EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING SERVICES

2850 FAIRLANE COURT

PLACERVILLE, CA 95667

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

Project Title: El Dorado County Animal Shelter

Lead Agency Name and Address: County of El Dorado/Chief Administrative Office, 3000 Fairlane Court, Ste. 1, Placerville, CA 95667

Contact Person: Brent Collins **Phone Number:** (530) 621-5593

Property Owner's Name and Address: El Dorado County General Services

Project Applicant's Name and Address: County of El Dorado/Chief Administrative Office, 3000 Fairlane Court, Ste. 1, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Agent's Name and Address: Brent Collins, County of El Dorado/Chief Administrative Office, 3000 Fairlane Court, Ste. 1, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:

Project Location: 6425 Capitol Avenue, on the west side of Capitol Avenue, approximately 470 feet north of the intersection of Capitol Avenue and Enterprise Drive, Diamond Springs area.

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 329-341-04-10

Zoning: I, Industrial

Section: 25 **T:** 10 **R:** 10

General Plan Designation: I, Industrial

Description of Project:

1. Acquisition by El Dorado County of 4.27 acres of land known as 6425 Capitol Avenue, Bldg. B.

2. Record of Survey to create a 4.27-acre parcel from a 6.67-acre parcel.

3. Tenant improvements within an existing 21,086 square foot building and development of a barn and animal enclosure areas on the 4.27-acre parcel.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	I	I	Commercial office buildings
North:	I	I	Industrial
East:	I	I	Industrial
South:	I	I	Industrial
West:	R20K	HDR	Residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project site is located on the west side of Capitol Avenue approximately 460 feet north of the intersection of Capitol Avenue and Enterprise Drive. The 4.27-acre project site is occupied by an approximately 21,186 square foot commercial concrete tilt up building, parking lot, and ornamental landscaping. The majority of the site has been mass graded for the original commercial/industrial project. Grades range anywhere from 1-5%, with grades sloping downwards to the west. There is a large vacant area on the property which is dominated by non-native annual grasses; the western boundary of the site is populated with oak trees, pines and chaparral. Two soil units have been mapped on the project site, Boomer very rocky loam (BkD), 3 to 30 percent slopes and Diamond Springs very sandy loam (DfB), 3 to 9 percent slopes. Both soils are very well drained, with slow to medium runoff potential, and slight to moderate erosion hazard.

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

1. El Dorado County Building Services, Building Permits
2. El Dorado County Board of Supervisors, Financing

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed Animal Shelter relocation project.

Project Description

The proposed project includes the acquisition of 4.27 acres of land located at 6425 Capitol Avenue by El Dorado County; division of the parent parcel (329-341-04-10) to create a 4.27 acre parcel; and tenant improvements to the existing 21,186 square foot building to accommodate animal shelter operations and development of vacant land to include a 2500 square foot enclose barn and fencing to provide for containment of livestock and dogs.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The 4.27-acre site is located on the west side of Capitol Avenue approximately 460 feet north of the intersection of Capitol Avenue and Enterprise Drive with the Park West Business Center in the Diamond Springs area. Surrounding land uses are all light industrial and commercial in nature, with the exception of medium-density residential development to the west.

Project Characteristics

Operations

- **Hours of Operation:** The hours of operation when staff is present at the Facility will normally be from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Sunday through Saturday. The Facility will be open to the public for adoption and reclaiming of animals 6 days a week (9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday and closed Sunday and County holidays). The public will be able to access the shelter to turn in stray animals six days a week excluding Sundays and County holidays between the hours of 800AM and 500 PM.
- **Staffing:** Staffing for the site may vary, but in general there are 14 employees (4 office employees, 4 shelter employees, and 6 field officers). There may also be volunteers on the site at any given time.

Best Management Practices (Daily Operations & Construction)

- **Waste Management:** Animal waste is removed on a regular basis. Dog kennels are scooped twice a day with the waste being disposed of in trash bags. Any remaining fecal matter is washed down the drain and a standard animal shelter disinfectant is applied and left on for the proper contact time. The disinfectant is then rinsed down the drain. Cat litter boxes are scooped our throughout the day and the waste is disposed of in plastic bags. Litter is changed on a regular basis and the litter boxes are also cleaned and disinfected. All other small animal enclosures are cleaned of waste one-two times per day. Exterior areas for dog exercise will scooped after each individual dog is exercised. These areas will also be treated with an absorbent. Livestock areas will be cleaned daily and the waste will be placed in a 5 cubic yard transport trailer in an area near the barn. The trailer will be tarped as required to start composting in the trailer. Once the trailer is full, the waste will be removed off-site to the County composting facility adjacent to the County Fairgrounds. ~~These areas will also be treated with an absorbent.~~ Any companion animal (dog or cat) that is euthanized will be removed outside of normal business hours, out of public view and will be in unmarked bags and disposed of off-site. The unmarked bags will be stored inside the facility until it is time for their removal.
- **Exterior Construction:** Construction associated with the project will primarily consist of the erection of the enclosed barn structure and the possibility of minor grading associated with leveling of animal confinement areas.
    - A fugitive dust management plan will be prepared in accordance with Air Quality Management

District guidelines should grading exceed 250 cubic yards or 10,000 square feet of surface area.

- Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am to 5:00pm on weekends and federally recognized holidays.

- **Pest Control:** The shelter will utilize a number of methods to control various pests that may arise as a result of operation of the facility. These may include but are not limited to the following:
  - *Flies:* Flies are controlled through a number of shelter procedures and practices:
    - Use of Equitrol Feed-Thru Fly Control as appropriate.
    - Use of SprayMaster system installed in paddock area. SprayMaster uses an environmentally friendly programmable application to the animals to ensure animals are free of nuisance flies.
    - Daily cleaning procedures for pastures and paddocks also reduce the possibility of site originated nuisance flies.
    - Manure will be tarped as required to start composting in trailer. Heat generated by composting process minimizes the potential for flies.
    - Frequent removal of manure from the site will also ensure animals are not adversely impacted by nuisance flies.
  - *Mosquitoes:* Mosquitoes are controlled through a number of shelter procedures and practices:
    - The Shelter will not use common, open style water troughs commonly associated with mosquito propagation. Water will be changed on a regular basis and water buckets are cleaned frequently.
    - Watering systems are controlled to measure animal consumption for medical evaluation purposes. Watering control measures are also valuable in removing the possibility of larva in watering containers.
  - *Rodents:* Rodent population is controlled by securing potential rodent food sources in secured, cleaned, metal food containers.

-

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature:		Date:	
Printed Name:	Gordon Bell	For:	El Dorado County

Signature:	Peter N. Maurer for	Date:	10 July 2013
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 will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

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

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

a. **Scenic Vista:** The project site is located within an existing industrial area which includes a multitude of industrial and commercial uses. There are no scenic vistas in this area as designated by the County's General Plan. As such, development of this project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. There would be no impact.

b. **Scenic Resources:** The nearest state scenic highway, as designated and listed by Caltrans, is U.S. Highway 50 beginning from the eastern limits of the Government Center interchange (Forni Road/Placerville Drive) to South Lake Tahoe. The Government Center interchange is approximately 1.75 miles north of the project site. However, the site is not visible from this interchange, nor are there any scenic resources in this industrial area, thus there would be no impact.

c. **Visual Character:** The project site is currently developed with industrial buildings which are primarily used for commercial office uses. The proposed project consists of the retrofit of an existing building and the construction of a pole barn (approximately 2500 square feet) in a vacant area south of the existing building as well as paddocks for holding of large and small animals. Surrounding land uses are all industrial and commercial with the exception of residential lots just west of the project parcel. The site is screened from these residential uses by a large row of oak trees which shall remain after project completion. Given that the site is currently used for industrial/residential purposes, and the majority of the project will consist of the retrofit of the existing building, it can be concluded that the visual character will not be substantially altered and the proposed project would be in character with surrounding industrial and commercial uses. There would be no impact.

d. **Light & Glare:** The proposed project will introduce additional lighting in this area in order to light the outdoor animal confinement areas. This light could have an impact on adjacent residential areas to the west; however, trees bordering the site on its western boundary would have the effect of diffusing any of this light and thus it is not expected to have any impact on this residential area. This additional lighting would not adversely impact day or nighttime views in the area consistent with the industrial land use designation. All future outdoor lighting for future development will be required conform to Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation. There would be no impact.

Finding: The proposed project primarily consists of the retrofit of an existing commercial/industrial building to accommodate the animal shelter. A barn and fencing would be erected on vacant areas of the parcel. This parcel is located in an industrial and commercial area and proposed development will not significantly change the character of the parcel. The parcel is screened from adjacent residential land uses by existing trees on the western boundary of the project. As the project will not impinge upon scenic vistas, will fit in with existing industrial and commercial character of the area, and will ensure that all lighting is shielded to the extent that it will not produce significant glare

on surrounding properties, impacts are considered to be less than significant for this "Aesthetics" category.

II.	**AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.** *Would the project:*	
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	X
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	X
c.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	X
d.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	X
e.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	X

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

a. Conversion of Prime Farmland. Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that the proposed project site contains Boomer very rocky loam (BkD), 3 to 30 percent slopes and Diamond Springs very sandy loam (DfB), 3 to 9 percent slopes. Both soils are very well drained, with slow to medium runoff potential, and slight to moderate erosion hazard. Review of the General Plan Land Use Map for the project area indicates that the project site is designated as Industrial (I) and is not located within or adjacent to lands designated with the Agricultural Districts (A) General Plan Land Use Overlay. As such, no conversion of farmland would occur.

b. Williamson Act Contract. The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract because the site is not designated for agricultural use. There would be no impact.

c. Non-Agricultural Use. The site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land under the Farmland Mapping Program. Surrounding properties are also similarly designated. There would be no impact.

d. Conflicts with Zoning for Forest/timber Lands: No conversion of timber or forest lands would occur as a result of the project. There would be no impacts.

e. Loss of Forest land or Conversion of Forest land: Neither the General Plan nor the Zoning Ordinance designate the site as an important Timberland Preserve Zone and the underlying soil types are not those that support timber production. There would be no impacts.

Finding

The project would not have a significant impact on agricultural lands, convert agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses, nor affect properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. For this "Agriculture" category, there would be no impact.

III. AIR QUALITY. *Would the project:*

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

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

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

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

a. **Air Quality Plan.** El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000), establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NOx, and O3).

The proposed project is not expected to have significant air quality impacts because it primarily consists of the interior retrofit of an existing building and installation of fencing and a barn. In addition, this is relocation of an existing facility, and thus no new vehicular emissions are being created by the project. Minor grading will occur for leveling of the paddock areas and the foundation for the barn, but this is not expected to generate significant amounts of fugitive dust. However, should there be significant grading proposed as a result of the project, the applicant will implement a Fugitive Dust Plan during grading activities in accordance with El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) guidelines. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions below a level of significance.

b. **Air Quality Standards:** As discussed above, this project is a relocation of the existing Animal Shelter facility located in the City of Placerville. As such, there are no new vehicular trips being created in El Dorado County as

a result of the project, and thus there are no new long-term emissions being created as a result of the project. Therefore, there would be no impact to air quality standards.

c. **Cumulative Impacts:** As noted in b) above, this is a relocation of an existing facility and will not create any new air quality impacts. There would be no cumulative air quality impacts.

d. **Sensitive Receptors.** There are residences located just west of the site. The most significant pollutant generated by the project would be PM_{10} emissions during grading for the barn which is expected to be very short term (e.g. 1-2 days). The majority of this dust would not be expected to reach these residences as it would be captured in the trees which form a buffer on the western boundary of the project site. Given the short grading period and the buffer on the western boundary of the project site, impacts to sensitive receptors are expected to be less than significant.

e. **Odors.** The proposed facility will include outdoor areas for large animal (livestock) confinement and outdoor exercise areas for large and small dogs. It is expected that animal waste will be generated in these areas as a result of animal confinement. There is the potential for animal waste to generate odors at adjacent residences to the west should this waste be allowed to collect onsite. However, animal waste is removed on a regular basis. Dog kennels are scooped twice a day with the waste being disposed of in trash bags. Any remaining fecal matter is washed down the drain and a standard animal shelter disinfectant is applied and left on for the proper contact time. The disinfectant is then rinsed down the drain. Cat litter boxes are scooped throughout the day and the waste is disposed of in plastic bags. Litter is changed on a regular basis and the litter boxes are also cleaned and disinfected. All other small animal enclosures are cleaned of waste one-two times per day. Exterior areas for dog exercise will scooped after each individual dog is exercised. Livestock areas will be cleaned daily and the waste will be removed off-site. These areas will also be treated with an absorbent. Any animal (dog or cat) that is euthanized will be removed outside of normal business hours, out of public view and will be in unmarked bags and disposed of off-site. Adherence to the Best Management Practices (BMPs) outlined above would reduce the potential impacts to adjacent sensitive receptors as a result of odors to less than significant levels.

Finding

A significant air quality impact is defines as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, this project is a relocation of an existing facility and thus no new air quality impacts are being created. For this "Air Quality" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	X

d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	X
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	X
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. **Special Status Species:** There is no special status species located within the development footprint. Ground disturbance related to this project will be confined to grading of a foundation for the proposed barn and fence pole holes for the large animal and dog confinement areas. This ground disturbance will take place in areas that have been previously disturbed by grading activities for the original project. This currently vacant area is populated with non-native annual grasses and weedy species. There will be no removal of oak trees as a result of this project. There would be no impact to special status species.

b-c. **Riparian Habitat, Wetlands:** There is no riparian habitat or wetlands on the project site as defined by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. There is a drainage ditch located on the north side of the property that exhibits riparian characteristics; however, this is well outside of the development footprint, and will not be impacted by any of the proposed activities. There would be no impact to riparian habitat or wetlands.

d. **Migration Corridors:** The El Dorado County General Plan does not identify this site as being part of a migration corridor for wildlife. In addition, this location is part of a larger developed commercial/industrial business park within an urban area. There would be no impact to migration corridors.

e. **Local Policies:** El Dorado County Code and General Plan Policies pertaining to the protection of biological resources would include protection of rare plants, setbacks to riparian areas, and mitigation of impacted oak woodlands. No locally designated plant or animal species would be impacted and no locally designated natural communities would be impacted. As discussed previously, the development activities would not result in the removal of any oak trees or sensitive species, as the development footprint is limited to the area populated by non-native annual grasses. There would be no impact.

f. **Adopted Plans:** The project site is not currently covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. There would be no impact.

Findings: Given that the development footprint is limited to areas occupied by non-native annual grasses and areas that have been previously disturbed by grading activities, there would be no impact to biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

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

Discussion:

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

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

a-c. **Historic Resources, Archaeological Resources, Paleontological Resources:** There are no cultural or paleontological resources within the development footprint of the site, as the site has been previously mass graded for the existing development. In addition, proposed ground disturbance will be minimal, consisting of grading for the foundation for the barn and ground penetration for the fence posts around the perimeters of the animal confinement areas. There would be no impact.

d. **Human Remains:** There are no known burial sites within the project site. If human remains are unearthed during construction, the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall apply. Under these sections, no further disturbance of the remains shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are identified as Native American, the County Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American, and the descendant may make recommendations for means of treating and disposing of the remains and any grave goods with appropriate dignity. The impact would be less than significant.

Finding: The project would not have impacts to cultural resources given the fact that ground disturbance associated with the project will be minimal and proposed development will occur in areas previously graded areas. There would be no impact to Cultural Resources.

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

a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	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	X

	to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		
	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. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist- Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County (El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR, May 2003, p.5.9-5). No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, CA, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1). There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated west of the Melones fault zone and east of the East Bear Mountain fault zone. The East Bear Mountain fault zone is associated with the Foothills fault system, previously considered inactive but re-classified to potentially active after a Richter magnitude earthquake measuring 5.7 occurred near Oroville in 1975. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 55 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 45 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results

published by the California Geological Survey (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002. http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha). While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project is located (El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR, May 2003, p.5.9-6-5.9-9). The project site is relatively flat. There would be no risk of landslide. There would be no impact.

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

b-c. **Soil Erosion and Loss of Topsoil.** The site has been disturbed previously for industrial and commercial development as part of the business park. Ground disturbance will be limited to digging of fence pole hosts and foundation piers for the barn. No significant grading is proposed, and thus impacts related to soil erosion and losses of topsoil are considered to be less than significant.

d. **Expansive Soils.** Expansive soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Two soil units have been mapped on the project site, Boomer very rocky loam (BkD), 3 to 30 percent slopes and Diamond Springs very sandy loam (DfB), 3 to 9 percent slopes. Both soils are very well drained, with slow to medium runoff potential, slight to moderate erosion hazard, and moderate to low shrink/swell potential, respectively. Table 19-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The applicant will be required to submit a site-specific geotechnical study which includes design recommendations for the barn foundation specific to soils onsite. This study would be subject to review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed commercial structures. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Septic Systems:** There would be no impact related to septic systems because the proposed project is to be served by public water and sewer. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Geology and Soils" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. *Would the project:*

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

a. The prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect as specifically listed in Assembly Bill AB 32, the

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

GHGs are a global pollutants, unlike criteria for air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, which are pollutants of regional and local concern. Carbon dioxide equivalents are a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the greenhouse effect.

Emitting CO2 into the atmosphere is not itself an adverse environmental affect. It is the increased concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere potentially resulting in global climate change and the associated consequences of such climate change that results in adverse environmental affects (e.g., sea level rise, loss of snowpack, severe weather events). Although it is possible to generally estimate a project's incremental contribution of CO2 into the atmosphere, it is typically not possible to determine whether or how an individual project's relatively small incremental contribution might translate into physical effects on the environment.

In June 2008, the Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) issued a technical advisory (CEQA and Climate Change) to provide interim guidance regarding the basis for determining the proposed project's contribution of greenhouse gas emissions and the project's contribution to global climate change. In the absence of adopted local or statewide thresholds, OPR recommends the following approach for analyzing greenhouse gas emissions: Identify and quantify the project's greenhouse gas emissions; Assess the significance of the impact on climate change; and if the impact is found to be significant, identify alternatives and/or Mitigation Measures that would reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels. (California Energy Commission. 2006. *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004.* (Staff Final Report). Publication CEC-600-2006-013-SF).

The project proposes to retrofit an existing commercial building with a use that would in fact generate less traffic than a commercial office use which previously existed. The project also has the potential to impound large livestock. Such animals do have the potential to generate methane gas. However, these animals would be few in number and they already exist, and thus currently contribute methane to the atmosphere. This is not a new contribution. In light of these factors, impacts related to the project's expected contribution to GHG emissions would not be considered significant, either on a project-level or cumulative basis. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: It has been determined that the project would result in less than significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions because of the fact that the project is a retrofit of an existing building and is expected to generate less emissions than previous uses in this building. For this "Greenhouse Gas Emissions" category, there would be no significant adverse environmental effect as a result of the project.

VIII.	**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** *Would the project:*				
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				**X**
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				**X**
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				**X**

d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	X
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	X
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	X
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	X
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	X

Discussion:

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

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

a. **Hazardous Substances.** Construction activities associated with the project may involve the transportation, use, and disposal of construction materials, paints and fuels that may be considered hazardous. The use of these hazardous materials would only occur during construction. Some spillages of paints and fuels may occur, but they would be minor and not pose a significant hazard to workers and adjacent land uses.

b. **Creation of Hazards.** The proposed project will not utilize acutely hazardous materials that could be released into the environment either by accident or upset, thus there would be no creation of hazards. There would be no impact.

c. **Hazardous Emissions.** The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. In addition, there are no schools within ¼ -mile of the project site. There would be no impact.

d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List, http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/). No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the proposed project site are known to have occurred. This has been verified in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by EBI Consulting for this project (January 25, 2013). There would be no impact.

e. **Public Airport Hazards**. The project is not located near or within any Safety Zones of a public airport. There would be no impact.

f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** The project is not located near any private airstrips or landing pads. There would be no impact.

g. **Emergency Response Plan.** Construction and operation of the proposed animal control facility would involve no disruption of emergency access to and from occupied uses along Capitol Avenue as all work will be contained onsite. There would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.

h. **Fire Hazards.** The project site is located in an area of "Moderate Fire Hazard" according to the Fire Hazard Rating Map contained in the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan, Figure HS-1. Any potential development activity would be subject to SRA Fire Safe Regulations, which provide standards for basic emergency access and perimeter wildfire protection. The proposed project is an existing development that has been designed in compliance with state and local fire district regulations. The barn which would be constructed as a result of this project would also comply with all state and local fire district regulations and will be reviewed for compliance during the building permit process. This would reduce the risks associated with wildland fires to a less than significant level. Electrical equipment would be enclosed, and the project would not include any operations (e.g., use of hazardous materials or processes) that would substantially increase fire hazard risk. Emergency response access to the site and surrounding development would not be adversely affected, as discussed above. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

Finding: No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Hazards" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? X

Discussion:

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

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

a. **Water Quality Standards:** Construction of the proposed project would involve a minor amount of ground disturbance (approximately 2500 square feet) that would have not increase the level of sediments in stormwater discharges over the long-term or in the short-term. Operation of the proposed project would not involve any uses that would generate a significant increase in wastewater especially given the fact that this is backfilling a building that previously generated water usage, and thus overall there would be no significant increase in wastewater being treated by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). There is no evidence indicating that the project or activities associated with the project would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or exceed thresholds that would require review by the RWQCB. Therefore, no water quality standards would be violated, and no impact would occur.

b. **Groundwater Supplies:** The project would not withdraw any groundwater from the site, as the existing building is connected to EID's water supply system and not use wells. Construction of the 2000 square foot barn in the currently vacant area of the site will have no significant impact in groundwater recharge. Since the project would not withdraw any groundwater directly, and since EID uses surface water, the reduced recharge area would not lead to a net deficit in aquifer volumes or a lowering of the groundwater table. There would be no impact.

c. **Drainage Patterns:** The project would have no impact on normal drainage patterns as the only impervious area proposed as part of the project is the barn. The barn is located in a relatively flat area that does not contain any drainage courses. Drainage from the barn will be directed to an appropriately designed sump so that animal waste does not contaminate offsite drainages. Drainage ~~is this~~ in the open space area primarily occurs through infiltration into existing soils and is not particularly directed to any drainage course. Therefore, the impact of the barn construction is expected to be less than significant, as all sediment generated by minor grading activities would remain in place. There would be no impact.

d. **Surface Runoff:** The project would not generate an increase in surface runoff, through site grading and the creation of impervious surfaces as it is an existing developed site. Construction of the 2500 square foot barn would decrease the amount of impervious area at the site, but there will still be approximately be 4.17 acres of pervious surfaces remaining on the project site. There would be no impact.

f. **Water Quality:** All impacts to water quality are discussed within the sections above, as well as the Geology and Soils section contained earlier in this Initial Study. No additional impacts have been identified. There would be no impact.

g. **Flood Related Hazards:** The project is a public facility project with no housing component, and as such the project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard. There would be no impact.

h. **Impedance of Flood Flows:** The project site is not located within a 100-year flood plain according to the FEMA prepared Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel No. 06017C0775E, revised September, 26, 2008. There would be no impact.

i. **Flood Risk:** The project would not place people or structures at risk due to flooding. As discussed above, the project is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area, and the business park development has been designed to appropriately direct drainage. There would be no impact.

j. **Sieche or Tsunami:** The project is not at risk for inundation due to a seiche or tsunami as it is not located near any body of water. The project is not located in an area prone to inundation by mudflows. There would be no impact.

Findings: 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.

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
- Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
- Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
- Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.

a. **Established Community:** The proposed project is primarily the retrofit of an existing building in the Park West Business Center. It would not divide an established community. There would be no impact.

b. **Land Use Consistency:** The 2004 General Plan has designated this property for industrial uses. Use of the building for an animal shelter is not only consistent with the Industrial designation, but is also consistent with the zoning ordinance, as animal shelters are an allowed use in the Industrial zone district pursuant to County Code Section 17.34.020(A). There would be no impact.

c. **Habitat Conservation Plan:** There is currently no adopted HCP or NCCP that covers El Dorado County.

There would be no impact.

Findings: The project involves minor amounts of development on existing developed parcel intended for such uses. As such, the proposed project will have no effects on the community or adopted plans or policies. For the Land Use Planning section, there would be no impact.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?		X
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?		X

Discussion:

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

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

a&b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not located in an area where mineral resources are classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b per the County's General Plan Important Mineral Resource Areas map (Figure CO-1, El Dorado County General Plan, 2004). Also, there are no MRZ-2 classified areas within or adjacent to the project site, and the project has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect proposed uses or be affected by the project development. There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Mineral Resources" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a) **Noise Exposure:** A Noise Study was prepared by *Acoustical Engineering Consultants* in February 2013 to address potential noise impacts from the relocation of the El Dorado County Animal Shelter to an existing building near single family residences in Diamond Springs. Field sound tests and an acoustical analysis were performed. Construction of the new facility will include improving the interior spaces within the existing concrete shell to provide rooms for dog and cat kennels, offices, adoption areas, veterinary areas, and support spaces. Site modifications will also occur with the addition of outdoor dog exercise areas, a barn, and an area for large animals such as horses and sheep. The animal shelter is expected to be open to the public from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Saturday. The main source of sound from an animal shelter is dogs barking. Sound tests were conducted at the future El Dorado County Animal Shelter site near the adjacent residences to assess background levels and sources. Sound level data was also collected at a similar animal shelter for Sacramento County. Interior dog kennel sound level measurements were used as the basis for noise modeling at the future site. Observations at the Sacramento County facility and research of dog behavior indicates dogs will primarily bark within the confines of the interior kennel spaces and not when taken outside for exercise. Unlike the Sacramento County facility, the El Dorado County Animal Shelter will not have interior/exterior kennels where dogs can freely roam into exterior holding areas where barking could be an issue. Sound level predictions were made at the nearest residential property line approximately 230 feet southwest of the animal shelter building and compared with El Dorado County noise regulations, primarily Table 6-2 of the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element1. Noise levels from the animal shelter are predicted to be well below both the daytime and nighttime hourly Leq and LMAX limits at the nearest residential property line without mitigation. The containment of dog barking within the indoor kennels combined with operational procedures to prevent noise when animals are brought outside is sufficient to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. This impact would be less than significant. Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of the General Plan are not applicable to this project site or adjacent land uses on the remaining three sides, as industrial land uses are not designated noise-sensitive land uses.

b) **Groundborne Noise:** The project may generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction. However, those impacts are very temporary given the limited amount of construction that would occur (grading for the barn foundation) and would be confined to standard construction hour limitations, as described in d) below. Moreover, the nearest sensitive land use to groundborne vibrations or noise are the residences west of the project site, which are approximately 230 feet away or more. There would be no expectation that residences would experience long-term impacts from groundborne vibration or noise at that distance due to normal operations of the animal shelter as no heavy vehicle operations are proposed as part of daily activities. The impacts would be less than significant.

c) **Long-Term Noise Increases:** The El Dorado County Animal Shelter project will add new sound sources to the region. The main source of sound from an animal shelter or animal control facility is from dogs barking. Cats and other small animals rarely generate significant noise levels and are kept indoors. Although the animal shelter facility will temporarily house large animals such as horses, pigs, and sheep in exterior pens or in the barn, these animals are typically docile and quiet. Any roosters brought into the animal shelter are expected to either be kept indoors or covered to eliminate crowing.

Dog kennels and holding areas for El Dorado County Animal Shelter are all indoors with most contained in the central core area of the building. While the Sacramento County facility has some indoor/outdoor kennels where

dogs can roam between spaces, the El Dorado County facility will not. Dogs will be routinely exercised in designated areas to the south of the building typically one-on-one with a pet handler. Although dog behavior can be unpredictable, most dogs do not bark when being exercised outdoors because they are happy to be playing and are interacting with a handler. None of the dogs barked when being exercised at the Sacramento County facility during the site visit. It is much more likely that dogs left alone in backyards of nearby residents would bark before dogs outside the animal shelter building would bark. Sound levels from animals exterior to the animal shelter building are expected to be less than significant at the nearest residential property without mitigation.

Kenneled dogs inside the animal shelter, however, will bark for a variety of reasons. Sound levels were measured in some of the holding/adoption rooms at the Sacramento County facility. Average Leq sound levels inside the holding areas ranged from approximately 95 to 98 dB(A) while LMAX levels reached 103 to 106 dB(A) with multiple dogs barking depending on the number of dogs, distance to the microphone, etc. Since the holding areas are either in the center of the building with no exterior wall or behind a concrete portion of exterior wall with no windows or doors leading directly to the exterior, the potential weak path for sound transmission to the exterior is through the roof/ceiling assembly. The existing roof/ceiling system is described as the following, starting at the top of the roof: single ply over fiberboard, 6" rigid insulation, 5/8" thick sheathing, joists with foil-faced batt insulation, and a T-bar ceiling system suspended below. Noise levels transmitted through the roof/ceiling assembly and across to the nearest residential property line are predicted to be well below both daytime and nighttime Leq and LMAX standards without mitigation. No additional noise control measures are required. There would be no impact.

d) **Short-Term Noise Increases:** The project may result in a short-term noise increase in ambient noise levels due to construction activities related to the barn. This impact is expected to be very short-term in nature, less than 2-3 weeks. The majority of that noise would result from heavy vehicles needed for grading for the foundation; this would be expected to last less than 2 days. Adherence to standard County conditions of approval limiting the hours of construction activities to 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am to 5:00pm on weekends and federally recognized holidays would reduce this potential impact to less than significant levels.

e) **Airport Plan:** The proposed project is not located within an adopted airport land use plan and is located 4 miles away from the Placerville Airport. People working in the project area would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from this airport. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) **Airport Noise:** The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Impacts to people working or residing in the area would be less than significant.

Findings: For the Noise category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects would occur from the proposed development, with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure NOI -1.

XIII.	**POPULATION AND HOUSING.** *Would the project:*	
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. **Population Growth:** The proposed project would not induce population growth in the area. Employees currently working at the Placerville Animal Control Shelter would be relocated to the new shelter. Also, given that this project is a backfill of an existing building, there will be no need for development of new infrastructure. There would be no impact.

b. **Housing Displacement:** There is no housing on the site, and thus there would be no displacement of existing housing. There would be no impact.

c. **Replacement Housing:** The proposed project would not displace any people, as there are no people currently living on the project site. There would be no impact.

Finding: The project would not displace any housing or people. The project would not directly or indirectly induce significant population 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.

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

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 project site would be and is currently served by the Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District. The Fire Department maintains a fire station at 501 Main Street in Diamond Springs, which is approximately 1.0 mile from the project site. The proposed project is not expected to substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for fire services as the only new structural element of the project is the barn, which is considered a non-habitable structure. There would be no impact.

b) **Police Services:** Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department. Because of the small size and scope of the proposed project and the fact that animal control officer are considered law enforcement officers, it is would not substantially increase nor substantially expand demand for police services. There would be no impact.

c) **School Services:** School services in the Placerville area are provided by the Mother Lode Union Elementary School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The proposed project is a public facility which proposes a very small staff. In addition, this is a relocation project, with staff moving from the existing facility in Placerville. As such, the project would generate any increase in student population requiring additional facilities since students of employees would already be attending the schools listed above. There would be no impact.

d) **Recreation:** The project is located within the El Dorado Recreation District which is maintained by the El Dorado County General Services, Division of Chief Administrative Office). As discussed in the Population and Housing section, the proposed project would not induce significant population growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore the project is not expected to increase or expand demand for parks. There would be no impact.

e) **Other Governmental Services:** There are no other governmental services anticipated to be adversely impacted by the proposed project. As previously noted, the project is not expected to induce significant population growth, which would stimulate demand for public services that could be met with new or expanded facilities. There would be no impact.

Findings: The proposed project would not result in any substantial increase in demand for public services, due to the
lack of population growth the project would induce. Therefore, no new or expanded public service facilities would be
required.

XV. RECREATION.

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

Discussion:

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 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. This project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities as it is not residential in nature. There would be no impact.

b. The project does not include recreational facilities. As noted in a) above, the project would not generate an increase demand for park services. Therefore, the project would not require construction or expansion of additional facilities. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant impacts related to parks or recreational facilities would result from the proposed project. For this Recreation section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded, there would be no impact.

XVI.	**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** *Would the project:*	
a.	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in 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. **Traffic Increases, Levels of Service:** The proposed project consists primarily of backfilling an existing commercial/light industrial building with the animal shelter facility. As such, traffic loading for the area's street system was already considered at the time of the initial development of the existing building, and the Park West Business Park. Roads within the business park were developed for the commercial/industrial uses within the business park, and thus this project would not be expected to have an impact on road capacity. Typical trip generation rates for general office uses (which this

building was used for previously) are 11.01 trips/1000 square feet, with 1.56 peak hour trips/1000 square feet in the AM peak hour and 1.49 peak hour trips/1000 square feet in the PM peak hour (ITE Transportation Manual, 6th 9th Edition). Given these figures, the previous tenant would have been expected to generate approximately 231 daily trips, 32 AM peak hour trips, and 31 PM peak hour trips. Based on observations of the existing animal shelter facility in Placerville, daily operations would be expected to generate approximately 36 trips per day (16 trips attributed to staff, 10-20 trips attributed to visitors and volunteers). Given that the backfilling of the building will result in far fewer trips than would be attributed to a general office use, it can be concluded that there would be no impact to existing levels of service or road capacity.

c. **Air Traffic:** The project is not located adjacent to or within the safety zone of any airport. The closest airport, the Placerville airport, is 4.3 miles away, and would not be affected by the proposed project, nor would the project be affected by existing air traffic patterns. There would be no impact.

d. **Design Hazards:** As discussed previously, this is a backfill project. The original development was reviewed by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) to ensure that there were no design hazards. The impacts would be no impact.

e. **Emergency Access:** The project as proposed would provide two access points off of Capitol Avenue. These access points would provide adequate emergency access. There would be no impact.

f. **Parking:** The proposed project would provide parking in excess of zoning ordinance requirements for the proposed use. There would be no impact.

g. **Alternative Transportation:** The project does not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs regarding alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

Findings: Environmental impacts of the project related to transportation would be less than significant level. As discussed above, daily operations of the animal shelter facility would actually generate less transportation impacts than what was originally anticipated for the use of this property. For the Transportation/Traffic category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a. **Wastewater Requirements:** The project site is currently served by the El Dorado Irrigation District and will continue to be served by the District and thus it will not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. There will be no impact.

b. **Construction of New Facilities:** No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required because this site is already served by the El Dorado Irrigation District and has been historically served by the EID. The EID would continue to serve this building and as such no new facilities are required. There would be no impact.

c. **Construction of New Drainage Facilities:** On-site storm water drainage facilities consist of a drainage ditch located on the northern boundary of the site in a 20-foot wide drainage to capture sheet flow from the site. Other drainage facilities were developed with the existing development which was reviewed and approved by the appropriate agencies during the building permit review for the existing two buildings. There would be no need to construct new drainage facilities for this project. There would be no impact.

d. **Water Supply:** The project is a backfill of an existing commercial/light industrial building with existing water entitlements from the El Dorado Irrigation District. There would be no impact.

e. **Adequate Capacity:** The project is a backfill of an existing commercial/light industrial building with existing entitlements for wastewater disposal from the El Dorado Irrigation District. There would be no impact.

f. **Solid Waste Disposal:** 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. In addition, this project is a relocation project, thus waste stream is merely being transferred from one location to the other, but there will not be a net increase in solid waste being disposed of to the Lockwood Landfill. There would be no impact.

g. **Solid Waste Requirements:** 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 project site would be handled through the local

waste management contractor. Solid waste collection and disposal within California is subject to the provisions of the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This legislation mandates a 50 percent diversion from the solid waste stream going to landfills by 2000. According to the most recent information available from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (2005), unincorporated El Dorado County currently meets the 50 percent diversion rate. The solid waste collection service provided to the project site includes a recycling program, which would ensure continued compliance with state diversion requirements. The impacts would be less than significant.

Findings: 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.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. *Does the project:*

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

Discussion:

a) No substantial evidence contained in the project record has been found that would indicate that this project would be anticipated to have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment. As proposed, and with adherence to County permit requirements, this project would not be anticipated to have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. The proposed project is not anticipated to have any impacts due to the fact that the majority of the project is a retrofit of an existing building and the only new development is the barn and confinement areas. Adherence to required standards that would be implemented as part of the building permit process and Best Management Practices (BMPs) proposed as part of operation of the facility would ensure that there is no impact.

b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as "two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." Based on the analysis in this environmental review, it has been determined that there would be no cumulative impacts primarily due to the fact that this is an existing developed parcel and this is a relocation of an existing facility.

c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. There would be no impact.

INITIAL STUDY ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1.....Aerial Location Map
Attachment 2.....Assessor's Parcel Map
Attachment 3.....USGS Quad Map
Attachment 4.....Development Plan
Attachment 5.....Conceptual Site Plan
Attachment 6.....Conceptual Floor Plan
Attachment 7.....Acoustical Analysis

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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.)

Field Sound Tests and Noise Impact Analysis of El Dorado County Animal Shelter Facility in Diamond Springs, California, prepared by Acoustical Engineering Consultants (AEC), February 12, 2013

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment: El Dorado County Animal Shelter Project, 6425 Capitol Avenue, Bldg. 2, Diamond Springs, CA, prepared by EBI Consulting, January 25, 2013