


**File No. TM05-1398-R**  
**Location Map**



**EXHIBIT A**


POR. SW1/4 SEC. 36, T.10N., R.9E., M.D.M.  
 THOUSAND OAKS ESTATES UNIT NO. 2  
 G-75

Tax Area Code

70:30




EXHIBIT B




THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY, It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purpose only.

NOTE - Assessor's Block Numbers Shown in Ellipses  
 Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles


Assessor's Map Bk. 70 - Pg. 30  
 County of El Dorado, California




**File No. TM05-1398-R**  
**General Plan Map**



**EXHIBIT C**





**File No. TM05-1398-R**  
**Zoning Map**



**EXHIBIT D**

# REVISED TENTATIVE MAP THOUSAND OAKS ESTATES, UNIT NO. 3 COUNTY OF EL DORADO, CALIFORNIA



**LEGEND FOR WATER & SEWER FACILITIES:**

|  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
|  | EXISTING WATER LINE              |
|  | EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT            |
|  | EXISTING GATE VALVE              |
|  | PROPOSED SEPTIC/LEACH FIELD AREA |

**OWNER OF RECORD:**  
MELVIN L. THOMAS  
3995 RAINBOW AVE. CT.  
SHERMAN SPRINGS, CA 95861  
TEL. 916-477-1440

**NAME OF APPLICANT:**  
MELVIN L. THOMAS  
3995 RAINBOW AVE. CT.  
SHERMAN SPRINGS, CA 95861  
TEL. 916-477-1440

**MAP PREPARED BY:**  
BOBE E. THORNE & ASSOCIATES, INC.  
4000 PLAZA DEL SOLANO CIRCLE  
CANTON PARK, CA 95826  
TEL. 916-477-1440 FAX 916-477-1440  
EMAIL: planning@thorneatvill.com

**SCALE:**  
1" = 50'

**CONTIGUOUS INTERVAL:**  
1" = 10'

**SOURCE OF TOPOGRAPHY:**  
AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

**SECTION, TOWNSHIP & RANGE:**  
SECTION 36, T. 12 N., R. 2 E., S. 26 N.

**ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER:**  
070-000-0

**PRESENT ZONING:**  
RA

**TOTAL AREA:**  
8.84 ACRES

**TOTAL NUMBER OF PARCELS:**  
1 RESIDENTIAL LOTS

**MINIMUM PARCEL AREA:**  
1.524 ACRES

**WATER SUPPLY:**  
EL DORADO REGIONAL DISTRICT

**SEWERAGE DISPOSAL:**  
REVERSE SEPTIC SYSTEMS

**PROPOSED STRUCTURAL FIRE PROTECTION:**  
OPENABLE SPRINKLER PFD

**DATE:**  
OCTOBER 24, 2008  
REVISED: JANUARY 20, 2009  
REVISED: FEBRUARY 11, 2009  
APRIL 16, 2009  
SEPTEMBER 17, 2009  
JULY 21, 2011

**DESIGNED BY:** *Bobe E. Thorne*  
**APPROVED DATE:** *January 10, 2009*

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:**  
APPROVAL/RECALL DATE: *11/14*

- NOTES:**
1. DIMENSIONS WILL BE PROVIDED AS FOLLOWS:
    - A. DRAINAGE AND PUBLIC UTILITIES DIMENSIONS TO BE ALONG ALL SIDE LINES, A DISTANCE OF 50' FROM THE FRONT CORNER.
    - B. THE FRONT SET OF ALL LOTS AS PUBLIC UTILITIES EXISTENTS.
    - C. THE SET CONTIGUOUS TO ALL STREETS OR IF BEYOND THE TOP OF CURB OR TOP OF FILL AS SLOPE DIMENSIONS.
    - D. THE SET ADJACENT TO ALL STREET RIGHT-OF-WAYS AS POSTAL DIMENSIONS.
    - E. IF DRAINAGE EXISTENT CENTERED ON Y-POINTS AND/OR EXISTING DRAINAGE CHANNELS.
  2. THE APPLICANT WILL MAKE ALL REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS BASED ON PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS APPROVED BY THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING:
    - A. CONSTRUCT THE COMMON DRIVEWAY TO LOTS 2 & 3 AS SHOWN IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE TYPICAL SECTION WITH CURB AND FILL BEING NO WIDER THAN 12' EXCEPT IN ROCK MATERIAL.
    - B. DISTURBED AREAS WILL BE RESEED IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE EL DORADO COUNTY RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT SPECIFICATIONS.
    - C. DRAINAGE CHANNELS SUBJECT TO DESIGN WILL BE REFINISHED OR ASPHALT LINED.
    - D. PITCHING SLOPE WATER TO ALL RESIDENTIAL LOTS AND REVERSE PORTIONS OF ALL LOTS AHEAD FOR IN-PLACE, NOT TO BE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS WITH AREA FOR REPLACEMENT.
- DESIGN WATER REQUIREMENT:**  
DESIGN WATERS HAVE BEEN REQUESTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 54000.05 OF THE MAJOR LAND DIVISION ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:  
1. TO ALLOW THE PROBABLY SPARED LOTS AS SHOWN AND REFINISH FOR LOT 1 LESS THAN 100 FT. AS SHOWN.  
2. ALLOW THE EXISTING ROADS TO REMAIN AS IS.

**ENGINEER'S STATEMENT:**  
BOBE E. THORNE, CERTIFY THAT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE THE LAND DIVISION MAP AND THE TYPICAL SECTION BEING SUBMITTED HAS BEEN DESIGNED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SPECIFICATIONS AND SUBSTITUTES ESTABLISHED BY THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO.

BOBE E. THORNE, RCE 3046  
REC. EXP. DATE: 12/31/2012

## EXHIBIT E

To:  Office of Planning and Research  
PO Box 3044  
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121  
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

From: (Public Agency)  
Development Services/Planning Services  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667

County Clerk  
County of El Dorado  
360 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

**FILED**

JAN 14 2008

WILLIAM E. SCHULTZ, Recorder-Clerk  
By *[Signature]*

**Subject:**

**Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.**

Tentative Map TM05-1398/Thousand Oaks, Unit 3

Helen L. Thomas; 3359 St. Ives Court (530) 677-1499  
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

| Project Title   | Project Applicant                           | Telephone                                       |
|---|---|---|
| 2007022119<br>State Clearinghouse Number<br>(if submitted to Clearinghouse) | Jason Hade<br>Lead Agency<br>Contact Person | (530) 621-5355<br>Area Code/Telephone Extension |

Assessor's Parcel Number 070-300-15; south side of St. Ives Court, approximately 500 feet south of the intersection with Meder Road, in the Shingle Springs area of El Dorado County.

**Project Location (include county)**

**Project Description:** Tentative map creating two lots ranging in size from 1.22 to 7.18 acres, with design waiver to allow irregular shaped lots and frontage for Lot 2 to be less than 100 feet as shown on the tentative map.

This is to advise that the Planning Commission has approved the above described project on 01/10/2008  
 Lead Agency  Responsible Agency (date)

and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

- The project  will  will not have a significant effect on the environment.
- An environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.  
 A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
- Mitigation Measures  were  were not made a condition of the approval of this project.
- A Statement of Overriding Considerations  was  was not adopted for this project.
- Findings  were  were not made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

**Fish and Game Fees/Recording Fees**

- Negative Declaration prepared; \$1,876.75 Fish and Game fee required for Notice of Determination
- EIR filed; \$850 fee required for Notice of Determination
- Recording fee of \$50 required  County project; no recording fee required

This is to certify that the final EIR with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at:

*[Signature]*  
Signature (Public Agency)

1-14-08  
Date

*[Signature]*  
Title

Date received for filing at OPR:



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

|  |               |   |   |
|--|---------------|---|---|
| <b>Project Title:</b> Tentative Subdivision Map Application TM05-1398 / Thousand Oaks Unit No. 3   |               |   |   |
| <b>Lead Agency Name and Address:</b> El Dorado County, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667  |               |   |   |
| <b>Contact Person:</b> Jason R. Hade, AICP, Senior Planner   |               | <b>Phone Number:</b> (530) 621-5355           |   |
| <b>Project Owner's Name and Address:</b> Helen L. Thomas, 3359 St. Ives Court, Shingle Springs, CA 95682   |               |   |   |
| <b>Project Applicant's Name and Address:</b> Helen L. Thomas, 3359 St. Ives Court, Shingle Springs, CA 95682   |               |   |   |
| <b>Project Location:</b> The subject property is located on the south side of St. Ives Court, approximately 500 feet south of the intersection with Meder Road in the Shingle Springs area, Supervisorial District IV.   |               |   |   |
| <b>Assessor s Parcel No(s):</b> 070-300-15   |               | <b>Parcel Size:</b> 8.4 acres                 |   |
| <b>Zoning:</b> One-Acre Residential (R1A)  |               | <b>Section:</b> 36 <b>T:</b> 10N <b>R:</b> 9E |   |
| <b>General Plan Designation:</b> Medium Density Residential (MDR)  |               |   |   |
| <b>Description of Project:</b> Tentative subdivision map application to create two lots ranging in size from 1.22 acres to 7.18 acres. A design waiver request has been submitted to allow irregular shaped lots and frontage for lot two to be less than 100 feet as shown on the tentative map   |               |   |   |
| <b>Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:</b>  |               |   |   |
|  | <u>Zoning</u> | <u>General Plan</u>                           | <u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School) |
| North:   | R1A           | MDR   | Single-Family Residences  |
| East:  | R1A           | MDR   | Single-Family Residences  |
| South:   | R1A           | MDR   | Single-Family Residences  |
| West:  | RE-10         | MDR   | Undeveloped   |
| <b>Briefly Describe the environmental setting:</b> The project site lies at an elevation of approximately 1,480 feet above mean sea level. Topography of the property is level to gently sloped land that is vegetated with trees, shrubs and patches of nonnative grassland. Two manmade ponds are located within the project study area. Residential development borders the subject site on all sides except the southern segment of the western boundary. A 3,976 square foot residence is located on the proposed lot one. Access to lot one would be provided by a driveway from St. Ives Court while lot two would be served by connecting to Mineshaft Lane. |               |   |   |
| <b>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):</b>  |               |   |   |
| El Dorado County Department of Transportation: Encroachment Permit   |               |   |   |

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

**DETERMINATION**

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

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** would be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there would 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** would 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: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: Jason R. Hade, AICP For: El Dorado County

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County



### **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 would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**Discussion:**

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

- a) No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway would be affected by this project.
- b) The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on existing scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources as the project is not located within a corridor defined as a State scenic highway.
- c) The proposed project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. As proposed, the project would not result in tree removal or disturbance of the two manmade ponds or seasonal wetlands.
- d) As only two lots are proposed, the project would not have a significant effect or adversely affect day or nighttime views adjacent to the project site. All outdoor lighting would conform to Section 17.14.170 of County Code.

**FINDING:** It has been determined that there would be no impacts to aesthetic or visual resources. Identified thresholds of significance for the "Aesthetics" category have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

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

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>                 |  |  |  |  |
| or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? |  |  |  |  |

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
  - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
  - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a) Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that no areas of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected by the project. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use map for the project and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- b) The proposed project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning in the project vicinity and would not adversely impact any properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) No existing agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

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

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

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, would 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<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, as a result of construction or operation emissions, would 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) 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, NO<sub>x</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>). The applicant provided “Air Quality Analysis for Proposed Residential Subdivision of APN 070-300-15, El Dorado County, CA,” prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants. According to the analysis, “the project conforms to the State Implementation Plan for achieving and maintaining federal ambient air control standards.” (*Air Quality Analysis for Proposed Residential Subdivision of APN 070-300-15, El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, September 8, 2005*). Therefore, the potential impacts of the project would be less than significant.
  - b) The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and determined that with the implementation of five standard conditions of approval, the project would have a less than significant impact on the air quality. As part of the conditions, an asbestos dust mitigation plan application must be prepared and submitted to the AQMD prior to the beginning of project construction. These measures are included as conditions of project approval and would reduce any impacts in this category to a level of less than significant.
  - c) As stated above under section “a,” construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in cumulative impacts to the air basin. This conclusion was reached in the submitted air quality analysis and reviewed and confirmed by the AQMD.
  - d) Although Ponderosa High School is a sensitive receptor located approximately 1,000 feet east of the project site, the air quality analysis concluded that implementation of standard AQMD conditions of approval would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
  - e) Residential development is not classified as an odor generating facility within Table 3.1 of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District CEQA Guide. The proposed residential subdivision would not result in significant impacts resulting from odors.

**FINDING:** Although the project has the potential to create significant impacts to air quality, standard conditions of approval have been incorporated into the project design to reduce the potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. It was determined that a less than significant impact would result from the project in that no sensitive receptors would be

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

adversely impacted, no objectionable odors would be created and the project would not obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan. Based on the inclusion of standard conditions of approval, no significant adverse environmental effects would result from the project.

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a & b)

The applicant submitted a “Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for APN 070-300-15 El Dorado County, CA,” prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants. The report concluded the following:

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

*The project study area (PSA) provides potential habitat for several special-status species. Birds-of-prey could potentially nest in or adjacent to the PSA. A protocol survey for special-status plants was conducted during the blooming period. One federal-endangered plant species (El Dorado bedstraw) occurs in the PSA. Take of federal-endangered plants requires consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service if a federal nexus exists (project is on federal land, is federally funded, or is federally permitted). El Dorado bedstraw is also designated as "rare" under the California Native Plant Protection Act. Construction of the new driveway in the PSA would not affect the El Dorado bedstraw. (Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for APN 070-300-15 El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, September 8, 2005)*

The initial biological study identified above was prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants based on the project design available at the time of report preparation on September 8, 2005. However, a revised tentative map was prepared by the project engineer on July 12, 2007. The revised map reduces the previously proposed map by one lot resulting in a two lot subdivision proposal. Although lot one is already built-out with a primary residence and accessory structure, it is possible that a second residential unit and additional accessory structures could be constructed on the proposed lot in the future. As such, the approximately 80 221 El Dorado bedstraw plants located on proposed lot one ~~must will~~ be protected, 123 by recorded deed restriction. Based on 17.71.200.C.1 of the Zoning Ordinance, payment of mitigation area 1 fees reduces the impact to less than significant. However, the following mitigation measures would further reduce potential project impacts to the El Dorado bedstraw:

~~MM BIO-1~~ — To further reduce impacts to the El Dorado bedstraw, the applicant shall collect seed from the El Dorado bedstraw plants on lot number one at an appropriate time of year, as determined by a qualified botanist, and sow the seed in suitable habitat near the existing El Dorado bedstraw plants on proposed lot number one prior to final map recordation.

~~Monitoring:~~ The qualified botanist shall submit a letter to Development Services once the seeds have been properly sowed on proposed lot one.

~~MM BIO-2~~ — To further reduce impacts to the El Dorado bedstraw, the applicant shall transplant the El Dorado bedstraw plants found on lot number one to suitable habitat near the existing El Dorado bedstraw plants on proposed lot number one under the supervision of a qualified botanist prior to final map recordation.

~~Monitoring:~~ The qualified botanist shall submit a letter to Development Services once the seeds have been properly transplanted on proposed lot one.

**MM BIO-3 1** To protect 123 existing and propagated El Dorado bedstraw plants, the applicant shall record a deed restriction on lot number one for the area ~~between the pond and the existing house~~, as shown on Revised Attachment 1, "Deed Restriction Area," to include the existing and propagated El Dorado bedstraw plants prior to final map recordation. The deed restriction shall restrict tree removal, landscaping and other activities incompatible with the continued growth of the El Dorado bedstraw. (New MM BIO-1)

~~Monitoring:~~ The applicant shall submit one monitoring report prepared by a qualified botanist to Planning Services within one year of plant seed sowing and transplantation. Monitoring shall include an assessment of the population of El Dorado bedstraw and activities within the deed restriction area. Planning Services staff shall review the deed restriction area prior to final map filing.

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

- c) According to the preliminary jurisdictional delineation report submitted, the total acreage of potential jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. at the subject site is 1.783 acres. General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 requires a minimum setback of 100 feet from the two ponds at the site and a minimum setback of 50 feet from the wetlands delineated on Figure 3 within the report. According to the submitted delineation study, “the applicant has stated the intent to avoid impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S.” (*Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for APN 070-300-15 El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, September 8, 2005*). Discharge of fill into jurisdictional wetlands or below the OHWM of a channel requires a section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game. No federal or state permits are necessary if work does not occur in the ponds or wetlands. (*Building setbacks to ponds and wetlands on APN 070-300-15, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, December 21, 2005*) According to a *Response to Comments Received for Thousand Oaks Unit 3, TM05-1398-A*, prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants on December 14, 2005, “there are no riparian areas surrounding ponds 1 and 2 outside of the wetlands indicated on our preliminary jurisdictional delineation map. The tentative map does not indicate any improvements to the existing driveway and culvert on the access driveway to Lot #1. The proposed septic area for Lot #1 does not overlap jurisdictional waters or wetlands, and has been placed 100 ft away from such features at the nearest point. The project does not propose fill of any waters, wetlands, or riparian areas, therefore a streambed alteration agreement is not required. DFG recommends the same setbacks as the County’s interim standards, but the recommendations are not binding.” As such, impacts to ponds and wetlands located at the subject site would be less than significant.
- d) Review of the Planning Services GIS *Deer Ranges Map* (January 2002) indicates that there are no mapped deer migration corridors on the project site. The project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.
- e) According to the submitted “Tree Canopy Analysis for APN 070-300-15,” the existing tree canopy coverage at the subject site is 46 percent. (*Tree Canopy Analysis for APN 070-300-15, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, August 30, 2004*) The applicant has indicated that no trees would be removed due to the project as the driveway connecting Mineshaft Lane and the new lots would be designed to avoid removal of any trees.
- f) As discussed in the submitted biological report, ponds one and two provide potential foraging and breeding habitat for amphibians, but are outside the current range of the California red-legged frog. The adjacent ponds and wetlands also provide potential foraging habitat for the northwestern pond turtle (NWPT). Although no NWPT were observed at the subject site, NWPT could occupy the ponds for some or all of the year. The uplands surrounding the ponds are not suitable nesting habitat for NWPT. (*Building setbacks to ponds and wetlands on APN 070-300-15, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, December 21, 2005*)

**FINDING:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above would result in less than significant project impacts to biological resources. Therefore, the established thresholds for significance in the “Biological Resources” category would not be exceeded.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property 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 & b)

The applicant submitted a “Cultural Resources Study of Thousand Oak Unit No. 3 APN 070:300:15 Shingle Springs, El Dorado County, California” prepared by Historic Resource Associates in February 2006. According to the study, “Following a field investigation of the project area, no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts were found, nor were any significant historic buildings, structures, or objects discovered.” (*Cultural Resources Study of Thousand Oak Unit No. 3 APN 070:300:15 Shingle Springs, El Dorado County, California, Historic Resource Associates, February 2006*) In the event sub-surface historical, cultural or archeological sites or materials are disturbed during earth disturbances and grading activities on the site, standard conditions are included within Attachment 1 of the staff report to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- c) A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or know fossil locales.
- d) Due to the size and scope of the project, there is a potential to discover human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the standard conditions within Attachment 1 shall be implemented immediately.

**FINDING:** Although the project has the potential to impact sub-surface cultural or historic resources, or disturb human remains located outside of a designated cemetery, the application of the standard conditions identified in Attachment 1 of the staff report address such impacts. Established thresholds of significance would not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category.



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

| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>   |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |  |  | X |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |  |  | X |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   |  |  | X |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   |  |  | X |
| iv) Landslides?  |  |  | X |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  |  |  | X |
| c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?   |  |  | X |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?  |  |  | X |
| e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?   |  |  | X |

**Discussion:**

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

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
- Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

a) According to the Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas (Jennings, 1994) and the Peak Acceleration from

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

Maximum Credible Earthquakes in California (CDMG, 1992), no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones (Special Studies Zones) are located on the project site. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating structures in the project area would be offset by compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.

- b) No project grading is proposed. Any future grading activities would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- c) The soil on the project site is classified as Rescue sandy loam, 2 -9 percent slopes, Argonaut clay loam, 3 – 9 percent slopes and Placer diggings (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). Soil permeability on site is moderately slow, runoff is slow to medium and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. All grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which would reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
- d) According to the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*, the erosion hazard of soils at the subject site is slight to moderate. Based upon this information, the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.
- e) Prior to final map recordation, the applicant would submit septic percolation testing data to the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department – Environmental Health Division for review and approval.

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

| <b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 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 |

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

| <b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  |   |  | X |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |   |  | X |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | X |  |   |

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
  - Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
  - Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.
- a) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be transported, used or disposed of for the project.
  - b) No significant amount of hazardous materials would be utilized for the project. The project would not result in any reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
  - c) As proposed, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
  - d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there would be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.
  - e) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There are less than significant impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations and the over-flight of aircraft in the vicinity of the project.
  - f) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 22, 2001, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights in the vicinity of the project site.

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

- g) The proposed project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the County. This is based upon the location of the nearest fire station, availability of multiple access points to the project site, availability of water for fire suppression and provisions within the County emergency response plan. The County emergency response plan is located within the County Office of Emergency Services in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.
- h) The El Dorado County Fire Protection District reviewed the project proposal and concluded that the project would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires or wildland fires adjacent to or located in an urbanized area with the implementation of several standard conditions of approval contained within Attachment 1 of the staff report. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** The proposed project would not expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, and expose people and property to risks associated with wild land fires. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded by the proposed project with the implementation of standard conditions of approval from the El Dorado County Protection District.

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

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

| <b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>                  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? |  |  |          |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  |  |  | <b>X</b> |

**Discussion:**

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
  - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
  - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
  - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
  - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) No grading is proposed for the project. The only planned site improvement is to upgrade the existing driveway for lot two.
- b) There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The proposed project would be required to connect to public water.
- c) As there is no proposed grading there is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances associated with the project would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply to this project.
- d & e)  
 No grading is involved with the proposal. Therefore, substantial drainage pattern alteration or runoff would not occur.
- f) The project would not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site. The proposed septic system design for the revised tentative map was reviewed and approved by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, Environmental Health Division on October 15, 2007. There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of one new septic system in conjunction with other existing septic system in the project area would degrade the area's water quality.
- g & h)  
 The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0725C, December 4, 1986) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.

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

- i) The subject property within the Shingle Springs area is not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters. According to the applicant, two berms were constructed that impound water in the drainage forming ponds one and two. Culvert one is the overflow for pond one. When water in pond one rises to the level of the culvert, water flows into pond two. Pond two does not have an overflow culvert, instead an open channel was constructed to carry overflow water around the berm. Water in pond two does not rise above the level of channel one. The potential for flooding impacts relating to these two berms is less than significant because of the overflow system described above.
- j) The ponds on the project site are not large enough to be susceptible to a seiche. The proposed project is not located near a coastal area, and therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to tsunamis. No volcanoes or other active volcanic features are near the project site and, therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to mudflows. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
  - Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
  - Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
  - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
  - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a) The project would not result in the physical division of an established community. As proposed, the project is compatible with the surrounding residential land uses and would not create land use conflicts with surrounding properties. Impacts would be less than significant.
  - b) As proposed, the project is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance with the approval of the two design waiver requests. The applicant has proposed a 25-foot setback from the

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

ponds and wetlands at the subject site. A letter submitted by the applicant from Sycamore Environmental Consultants dated December 21, 2005 concludes that “we believe a building setback of 25 feet for the construction of a home on the northern end of the parcel is sufficient to protect the water quality and habitat value of the man-made ponds and wetlands in this ephemeral drainage.” (*Building setbacks to ponds and wetlands on APN 070-300-15, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, December 21, 2005*) The Planning Commission has reviewed the submitted biological documentation and concurs with the report’s findings that the proposed 25-foot non-building setback from the ponds and wetlands is sufficient to protect the water features and habitat area. Therefore, the proposed tentative subdivision map is consistent with the applicable General Plan policies, including Policy 7.3.3.4. As no conflict exists between the project and applicable land use policies, potential environmental impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- c) As discussed in Section IV Biological Resources, parts a, b and f, the submitted biological resources evaluation concluded that the proposal would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Mitigation measures to protect the El Dorado bedstraw found at the project site are identified within the Biological Resources section above. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** For the “Land Use Planning” section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.
- a) The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan. No impacts would occur.
  - b) The Western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** No impacts to any known mineral resources would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. In the “Mineral Resources” section, the project would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a & c)

The project would not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project would not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan as it involves the creation of one additional lot and related residential noise. Impacts would be less than significant.

b & d)

Persons adjacent to the project vicinity would not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of project operation. No grading is proposed. Therefore, persons adjacent to the project vicinity would not be subjected to significant short-term ground borne noise and vibration as a result of grading and excavation during construction of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.



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

- e) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards contained within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport. No impacts would occur.
- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** For the “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would occur from the proposed development.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
  - Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
  - Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.
- a) The proposed project has been determined to have a minimal growth-inducing impact as the project includes the creation of one additional residential lot and does not include any school or large scale employment opportunities that lead to indirect growth.
  - b. No existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project. No impacts would occur.
  - c) No persons would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** The project would not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project would not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or expanding infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts would result from the project.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

- a) **Fire Protection:** The El Dorado County Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Fire District from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District would review the project improvement plans and final map submittal for condition conformance prior to approval. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Police Protection:** The project site would be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff's Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. No specific minimum level of service or response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff's Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The addition of two residential lots would not significantly impact current response times to the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Buckeye Union School District. The affected school district was contacted as part of the initial consultation process and no specific comments or mitigation measures were received. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- d) Parks: The proposed project would not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. In this case, the tentative map shall be conditioned to require the payment of an in-lieu park fee consistent with the procedures outlined within Section 16.12.090.
- e) No other public facilities or services would be substantially impacted by the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the creation of one additional residential lot at the subject site, either directly or indirectly. No significant public service impacts are expected. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 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) Because the project only includes the creation of two residential lots, it would not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing recreation facilities. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts to recreation or open space would result from the project. For this “Recreation” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a & b)

The El Dorado County Department of Transportation has determined that the project would generate approximately 20 average daily trips. Therefore, a traffic study is not required and potential traffic impacts from the project are anticipated to be less than significant.

- c) The project would not result in a change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity. No impacts would occur.
- d) St. Ives Court and Mineshaft Lane are both County maintained and would provide access to the subject site through driveways. The proposed project does not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards. No traffic hazards would result from the project design. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- e) As shown on the tentative map, 10-foot wide driveways would provide adequate emergency access to the lots as determined by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District.
- f) The submitted tentative map was reviewed to verify compliance with on-site parking requirements within the Zoning Ordinance. Section 17.18.060 of the Zoning Ordinance lists the parking requirements by use. Parking requirements for conventional single-family detached homes are two spaces not in tandem. Utilizing the parking standards discussed above, the project requires a minimum of four parking spaces. As proposed, the project meets the minimum parking requirements for the conventional single-family detached residential use subject to verification prior to building permit issuance for each proposed home. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No bus turnouts are required for this tentative map. No impacts would occur.

**FINDING:** No significant traffic impacts are expected for the project and mitigation is not required. For the "Transportation/Traffic" category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;

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

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

a & b)

The El Dorado Irrigation District would provide water to the subject site and individual on-site sewage disposal systems would serve each of the proposed lots subject to El Dorado County Environmental Management Department review and approval. No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required as a result of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) No change in project drainage is proposed as a result of the tentative map. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d) The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) would provide potable water to the project. In the Facility Improvement Letter (FIL) provided by the applicant, EID states that “a six-inch water line exists in St. Ives Court.” (*El Dorado Irrigation District FIL0705-163, Brian L. Cooper, P.E., July 28, 2005*) Because of the sprinkler installation requirement and related conditions of approval discussed above under the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section, the water line extension discussed in the EID FIL is no longer required. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e) As stated above, the lots would be served by individual on-site sewage disposal systems subject to Environmental Management Department review and approval. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility / Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.
- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. On-site solid waste collection for the proposed lots would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space is available at the site for solid waste collection. Impacts would be less than significant.

**FINDING:** No significant impacts would result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the “Utilities and Service Systems” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects would result from the project.

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

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

**Discussion:**

- a) The project contains jurisdictional waters protected by State and Federal statutes and oak woodlands protected by County regulations. Avoidance and compliance with standard conditions of approval regarding applicable General Plan policies concerning these biological topics would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant. Additionally, mitigation measures are included to further reduce potential project impacts to identified rare plants on site. Subsurface earthwork activities may expose previously undiscovered buried resources. Standard construction cultural resource mitigation is incorporated into the project. This would ensure that impacts on cultural resources are less than significant. In summary, all potentially significant effects on biological and cultural resources can be mitigated to a level of less than significant.
- b) All cumulative impacts related to air quality, noise and traffic are either less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts on these areas. Impacts are less than significant.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project would not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Project mitigation has been incorporated into the project to reduce all potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures and standard conditions of approval have been designed to address air quality, biological resources, cultural resource and hazards and hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant.

**SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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



**PROJECT SPECIFIC REPORTS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

*Air Quality Analysis for Proposed Residential Subdivision of APN 070-300-15, El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, September 8, 2005.*

*Biological Resources Evaluation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation Report for APN 070-300-15 El Dorado County, CA, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, September 8, 2005.*

*Building setbacks to ponds and wetlands on APN 070-300-15, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, December 21, 2005.*

*Cultural Resources Study of Thousand Oak Unit No. 3 APN 070:300:15 Shingle Springs, El Dorado County, California, Historic Resource Associates, February 2006.*

*El Dorado Irrigation District FIL0705-163, Brian L. Cooper, P.E., July 28, 2005*

*Response to Comments Received for Thousand Oaks Unit 3, TM05-1398-A, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, December 14, 2006.*

*Tree Canopy Analysis for APN 070-300-15, Sycamore Environmental Consultants, August 30, 2004.*

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment 1: Deed Restriction Area

**Mitigation Measure Agreement for TM05-1398  
Thousand Oaks Unit No. 3**

As the applicant, owner, or their legal agent, I hereby agree to amend the above named project by incorporating all required mitigation measures, as identified in the related Environmental Checklist, which are necessary in order to avoid or reduce any potentially significant environmental effects to a point where clearly no significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

I understand that by agreeing to amend the proposed project through incorporation of the identified mitigation measures, or substantially similar measures, all potentially adverse environmental impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level and a "Proposed Negative Declaration" would be prepared and circulated in accordance with County procedures for implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). I also understand that additional mitigation measures may be required following the review of the "Proposed Negative Declaration" by the public, affected agencies, and by the applicable advisory and final decision making bodies.

I understand the required mitigation measures incorporated into the project would be subject to the El Dorado County Mitigation Monitoring program adopted in conjunction with the Negative Declaration, and that I would be subject to fees for the planning staff time to monitor compliance with the mitigation measures.

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

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

El Dorado County Planning Services  
Jason R. Hade AICP, Senior Planner

Signature of Applicant / Owner / Agent:

By \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Print Name and address below

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name and title above

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



# COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION

<http://www.edcgov.us/DevServices/>

**PLACERVILLE OFFICE:**

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

**BUILDING**

(530) 621-5315 / (530) 622-1708 Fax

[bldgdept@edcgov.us](mailto:bldgdept@edcgov.us)

**PLANNING**

(530) 621-5355 / (530) 642-0508 Fax

[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)

**LAKE TAHOE OFFICE:**

3368 Lake Tahoe Blvd., Suite 302

South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

(530) 573-3330

(530) 542-9082 Fax

[tahoebuild@edcgov.us](mailto:tahoebuild@edcgov.us)

September 16, 2014

Michael and Jeannette Parigini  
5937 Bryant road  
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

RE: Building Permit Number: 229242  
Assessor's Parcel Number: 087-340-10-100

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Parigini:

Planning Services has reviewed the subject building permit application for compliance and consistency with the El Dorado County Zoning Codes and General Plan Policy. Based on this review, the following needs to be addressed:

1. **General Correction, Floor Plan:** Your floor plans shows stairs going to a second level. Please provide a floor plan for that upper level of this building.
2. **General Correction, Elevations:** Please provide elevations for all sides of this structure.

Upon submittal of the above requested information, Planning Services can finish the review of your building permit application. This letter reflects the requirements from Planning Services only. You may receive comments from other departments who are reviewing your application. Their comments and review of your project may affect the timing of your application's approval and issuance. Please note: correction resubmittals, where previously identified corrections have not been made, shall be charged at the rate of \$100 per hour (1/2 hr. min). The same fee procedures shall be applicable to any additional plan review that is required for revisions generated by the applicant'

Should you have any questions, or which to discuss the above requirements further, please contact me at (530) 621-6530.

Sincerely,

**Priscilla Maxwell**  
Development Technician

**County of El Dorado**  
Community Development Agency  
Development Services Division/Planning  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(53) 621-6530  
FAX (530) 642-0508  
[priscilla.maxwell@edcgov.us](mailto:priscilla.maxwell@edcgov.us)