is "fully aware of the potential exposure and can exercise control over his or her exposure," otherwise the General Population limit applies (47 CFR Section 1.1310).

The FCC exposure limits generally apply to all FCC-licensed facilities (47 CFR Section 1.1307[b] [1]). Unless exemptions apply, as a condition of obtaining a license to transmit, applicants must certify that they comply with FCC environmental rules, including those that are designed to prevent exposing persons to radiation above FCC RF limits (47 CFR Section1.1307[b]). Licensees at co-located sites (e.g., towers supporting multiple antennas, including antennas under separate ownerships) must take the necessary actions to bring the accessible areas that exceed the FCC exposure limits into compliance. This is a shared responsibility of all licensees whose transmission power density levels account for 5.0 or more percent of the applicable FCC exposure limits (47CFR 1.1307[b][3]).

Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 77

14 CFR Part 77.9 is designed to promote air safety and the efficient use of navigable airspace. Implementation of the code is administered by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). If an organization plans to sponsor any construction or alterations that might affect navigable airspace, a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (FAA Form 7460-1) must be filed. The code provides specific guidance regarding FAA notification requirements.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 – Proposition 65

The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, more commonly known as Proposition 65, protects the state's drinking water sources from contamination with chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm.

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

Proposition 65 also requires businesses to inform the public of exposure to such chemicals in the products they purchase, in their homes or workplaces, or that are released into the environment. In accordance with Proposition 65, the California Governor's Office publishes, at least annually, a list of such chemicals. OEHHA, an agency under the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), is the lead agency for implementation of the Proposition 65 program. Proposition 65 is enforced through the California Attorney General's Office; however, district and city attorneys and any individual acting in the public interest may also file a lawsuit against a business alleged to be in violation of Proposition 65 regulations.

The Unified Program

The Unified Program consolidates, coordinates, and makes consistent the administrative requirements, permits, inspections, and enforcement activities of six environmental and emergency response programs. CalEPA and other state agencies set the standards for their programs, while local governments (CUPAs) implement the standards. For each county, the CUPA regulates/oversees the following:

- Hazardous materials business plans;
- California accidental release prevention plans or federal risk management plans;
- The operation of USTs and ASTs;
- Universal waste and hazardous waste generators and handlers;
- On-site hazardous waste treatment;
- Inspections, permitting, and enforcement;
- Proposition 65 reporting; and
- Emergency response.

Hazardous Materials Business Plans

Hazardous materials business plans are required for businesses that handle hazardous materials in quantities greater than or equal to 55 gallons of a liquid, 500 pounds of a solid, or 200 cubic feet (cf) of compressed gas, or extremely hazardous substances above the threshold planning quantity (40 CFR, Part 355, Appendix A) (Cal OES, 2015). Business plans are required to include an inventory of the hazardous materials used/stored by the business, a site map, an emergency plan, and a training program for employees (Cal OES, 2015). In addition, business plan information is provided electronically to a statewide information management system, verified by the applicable CUPA, and transmitted to agencies responsible for the protection of public health and safety (i.e., local fire department, hazardous material response team, and local environmental regulatory groups) (Cal OES, 2015).

California Occupational Safety and Health Administration

Cal/OSHA assumes primary responsibility for developing and enforcing workplace safety regulations in California. Cal/OSHA regulations pertaining to the use of hazardous materials in the workplace (CCR Title 8) include requirements for safety training, availability of safety equipment, accident and illness prevention programs, warnings about exposure to hazardous substances, and preparation of emergency action and fire prevention plans.

Hazard communication program regulations that are enforced by Cal/OSHA require workplaces to maintain procedures for identifying and labeling hazardous substances, inform workers about the hazards associated with hazardous substances and their handling, and prepare health and safety plans to protect workers at hazardous waste sites. Employers must also make material safety data sheets available to employees and document employee information and training programs. In addition, Cal/OSHA has established maximum permissible RF radiation exposure limits for workers (Title 8 CCR Section 5085[b]), and requires warning signs where RF radiation might exceed the specified limits (Title 8 CCR Section 5085 [c]).

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

California Accidental Release Prevention

The purpose of the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) program is to prevent accidental releases of substances that can cause serious harm to the public and the environment, to minimize the damage if releases do occur, and to satisfy community right-to-know laws. In accordance with this program, businesses that handle more than a threshold quantity of regulated substance are required to develop a risk management plan (RMP). This RMP must provide a detailed analysis of potential risk factors and associated mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce accident potential. CUPAs implement the CalARP program through review of RMPs, facility inspections, and public access to information that is not confidential or a trade secret.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Wildland Fire Management

The Office of the State Fire Marshal and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) administer state policies regarding wildland fire safety. Construction contractors must comply with the following requirements in the Public Resources Code during construction activities at any sites with forest-, brush-, or grass-covered land:

- Earthmoving and portable equipment with internal combustion engines must be equipped with a spark arrestor to reduce the potential for igniting a wildland fire (Public Resources Code Section 4442).
- Appropriate fire-suppression equipment must be maintained from April 1 to December 1, the highest-danger period for fires (Public Resources Code Section 4428).
- On days when a burning permit is required, flammable materials must be removed to a distance of 10 feet from any equipment that could produce a spark, fire, or flame, and the construction contractor must maintain the appropriate fire suppression equipment (Public Resources Code Section 4427).
- On days when a burning permit is required, portable tools powered by gasoline fueled internal combustion engines must not be used within 25 feet of any flammable materials (Public Resources Code Section 4431).

California Highway Patrol

CHP, along with Caltrans, enforce and monitor hazardous materials and waste transportation laws and regulations in California. These agencies determine container types used and license hazardous waste haulers for hazardous waste transportation on public roads. All motor carriers and drivers involved in transportation of hazardous materials must apply for and obtain a hazardous materials transportation license from CHP.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

A map of the fuel loading in the County (General Plan Figure HS-1) shows the fire hazard severity classifications of the SRAs in El Dorado County, as established by CDF. The classification system provides three classes of fire hazards: Moderate, High, and Very High. Fire Hazard Ordinance (Chapter 8.08) requires defensible space as described by the State Public Resources Code, including the incorporation and maintenance of a 30-foot fire break or vegetation fuel clearance around structures in fire hazard zones. The County's requirements on emergency access, signing and numbering, and emergency water are more stringent than those required by state law (Patton 2002). The Fire Hazard Ordinance also establishes limits on campfires, fireworks, smoking, and incinerators for all discretionary and ministerial developments.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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

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.-b. **Hazardous Materials.** Implementation of the project, in particular during construction, may involve transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as construction materials, paints, fuels, landscaping materials. The usage of these materials is more typical during construction phase. Contractors are required to obtain approval of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan through the Environmental Management Department- Hazardous Waste Division of El Dorado County. Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials. The impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

c.- g. **Hazardous Materials Near Schools.** The project is not in close proximity of any schools. No Impact.

Hazardous Sites. No parcels within El Dorado County are included on the Cortese List. There would be no impact.

Aircraft Hazards and Private Airstrips. The project site is not within any airport plan, nor is it in any public or private airport. There would be no impact.

Emergency Plan. No formal emergency or evacuation plan is proposed for the project. The subdivision has been designed in accordance with the County Design and Improvement Standards Manual which requires adequate road access and circulation. All lots would have direct access of Beatty Drive and the residential courts. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

h. **Wildfire Hazards.** The project site is within an area identified as moderate fire hazard. The project has been reviewed by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department for the project's potential exposure to wildfire. As conditioned, the Department requires the project to comply with Public Resource Code 4291, which includes bordering fence be non-combustible and planting of select low-lying vegetation. Prior to approval, Improvement and Building Permit Plans shall be reviewed by the department for consistency with applicable fire codes. A previously approved Wildfire Safe Plan shall be updated and implemented for the project. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

FINDING: Site construction and development would anticipate use of various potential hazardous materials, subject to permitting standards at the local and state level. Residential use does not commonly use these types of hazardous materials. The proposed residential use is not located in any airport facilities. A Wildfire Safe Plan would require implementation as part of the development. For this 'Hazards and Hazardous Materials' category, impacts would be less than significant.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) is the primary federal law that protects the quality of the nation's surface waters, including lakes, rivers, and coastal wetlands. The key sections pertaining to water quality regulation for the Proposed Project are CWA Section 303 and Section 402.

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

Section 303(d) — Listing of Impaired Water Bodies

Under CWA Section 303(d), states are required to identify "impaired water bodies" (those not meeting established water quality standards), identify the pollutants causing the impairment, establish priority rankings for waters on the list, and develop a schedule for the development of control plans to improve water quality. USEPA then approves the State's recommended list of impaired waters or adds and/or removes waterbodies.

Section 402—NPDES Permits for Stormwater Discharge

CWA Section 402 regulates construction-related stormwater discharges to surface waters through the NPDES, which is officially administered by USEPA. In California, USEPA has delegated its authority to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), which, in turn, delegates implementation responsibility to the nine RWQCBs, as discussed below in reference to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

The NPDES program provides for both general (those that cover a number of similar or related activities) and individual (activity- or project-specific) permits. General Permit for Construction Activities: Most construction projects that disturb 1.0 or more acre of land are required to obtain coverage under SWRCB's General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ). The general permit requires that the applicant file a public notice of intent to discharge stormwater and prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). SWPPP must include a site map and a description of the proposed construction activities, demonstrate compliance with relevant local ordinances and regulations, and present a list of Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and protect against discharge of sediment and other construction-related pollutants to surface waters. Permittees are further required to monitor construction activities and report compliance to ensure that BMPs are correctly implemented and are effective in controlling the discharge of construction-related pollutants.

Municipal Stormwater Permitting Program

SWRCB regulates stormwater discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) through its Municipal Storm Water Permitting Program (SWRCB, 2013). Permits are issued under two phases depending on the size of the urbanized area/municipality. Phase I MS4 permits are issued for medium (population between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large (population of 250,000 or more people) municipalities, and are often issued to a group of co-permittees within a metropolitan area. Phase I permits have been issued since 1990. Beginning in 2003, SWRCB began issuing Phase II MS4 permits for smaller municipalities (population less than 100,000).

El Dorado County is covered under two SWRCB Regional Boards. The West Slope Phase II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) NPDES Permit is administered by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) (Region Five). The Lake Tahoe Phase I MS4 NPDES Permit is administered by the Lahontan RWQCB (Region Six). The current West Slope MS4 NPDES Permit was adopted by the SWRCB on February 5, 2013. The Permit became effective on July 1, 2013 for a term of five years and focuses on the enhancement of surface water quality within high priority urbanized areas. The current Lake Tahoe MS4 NPDES Permit was adopted and took effect on December 6, 2011 for a term of five years. The Permit incorporated the Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and the Lake Clarity Crediting Program (LCCP) to account for the reduction of fine sediment particles and nutrients discharged to Lake Tahoe.

On May 19, 2015 the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors formally adopted revisions to the Storm Water Quality Ordinance (Ordinance 4992). Previously applicable only to the Lake Tahoe Basin, the ordinance establishes legal authority for the entire unincorporated portion of the County. The purpose of the ordinance is to 1) protect health, safety, and general welfare, 2) enhance and protect the quality of Waters of the State by reducing pollutants in storm water discharges to the

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

maximum extent practicable and controlling non-storm water discharges to the storm drain system, and 3) cause the use of Best Management Practices to reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on Waters of the State.

National Flood Insurance Program

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) administers the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) to provide subsidized flood insurance to communities complying with FEMA regulations that limit development in floodplains. The NFIP regulations permit development within special flood hazard zones provided that residential structures are raised above the base flood elevation of a 100-year flood event. Non-residential structures are required either to provide flood proofing construction techniques for that portion of structures below the 100-year flood elevation or to elevate above the 100-year flood elevation. The regulations also apply to substantial improvements of existing structures.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Porter–Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The Porter–Cologne Water Quality Control Act (known as the Porter–Cologne Act), passed in 1969, dovetails with the CWA (see discussion of the CWA above). It established the SWRCB and divided the state into nine regions, each overseen by an RWQCB. SWRCB is the primary State agency responsible for protecting the quality of the state's surface water and groundwater supplies; however, much of the SWRCB's daily implementation authority is delegated to the nine RWQCBs, which are responsible for implementing CWA Sections 401, 402, and 303[d]. In general, SWRCB manages water rights and regulates statewide water quality, whereas RWQCBs focus on water quality within their respective regions.

The Porter–Cologne Act requires RWQCBs to develop water quality control plans (also known as basin plans) that designate beneficial uses of California's major surface-water bodies and groundwater basins and establish specific narrative and numerical water quality objectives for those waters. Beneficial uses represent the services and qualities of a waterbody (i.e., the reasons that the waterbody is considered valuable). Water quality objectives reflect the standards necessary to protect and support those beneficial uses. Basin plan standards are primarily implemented by regulating waste discharges so that water quality objectives are met. Under the Porter–Cologne Act, basin plans must be updated every 3 years.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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

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

a. **Water Quality Standards.** Project related construction activities would be required to adhere to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which include application of Best Management Practices (BMP's) to minimize degradation of water quality during construction.

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

Any grading and improvement plans required by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) and Building Services would be prepared and designed to meet the *County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*. These standards require that erosion and sediment control be implemented into the design of the project. Combined with the design standards outlined by the *El Dorado Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM)*, as well as the *Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance*, required by the ordinance would be implemented and engineered correctly for the final design, including those necessary for site grading and drainage facilities. Grading and drainage plans would be designed pursuant to a project specific Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SWMP). This would address Storm Water Prevention and Pollution Program (SWPPP) standards in order to adhere to the state requirements, as well as the federal, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for water quality and water discharge. As a result, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

b. **Groundwater Supplies.** The project is proposed to be connected to public water service provided by El Dorado Irrigation District and would not utilize any groundwater as part of the project. Impact would be less than significant.

c-f. **Drainage Patterns.** Details the Preliminary Drainage Plan for the project is attached with this document. The site has a natural drainage from east to west of the property. Proposed subdivision drainage design would convey drain using v-ditches along lot perimeters that ultimately connects into the proposed underground storm drains and inlets along the roads. Construction of the infrastructures would be reflected on Improvement Plan in accordance with DISM standards and Drainage Manual which would ensure that all stormwater and sediment control methods are implemented during construction. All applicable construction measures are detailed in the standard conditions of approval imposed on the project. Impact would be considered less than significant.

g-j. **Flood-related Hazards.** The site, which is identified within the 06017C0712E panel of the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) map, is designated as Flood Zone X. This designation describes areas that are outside of any mapped 100-year or 500-year flood areas. The proposed development shall be required to adhere to applicable construction and building standards involving drainage control and flood prevention. No dams are located in the project area and therefore, no potential hazards related to dam failures. The risk of exposure to seiche, tsunami, or mudflows is remote. There would be no impact.

FINDING: The proposed drainage facilities would adequately convey the anticipated run-off associated to the project. Water would be provided for this project via connections to the EID infrastructures, as well as adequate capacity to connect to the existing EID sewer facility system. BMPs for pre-and-post-construction for erosion and sediment controls would be incorporated into the final grading and drainage design for the project. As conditioned, mitigated, and with adherence to applicable County Codes, impacts within this category would be anticipated to be less than significant.

X. **LAND USE PLANNING.** *Would the project:*				
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

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

Regulatory Setting:

California State law requires that each City and County adopt a general plan "for the physical development of the City and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning." Typically, a general plan is designed to address the issues facing the City or County for the next 15-20 years. The general plan expresses the community's development goals and incorporates public policies relative to the distribution of future public and private land uses. The El Dorado County General Plan was adopted in 2004. The 2013-2021 Housing Element was adopted in 2013.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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.-b. **Established Community and Land Use Consistency.** Based on the High Density Residential land use designation, the site is identified for residential development. The existing zone of One-Family district is consistent with this land use designation. Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 density, design, and configuration would blend with the existing residential development in the area. There would be no impact.

c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** El Dorado County does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan Program. There would be no impact.

FINDING: For the 'Land Use Planning' category, the project would have no impact.

XI. 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 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

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal laws, regulations, or policies apply to mineral resources and the Proposed Project.

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

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Surface Mining and Reclamation Act

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) requires that the State Mining and Geology Board identify, map, and classify aggregate resources throughout California that contain regionally significant mineral resources. Designations of land areas are assigned by CDC and California Geological Survey following analysis of geologic reports and maps, field investigations, and using information about the locations of active sand and gravel mining operations. Local jurisdictions are required to enact planning procedures to guide mineral conservation and extraction at particular sites and to incorporate mineral resource management policies into their general plans.

The California Mineral Land Classification System represents the relationship between knowledge of mineral deposits and their economic characteristics (grade and size). The nomenclature used with the California Mineral Land Classification System is important in communicating mineral potential information in activities such as mineral land classification, and usage of these terms are incorporated into the criteria developed for assigning mineral resource zones. Lands classified MRZ-2 are areas that contain identified mineral resources. Areas classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b (referred to hereafter as MRZ-2) are considered important mineral resource areas.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

El Dorado County in general is considered a mining region capable of producing a wide variety of mineral resources. Metallic mineral deposits, including gold, are considered the most significant extractive mineral resources. Exhibit 5.9-6 shows the MRZ-2 areas within the county based on designated Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay areas. The -MR overlay areas are based on mineral resource mapping published in the mineral land classification reports referenced above. The majority of the county's important mineral resource deposits are concentrated in the western third of the county.

According to General Plan Policy 2.2.2.7, before authorizing any land uses within the -MR overlay zone that will threaten the potential to extract minerals in the affected area, the County shall prepare a statement specifying its reasons for considering approval of the proposed land use and shall provide for public and agency notice of such a statement consistent with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 2762. Furthermore, before finally approving any such proposed land use, the County shall balance the mineral values of the threatened mineral resource area against the economic, social, or other values associated with the proposed alternative land uses. Where the affected minerals are of regional significance, the County shall consider the importance of these minerals to their market region as a whole and not just their importance to the County.

Where the affected minerals are of Statewide significance, the County shall consider the importance of these minerals to the State and Nation as a whole. The County may approve the alternative land use if it determines that the benefits of such uses outweigh the potential or certain loss of the affected mineral resources in the affected regional, Statewide, or national market.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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.

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

a-b. Mineral Resources. The site is identified for residential development. There are no known mineral resources on the site according to the General Plan. There are no known mineral resources of local importance on or near the project site. There would be no impact.

FINDING: No known mineral resources are located on or within the vicinity of the project. There would be no impact to this 'Mineral Resources' category.

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

Discussion

Regulatory Setting:

No federal or state laws, regulations, or policies for construction-related noise and vibration apply to the Proposed Project. However, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Guidelines for Construction Vibration in Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment state that for evaluating daytime construction noise impacts in outdoor areas, a noise threshold of 90 dBA Leq and 100 dBA Leq should be used for residential and commercial/industrial areas, respectively (FTA 2006).

For construction vibration impacts, the FTA guidelines use an annoyance threshold of 80 VdB for infrequent events (fewer than 30 vibration events per day) and a damage threshold of 0.12 inches per second (in/sec) PPV for buildings susceptible to vibration damage (FTA 2006).

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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

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 130.37.060.1 and Table 130.37.060.2 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.

TABLE 6-2
NOISE LEVEL PERFORMANCE PROTECTION STANDARDS
FOR NOISE SENSITIVE LAND USES
AFFECTED BY NON-TRANSPORTATION' SOURCES

Noise Level Descriptor	Daytime 7 a.m. - 7 p.m.		Evening 7 p.m. - 10 p.m.		Night 10 p.m. - 7 a.m.	
	Community	Rural	Community	Rural	Community	Rural
Hourly L_{eq}, dB	55	50	50	45	45	40
Maximum level, dB	70	60	60	55	55	50

a. **Noise Exposures.** The site is immediately bordered by open space and vacant residential properties to the west and existing development to the east, north and south. The anticipated noise effects from the proposed residential subdivision would occur and blend with the existing and planned residential uses in the immediate area. Site construction noise is anticipated to occur intermittently and on a short term basis. Construction activities would include use of various machinery and construction tools equipped with standard sound muffling device to reduce the noise effects. Along with application of standard construction hours of limitation, these effects are not anticipated to be significant in excess of the standards. Operational noise effects primarily involve common residential noises that would generally be confined within the lot. Residential units would be built utilizing standard building construction that would mitigate exterior noise effects. Noise effects on the outdoor yard areas of these custom lots would be intermittent, buffered by the residential structures and setback, and are therefore considered less than significant.

   Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Ground borne Shaking:** Future development of the site may generate ground borne vibration or shaking events during project construction. These potential impacts would be limited to project construction. Adherence to the time limitations of construction activities to 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am to 5:00 pm on weekends and federally recognized holidays would limit the ground shaking effects in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Permanent Ambient Noise Increases.** Post-construction of the site, implementation and operation of residential development is not expected to add significant noise ambient levels of the surrounding area. The overall types and volumes of residential noise are not anticipated to be excessive and would be common to the surrounding residential uses. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

d. **Temporary Ambient Noise Increases:** The construction phase of the project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels. Construction noise would be temporary and would be minimized by compliance with Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. Project operation would also result in periodic noise generation

above current levels from the use of personal vehicles, landscaping equipment, etc. The overall types and volumes of noise from project operation are not anticipated to be excessive and would be similar in nature with the existing residential uses. Thus, as a result, the impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

e-f. **Aircraft Noise.** The project site is not within any local airport plan, located within the immediate vicinity of public airport, or private airport. There would be no impact.

FINDING: Based on project and general site conditions, implementation of the project does anticipate significant impacts to or from noise effects. For this "Noise" category, the thresholds of significance are not anticipated to be exceeded.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Regulatory Setting:

No federal or state laws, regulations, or policies apply to population and housing and the proposed project.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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. **Population Growth.** The proposed residential subdivision would result in construction a total of 44 residential detached primary single-family residences. The resulting density of 1.96 units/acre is within the anticipated density range of 1 to 5 dwelling unit/acre under the High Density Residential land use designation. Based on the population density of 2.8 persons per unit under this land use designation, the development would result in the addition of 123 residents at buildout. Given that buildout of the subdivision is long-term, this addition of residents into the neighborhood would occur gradually. This amount of additional population would be considered less than significant.

b and c. Housing Displacement. The site is vacant thus implementation of the project would not result in any displacement or relocation of housing. There would be no impact.

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

FINDING: Implementation of project would not have any significant increase to population or housing. No displacement would occur. For this "Population and Housing" category, impacts would be less than significant.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. *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:*				
a. Fire protection?			X	
b. Police protection?			X	
c. Schools?			X	
d. Parks?			X	
e. Other government services?			X	

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

California Fire Code

The California Fire Code (Title 24 CCR, Part 9) establishes minimum requirements to safeguard public health, safety, and general welfare from the hazards of fire, explosion, or dangerous conditions in new and existing buildings. Chapter 33 of CCR contains requirements for fire safety during construction and demolition.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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

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

a. **Fire Protection.** The project site is within the El Dorado Hills Fire Department Service Area for fire and emergency service. The nearest fire station, Administration Station # 85, is located along El Dorado Hills Blvd at the intersection with Wilson Blvd. in El Dorado Hills, which is approximately 1¼ mile east of the project site. The

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

department has reviewed the project and recommended specific conditions of approvals that would ensure adequate services to the development. Specifically, the fire department would review Improvement Plans verifying necessary size of water infrastructures to accommodate anticipated water flows for fire sprinklers and fire hydrant. The department would also review building permits for the construction of the proposed residential units, installation of sprinklers, and adequate site circulation. The department would receive development impact fees prior to issuance of building permit. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection.** Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department. Due to the size, scope, duration of the project buildout, the demand for additional police protection is not anticipated to change. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

c-e. **Schools and Government Services.** The project site is within the Buckeye Union School District (K-12) and El Dorado Union High School District. The schools that could provide educational services to the future residents of the subdivision include William Brooks Elementary School, Rolling Hills Middle School and Silva Valley and Oak Ridge High School. The recent record of enrollment (2010-11) for William Brooks Elementary Schools and Rolling Hills Middle School are 513 and 971 students, respectively, while Oak Ridge High School currently has 2,305 students. The amount of residents (123) that subdivision could generate is anticipated to occur gradually as the development builds out. This above schools anticipates future capacity to accommodate the students generated from the subdivision.

FINDING: No significant increase of services is anticipated with this project. For this 'Public Services' category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Regulatory Setting:

National Trails System

The National Trails System Act of 1968 authorized The National Trails System (NTS) in order to provide additional outdoor recreation opportunities and to promote the preservation of access to the outdoor areas and historic resources of the nation. The Appalachian and Pacific Crest National Scenic Trails were the first two components, and the System has grown to include 20 national trails.

The National Trails System includes four classes of trails:

1. National Scenic Trails (NST) provide outdoor recreation and the conservation and enjoyment of significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities. The Pacific Coast Trail falls under this category. The PCT passes through the Desolation Wilderness area along the western plan area boundary.
2. National Historic Trails (NHT) follow travel routes of national historic significance. The National Park Service has designated two National Historic Trail (NHT) alignments that pass through El Dorado County, the California National Historic Trail and the Pony Express National Historic Trail. The California Historic Trail is a route of

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

approximately 5,700 miles including multiple routes and cutoffs, extending from Independence and Saint Joseph, Missouri, and Council Bluffs, Iowa, to various points in California and Oregon. The Pony Express NHT commemorates the route used to relay mail via horseback from Missouri to California before the advent of the telegraph.

3. National Recreation Trails (NRT) are in, or reasonably accessible to, urban areas on federal, state, or private lands. In El Dorado County there are 5 NRTs.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The California Parklands Act

The California Parklands Act of 1980 (Public Resources Code Section 5096.141-5096.143) recognizes the public interest for the state to acquire, develop, and restore areas for recreation and to aid local governments to do the same. The California Parklands Act also identifies the necessity of local agencies to exercise vigilance to see that the parks, recreation areas, and recreational facilities they now have are not lost to other uses.

The California state legislature approved the California Recreational Trail Act of 1974 (Public Resources Code Section 2070-5077.8) requiring that the Department of Parks and Recreation prepare a comprehensive plan for California trails. The California Recreational Trails Plan is produced for all California agencies and recreation providers that manage trails. The Plan includes information on the benefits of trails, how to acquire funding, effective stewardship, and how to encourage cooperation among different trail users.

The 1975 Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) requires residential subdivision developers to help mitigate the impacts of property improvements by requiring them to set aside land, donate conservation easements, or pay fees for park improvements. The Quimby Act gave authority for passage of land dedication ordinances to cities and counties for parkland dedication or in-lieu fees paid to the local jurisdiction. Quimby exactions must be roughly proportional and closely tied (nexus) to a project's impacts as identified through traffic studies required by CEQA. The exactions only apply to the acquisition of new parkland; they do not apply to the physical development of new park facilities or associated operations and maintenance costs.

The County implements the Quimby Act through §16.12.090 of the County Code. The County Code sets standards for the acquisition of land for parks and recreational purposes, or payments of fees in lieu thereof, on any land subdivision. Other projects, such as ministerial residential or commercial development, could contribute to the demand for park and recreation facilities without providing land or funding for such facilities.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The 2004 El Dorado County General Plan Parks and Recreation Element establishes goals and policies that address needs for the provision and maintenance of parks and recreation facilities in the county, with a focus on providing recreational opportunities and facilities on a regional scale, securing adequate funding sources, and increasing tourism and recreation-based businesses. The Recreation Element describes the need for 1.5 acres of regional parkland, 1.5 acres of community parkland, and 2 acres of neighborhood parkland per 1,000 residents. Another 95 acres of park land are needed to meet the General Plan guidelines.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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

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 Recreational Services.** Residential subdivisions are required to dedicate parkland or pay an equivalent in-lieu fee. The area is currently served by several parks including Kalithea Park, Ridgeview Village Unit 7 Park, and Ridgeview Village Unit 1 Park. Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 is part of the overall Ridgeview Village development, which entered into an agreement with El Dorado Hills Community Services District (CSD), and dedicated sufficient parkland area with Unit No.7.

The subdivision would be required to pay the park improvement fee for existing parks within the CSD service area. The fee is collected prior to issuance of residential building permit.

Impacts would be less than significant impact.

FINDING: Impacts to Parks and Recreational amenities are considered less than significant.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards 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. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			X	

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

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal laws, regulations, or policies apply to transportation/traffic and the Proposed Project.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies
Caltrans manages the state highway system and ramp interchange intersections. This state agency is also responsible for highway, bridge, and rail transportation planning, construction, and maintenance.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

According to the transportation element of the County General Plan, Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions. Level of Service is defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council). There are some roadway segments that are excepted from these standards and are allowed to operate at LOS F, although none of these are located in the Lake Tahoe Basin. According to Policy TC-Xe, "worsen" is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

A. A two percent increase in traffic during a.m., p.m. peak hour, or daily
B. The addition of 100 or more daily trips, or
C. The addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour.

Discussion: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

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. Circulation and Congestion Management Plan.

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was conducted Kimley Horn and Associated analyzing the potential traffic effects resulting from project implementation based on the established protocols and procedures by DOT. The study was based on a 48-lot version of the map with minor deviation in the internal circulation. The DOT has evaluated the study, and based on the reduced density, consistency with the General Plan, and adequacy of existing road capacity that serve the area, concluded the applicability of this study for the current version of the map.

The TIA covered factors such as analysis of the affected roadways, impacts to Level of Service (LOS), and estimation of generated trips by the project. The roadways analyzed include El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Olson Lane and El Dorado Hills Blvd and Wilson Blvd.

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

The applicable County standards include following:

- Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and State highways within the unincorporated areas of the County shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions." (El Dorado County General Plan Policy TC-Xd);
- If a project causes the peak-hour level of service...on a County road or State highway that would otherwise meet the County standards (without the project) to exceed the [given] values, then theimpact shall be considered significant;
- If any county road or state highway fails to meet the [given] standards for peak hour level of service...under existing conditions, and the project will 'significantly worsen' conditions on the road or highway, then the impact shall be considered significant." According to General Plan Policy TCX-e, significantly worsen is defined as "a 2 percent 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."

The TIA estimated 460 total new daily trips which consist of 36 new trips occurring during the AM peak-hour and 49 new trips occurring during the PM peak-hour. The project is consistent with the zoning and General Plan and is less that the General Plan forecasted growth for the traffic analysis zone. The addition of the project would not result in substandard operation of the studied intersections and capacity of the existing road network. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

c. **Air Traffic.** The project site is not identified in any local airport plan, nor is it located within any public or private airport flight zones. There would be no impact to air traffic patterns.

d. **Design Hazards.** Residential subdivision design has been reviewed by DOT for conformance with County design standards, such as sharp curves, dangerous intersection, or incompatible uses that would increase hazards. The project has been conditioned to reduce potential hazards onto the existing local road systems to less than significant impact levels.

e. **Emergency Access.** The proposed development has been reviewed for conformance with county design and fire standards for emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.

f. **Alternative Transportation Plan.** The nearest identified corridor within the El Dorado County Master Bicycle Plan is Sophia Parkway located approximately 1½ mile west of the project site. Beatty Drive, a major residential collector road, adequately provides circulation for bicycle and no additional bicycle improvements is required.

Bus turnouts are not required in the project area. There would be no impacts.

FINDING: The proposed project would have less than impacts to existing road infrastructures. For the Transportation/ Traffic category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or			X	
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal laws, regulations, or policies apply to Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) and the Proposed Project.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Assembly Bill (AB) 52

AB 52, which was approved in September 2014 and effective on July 1, 2015, requires that CEQA lead agencies consult with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project, if so requested by the tribe. The bill, chaptered in CEQA Section 21084.2, also specifies that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

Defined in Section 21074(a) of the Public Resources Code, TCRs are:

1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
    a. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
    b. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

TCRs are further defined under Section 21074 as follows:

a. A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a TCR to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape; and

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

b. A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a "nonunique archaeological resource" as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a TCR if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

Mitigation measures for TCRs must be developed in consultation with the affected California Native American tribe pursuant to newly chaptered Section 21080.3.2, or according to Section 21084.3. Section 21084.3 identifies mitigation measures that include avoidance and preservation of TCRs and treating TRCs with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource.

Discussion:

In general, significant impacts are those that diminish the integrity, research potential, or other characteristics that make a TCR significant or important. To be considered a TCR, a resource must be either: (1) listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, on the national, state, or local register of historic resources, or: (2) a resource that the lead agency chooses, in its discretion, to treat as a TCR and meets the criteria for listing in the state register of historic resources pursuant to the criteria set forth in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c). A substantial adverse change to a TCR would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a TCR such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired

a,b. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Consultation letters detailing project information were mailed to various native tribes on record including the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria, and T'si Akim Maidu. As discussed above, pursuant to the Cultural Resources Study prepared for the project and environmental analysis for the Ridgeview West, the geographic area of the project site does not contain any sensitive resources. Impact would be less than significant.

FINDING: No TCRs are known to exist on the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change to a TCR and there would be less than significant impact.

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

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Energy Policy Act of 2005

The Energy Policy Act of 2005, intended to reduce reliance on fossil fuels, provides loan guarantees or tax credits for entities that develop or use fuel-efficient and/or energy efficient technologies (USEPA, 2014). The act also increases the amount of biofuel that must be mixed with gasoline sold in the United States (USEPA, 2014).

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Public Resources Code, Division 30) requires all California cities and counties to implement programs to reduce, recycle, and compost wastes by at least 50 percent by 2000 (Public Resources Code Section 41780). The state, acting through the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), determines compliance with this mandate. Per-capita disposal rates are used to determine whether a jurisdiction's efforts are meeting the intent of the act.

California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991

The California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (Public Resources Code Sections 42900-42911) requires that all development projects applying for building permits include adequate, accessible areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials.

California Integrated Energy Policy

Senate Bill 1389, passed in 2002, requires the California Energy Commission (CEC) to prepare an Integrated Energy Policy Report for the governor and legislature every 2 years (CEC 2015a). The report analyzes data and provides policy recommendations on trends and issues concerning electricity and natural gas, transportation, energy efficiency, renewable energy, and public interest energy research (CEC 2015a). The 2014 Draft Integrated Energy Policy Report Update includes policy recommendations, such as increasing investments in electric vehicle charging infrastructure at workplaces, multi-unit dwellings, and public sites (CEC 2015b).

Title 24–Building Energy Efficiency Standards

Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards of the California Building Code are intended to ensure that building construction, system design, and installation achieve energy efficiency and preserve outdoor and indoor environmental quality (CEC 2012). The standards are updated on an approximately 3-year cycle. The 2013 standards went into effect on July 1, 2014.

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

Urban Water Management Planning Act

California Water Code Sections 10610 *et seq.* requires that all public water systems providing water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 customers, or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet per year (AFY), prepare an urban water management plan (UWMP).

Other Standards and Guidelines

Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design

Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) is a green building certification program, operated by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) that recognizes energy efficient and/or environmentally friendly (green) components of building design (USGBC, 2015). To receive LEED certification, a building project must satisfy prerequisites and earn points related to different aspects of green building and environmental design (USGBC, 2015). The four levels of LEED certification are related to the number of points a project earns: (1) certified (40–49 points), (2) silver (50–59 points), (3) gold (60–79 points), and (4) platinum (80+ points) (USGBC, 2015). Points or credits may be obtained for various criteria, such as indoor and outdoor water use reduction, and construction and demolition (C&D) waste management planning. Indoor water use reduction entails reducing consumption of building fixtures and fittings by at least 20% from the calculated baseline and requires all newly installed toilets, urinals, private lavatory faucets, and showerheads that are eligible for labeling to be WaterSense labeled (USGBC, 2014). Outdoor water use reduction may be achieved by showing that the landscape does not require a permanent irrigation system beyond a maximum 2.0-year establishment period, or by reducing the project's landscape water requirement by at least 30% from the calculated baseline for the site's peak watering month (USGBC, 2014). C&D waste management points may be obtained by diverting at least 50% of C&D material and three material streams, or generating less than 2.5 pounds of construction waste per square foot of the building's floor area (USGBC, 2014).

Discussion

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

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

a-e. Potable, Wastewater, and Stormwater Facilities.

The project is required to comply with EID requirements for the treatment, collection, processing, and disposal of waste as established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The proposed development would be served with public sewer and water by El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) via construction of lines connecting to existing lines (8-inch water lines and 6-inch sewer lines in the neighborhood. The project would construct an off-site sewer line utilizing a gravity force system ~~alternative that would minimize maintenance and operational costs to the existing sewer lift station.~~ A final Facility Plan Report detailing the construction of the facilities would be required and reviewed as part of the Improvement Plan for the development. Submittal of an EID meter award letter confirming acquisition of services would be verified prior to Final Map approval.

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

The preliminary drainage plan depicts storm runoff generated on-site and off-site that would require construction of drainage facilities that would utilize and connect to the existing network in the area. These facilities, which include v-ditches within the residential lots and underground drainage inlets and culverts, shall be designed in accordance with El Dorado County Drainage Manual. The final drainage plan shall be reviewed as part of the Improvement Plan by DOT. Impacts are less than significant.

f- g. Solid Waste

County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables on site. Solid waste collection for the proposed lots would be handled through the local waste management contractor.

In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period.

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

The subdivision would be required to obtain solid waste collection service provided by El Dorado Disposal in accordance with Environmental Management-Solid Waste Division standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: The project has been designed to adequately convey storm drainage. Utilities such as water, sewer, and trash/recycle services shall be provided to the residential development by and in accordance with local purveyors' standards. For this 'Utilities and Service Systems' category, impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. *Does the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: As noted above the discussion below is from the original analysis in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the currently approved version of Ridgeview Village Unit No.9 and remains applicable to the proposed project.

a. **Degradation of Environment.** The site is not within any wildlife corridor but contains existing biological resources that would be affected as part of project development including impacts to oak canopy. Oak canopy impacts would be mitigated in accordance with the retention and replacement standards under General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A. Potential raptor foraging or nesting habitat would be verified prior to any construction. Project effects to Air Quality are anticipated to be less than significant with application of recommended mitigation measures. Based on the above discussions, project impacts to quality of the environment are anticipated to be less than significant after applicable mitigation measures are implemented.

b. **Cumulative Effects.** Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as "two or more individual effects, which when considered together, would be considerable or which would compound or increase other environmental impacts." Based on the analysis and conclusions in this checklist, including impacts to Air Quality and Biological Resources it has been determined that the project's individual and cumulative effects are not considerable and would have a less than significant impacts with adherence to identified mitigation measures and conformance to specific construction and permitting standards.

c. **Effects on Human Beings.** Project implementation would result to less than significant environmental effects to the existing and future residents in the area. As analyzed, implementation of project design, adherence to specific mitigation measures, and application of standard building and construction requirements would minimize the identified potential effects.

PROJECT INFORMATION

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Location Map
Attachment 2: Assessor's Parcel Map
Attachment 3: General Plan Land Use Map
Attachment 4: Zone Map
Attachment 5: Map of Off-Site Properties
Attachment 6: Adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study
Attachment 7: Approved Ridgeview Village Tentative Subdivision Unit No.9 Map (July 11, 2013)
Attachment 8: Proposed Phasing Plan for Ridgeview Village Tentative Subdivision Unit No.9
Attachment 9: Approved Off-site sewer plan Ridgeview Village Tentative Subdivision Unit No.9 Map
Attachment 10: Proposed Off-site sewer plan Ridgeview Village Tentative Subdivision Unit No.9 Map
Attachment 11: Approved Tree Preservation Plan Ridgeview Village Tentative Subdivision Unit No.9 Map
Attachment 12: Arborist Report for Ridgeview Village Tentative Subdivision Unit No.9 Map
Attachment 13: Comparison of Oak Resource Impacts with Ridgeview West development

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

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 Manual (DISM)

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.)