

ATTACHMENT 7



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: A08-0001/OR 08-0001 Mixed Use Development

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

Contact Person: Shawna Purvines

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Unincorporated El Dorado County, 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, 95667

Project Applicant's Name and Address: County of El Dorado, 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, 95667

Project Agent's Name and Address: County of El Dorado, 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, 95667

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

Project Location: Unincorporated Area, El Dorado County.

Assessor's Parcel No: N/A

Zoning: N/A

Section: N/A **T:** N/A **R:** N/A

General Plan Designation: Commercial

Description of Project: The project is to amend General Plan Policies 2.1.1.3, 2.2.1.2 and Table 2-2 of Policy 2.2.1.3 of the Land Use Element of the General Plan to include mixed-use development to occur horizontally as well as vertically, eliminate the requirement for projects to be predominantly commercial, and increase density to allow for up to 24 dwelling units per acre within Community Regions. The project requires the Zoning Ordinance be brought into compliance with the General Plan and provide standards for mixed-use development projects.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Unincorporated Area of El Dorado County

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The project will affect parcel within the Community Regions and Rural Centers designated for commercial development and zoned for Commercial (C), Professional Office Commercial (CPO), and Planned Commercial (CP). The project will allow for residential development in conjunction with commercial development.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____ Date: May 23, 2008

Printed

Name: Shawna Purvines For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: May 23, 2008

Printed

Name: Peter Maurer For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from a proposed amendment to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

The General Plan Amendment would modify the current land use designation for Commercial to allow mixed-use development to occur horizontally as well as vertically, eliminate the requirement for projects to be predominantly commercial, and increase density to allow for up to 24 dwelling units per acre within Community Regions. Currently the General Plan allows for up to 10 residential units per acre when developed as part of a mixed-use project in commercial areas. In addition, residential developments of up to 24 units per acre are allowed on commercial sites with a special use permit.

The Zoning Ordinance amendment would allow for mixed-use development as a use permitted in Commercial Districts (C), Professional Office Commercial Districts (CPO), and Planned Commercial Districts (CP) with a maximum residential density of 24 dwelling units per acres within Community Regions and a maximum residential density of up to 4 units per acre in Rural Centers. The amendment would also add chapter 17.14.210 of the Zoning Ordinance to include Mix-Use Development Standards applicable for Commercial Districts (C), Professional Office Commercial Districts (CPO), and Planned Commercial Districts (CP).

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project is located on parcels designated commercial in the unincorporated area of El Dorado County.

Project Characteristics

The project would amend the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to allow for mixed-use developments on parcels designated commercial in the County's Community Regions and Rural Centers. Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21083.3 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15177, and the initial study prepared by staff the County has determined that the project is within the scope of the General Plan EIR adopted July 2004 and two Supplemental EIR's (SEIR) adopted August 22, 2006 and July 10, 2007 as part of the Traffic Impact Fee program and General Plan Floor Area Ratio amendment. Therefore, this initial study only looks at issues specific and unique to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Mixed-
09-0156.6.1.3

Use Amendment and current setting conditions, and does not re-evaluate issues adequately addressed in the previous General Plan EIR or SEIR. This review will not address Agriculture and Forestry, Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources, Biological Resources and Cultural Resources, Recreation, Hazards and Lake Tahoe Basin, which were previously addressed in the General Plan EIR and will not be affected by this project. Nor will this review address certain impacts identified in the General Plan EIR that were considered to have no bearing on the proposed General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Mixed-Use Amendment.

Background

1. Population and Housing

On June 9, 2006, Bay Area Economics (BAE) presented findings of their review of the countywide land use forecasts utilized in preparing the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan. The County of El Dorado commissioned this review in order to ascertain whether the land use forecasts remain valid or whether conditions have changed such that the County should consider undertaking an update of those forecasts for revising projections of the rate at which land will be developed within the county. The land use forecasts are contained in the document titled: El Dorado County Land Use Forecasts for the DRAFT General Plan, dated March 5, 2002, by Economic and Planning Systems, hereafter "Land Use Forecast Report".

Based on a review of the Land Use Forecast Report and currently available population projections for El Dorado County, BAE recommend that the County should not conduct an update of the residential absorption projections contained in the Land Use Forecast Report. Similarly, an updated land use forecast based on the newer El Dorado County employment forecast available from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) would likely not yield a residential absorption estimate of greater precision than that already contained in the Land Use Forecast Report. In addition to the comparison of long-term growth projections, research for this evaluation included documenting actual growth trends in El Dorado County since the Land Use Forecast Report was completed. Based on this information, it appears that the growth assumptions in the Land Use Forecast Report were reliable, and in fact somewhat conservative from an environmental impact standpoint. Therefore, findings indicate that the County could expect similar growth rates that are equal to or less than what is projected in the 2004 General Plan.

2. Transportation/Circulation

The existing physical conditions for the transportation system serving El Dorado County have been described in detail in the General Plan EIR, with updated information regarding anticipated roadway levels of service (LOS) provided in the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the (TIM Fee SEIR) certified August 22, 2006. The General Plan EIR describes specific transportation system components in the County, including the regional roadway system, state highways, major County roads, and including public transit, non-motorized transportation, and aviation.

The Department of Transportation would likely require a traffic study prior to any new mixed-use development projects. The study would determine if a mixed-use project would worsen the Level of Service of any roads serving the proposed project. The study would recommend mitigation measures for any increase in traffic in the project area. A similar study as anticipated to be requested was conducted

for a proposed mixed-use project as part of a Planned Development (Red Hook & Sanders Mixed Use Project, Pollock Pines, California, June 26, 2007). The study found a slight increase during the PM peak-hour but with a minor modification to the intersection affected the impact were reduce to less than significant. Mixed-use projects located within urbanized areas of the unincorporated County are expected to reduce traffic impacts when sited near alternative forms of transportation such as bus routes, bike and pedestrian walkways.

3. Land Use and Visual Resources

On July 10, 2007, the Board of Supervisors adopted an amendment to the Floor Area Ratio (A06-0002) on Commercial, Industrial and Research & Development designated parcels. The amendment allowed for an increase in allowable development square footage for each of these land use designations, subject to compliance with other applicable County development standard (e.g. noise, height, setbacks, parking, landscaping, etc). A Supplement to the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan EIR (SEIR) was prepared to determine if the project had a significant effect on the environment. Based on this review, the increase in FAR would have a significant impact on land use and visual resources in the absence of identified programmatic mitigation measures which were adopted with the Amendment. This SEIR was not challenged. Similar impacts to land use and visual resources are anticipated with the Mixed-Use amendment, which would allow higher density development on commercial parcels then what was previously reviewed in the General Plan EIR. Mitigation measures were adopted as part of the FAR amendment and when applied to mixed-use projects on parcels designated commercial, impacts would be less than significant.

Focus

The EIR for the County General Plan (General Plan) was developed as a program EIR that was "intended to provide information at a more general level of detail" (EDC 2004). As described in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, a program EIR can be used to simplify the task of preparing environmental documents on later parts of the program (e.g., adoption of the Mixed Use Development Amendment and Ordinance). As a result and where appropriate, this document incorporates by reference information and conclusions of the General Plan EIR, including topics on regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, and other factors that would apply to the plan as a whole.

Project Schedule and Approvals

This Initial Study is being circulated for public and agency review for a 30-day period. Written comments on the Initial Study should be submitted to the project planner indicated in the Summary section, above. Following the close of the written comment period, the Initial Study would be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and would be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency would also determine whether to approve the project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based

on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista. The project is for a General Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendment. The land uses affected by the amendment are commercial and located within the County’s Community Regions and Rural Centers where focus on urban and suburban uses is supported through policies in the General Plan.

- a & b. **Scenic Vista and Resources.** Development resulting from the proposed amendment would only occur in areas designated for commercial uses, none of which are considered important scenic resources. Impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources are determined to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the General Plan EIR and Supplemental EIR and adopted as General Plan policies under 2025 and buildout conditions. Individual projects will be analyzed for potential impacts and required to adhere to current policies. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Visual Character.** No development is proposed as part of the project. Future development would be required to be consistent with adopted General Plan policies that reduce degradation of visual resources. General Plan policies 2.6.1.1, 2.6.1.6, 7.5.2.1, 7.5.2.2 and 7.5.2.3 provide protection of visual character in the County. The Zoning Ordinance amendment limits the heights of new mixed-use buildings to fifty feet. In addition, as part of a General Plan amendment to increase the Floor Area Ratio, mitigation measures were adopted to address the compatibility of more massive development in visually sensitive areas. Impacts would be less than significant
- d. **Light and Glare.** The General Plan Amendment and Rezone would allow for future mixed-use development on parcels designated for commercial uses. New sources of light

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

and glare would result from development of the parcel. In addition, as part of a General Plan amendment to increase the Floor Area Ratio, mitigation measures were adopted to address light and glare created by future projects. Prior to approval of any development of a site, Planning Services would review the proposed lighting plan to determine any future outdoor lighting sources comply with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. The potential lighting sources would be required to be consistent with the existing conditions in the area. Therefore, the impacts of existing light and glare created by the project would be less than significant.

Finding

Minimal impacts to aesthetics are expected with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendment either directly or indirectly. For this “Aesthetics” category, the impacts would be less than significant.

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

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);

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

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

a-c.

Air Quality Plan and Standards. Under General Plan 2025 conditions, the project would not significantly increase construction air quality impacts beyond those identified for the General Plan in the General Plan EIR. As the total building square footage would not increase under this scenario, construction air quality impacts are anticipated to be comparable to those identified in the adopted General Plan. Under buildout conditions, development would result in a temporary generation of emissions resulting from site grading, excavation and other development related activities. Future development would be required to comply with Air Quality Management District (AQMD) rules during project construction. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for onsite and offsite improvements, a Fugitive Dust Plan would be required. Adherence to District rules during project construction would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

d-e.

Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors. Future development would be required to comply with District rules during project construction. Compliance with District rules would reduce short-term potential impacts to a less than significant level. Potential long-term impacts would be addressed through the Development Review application process. Potential commercial uses would be required to be consistent with the three Commercial Zone District included in the project description, which include uses compatible with multi-family residential uses. Approval of future uses through the Development Review process would ensure the potential long-term impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the proposed project would not affect air quality. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and future development will have to adhere to district rules resulting in less than significant impacts.

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

| VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|
| 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 |

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;

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

- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical storm water pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

a & f. **Water Quality Standards.** The project would not result in increased development levels for the 2025 conditions and, as such, would have a similar impact in 2025 as that identified for the adopted General Plan. Under buildout conditions, development would increase, building footprints are likely to increase on individual development sites, and increased building heights may result in longer construction periods. This is anticipated to potentially result in an increase in the level of surface-water pollutants associated with construction activities. Such construction activities as grading have the potential to cause significant erosion, siltation, and turbidity impacts in nearby drainages. Construction activities often result in petroleum products and debris entering nearby drainages, along with accidental spills of material used during construction. Some of these pollutants can enter groundwater. Adopted General Plan Policies 5.4.1.2, 7.1.2.2, 7.1.2.1, 7.1.2.3, 7.2.3.7, and 7.2.3.10, in the adopted General Plan, combined with the related County and state regulatory and permit programs, would prevent these impacts from being significant. These policies reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

b. **Groundwater.** All future projects will be required to connect to public water services.

c. **Erosion Control Plan.** Prior to approval of any future development, the Department of Transportation would review the proposed project and would require a Grading Plan for any proposed improvements. The Grading Plan would be required to be in conformance with the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*. Adherence to the standards of the Ordinance would reduce potential erosion impacts to a less than significant level.

d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** No development is proposed as part of project. Future development would require drainage, erosion control and plan for the required road improvements and any onsite grading. Adherence to the plan would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

e. **Storm Water Run-off.** Erosion control plans would be required for any future road improvements. Adherence to the erosion plans would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Finding

No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan Amendment either directly or indirectly. For this “Hydrology” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

a. **Established Community.** Any future projects would only take place on sites within the County’s Community Regions and Rural Centers. Policies 2.1.1.2, 2.1.1.3, 2.1.1.7, 2.1.2.2, 2.1.2.3, and 2.1.2.5 within the General Plan direct higher intensity growth and mixed use development into these regions, therefore projects will be surrounded by higher density developments and located within areas designated for a mix of commercial and higher density residential uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Land Use Plan.** The proposed General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendment would be consistent with surrounding jurisdictions. The General Plan EIR identified less than significant impacts associated with consistency with applicable plans, policies and regulations of other agencies under 2025 conditions. Although residential development would be somewhat more intensive under full buildout, General Plan policies and land

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

use map would ensure that development remained consistent with relevant plans and policies of other agencies and adjacent jurisdictions. Under 2025 conditions, the change in density for multi-family on commercial parcels would only have a limited impact on development, primarily reflected in taller buildings and possibly more square footage of development on certain parcels. This change would not impact the level of development within each market area or in the County as a whole. The amount of residential development anticipated to occur by 2025 in the General Plan EIR will remain the same under the 2025 conditions associated with the project. Impacts related to building heights and square footage were addressed and mitigated in the General Plan SEIR adopted July 2006. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** Prior to any development, an applicant would be required to submit biological studies to identify any natural resources located on the site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|--|
| XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i> | | | | |
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | X | |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | X | |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | X | |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | X | |

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

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i> | | | |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level? | | | X |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | X |

Discussion:

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

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

a-d. **Noise Standards.** Future development may include the use of heavy equipment for onsite and offsite improvements. The onsite and offsite road improvements may generate temporary construction noise from the large heavy equipment, trucks, bulldozer) at a potentially significant level (greater than 60 dB L_{eq} and 70 dB L_{max} between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (2004 GP Table 6-5 for maximum allowable noise exposure for non transportation noise sources in rural regions-construction noise). Construction operations for road improvements would require adherence to construction hours as required by General Plan Policy 6.5.11. Construction activities would be limited to 7a.m. to 7p.m. during weekdays and 8a.m. to 5p.m. on weekends and federally recognized holidays. Short-term noise impacts would therefore be less than significant. The long-term noise impacts would be related to future noise generated by the site. Prior to development of the site, an acoustical analysis would be required to determine the long term impacts on the surrounding residential land uses. Adherence to California Building Code requirements for onsite noise would be required. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

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

e & f. **Airport Noise.** As described in the General Plan EIR, 2025 and buildout conditions would result in an increase potential exposure of new noise-sensitive receptors to aircraft noise by potentially increasing localized development in areas within the aircraft noise contour. Because the specific site designs and locations are not currently known, it is conceivable that an increased number of receptors could be exposed to aircraft noise levels. General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires all projects, including single-family residential, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport to be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable CLUP. Policy 6.5.2.2 states that the County shall develop and apply a combining zone district for areas located within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of airports. Lastly, Policy 6.5.2.3 requires all airports which have not developed noise level contours consistent with the General Plan forecast year of 2025 to update the respective Master Plans and CLUPs to reflect aircraft operation noise levels in the year 2025. Therefore, implementation of relevant General Plan goals and policies would help to protect both existing and proposed sensitive land uses and receptors. The impact would be less than significant.

Finding

Potential short and long term noise sources would be required to comply with established noise standards and policies. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|--|
| XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | |
| 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:

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth.** Implementation of the project would not redefine the existing land use designations in the unincorporated County since residential development on commercial parcels is already allowed. However, the project would establish new density levels that would be implemented along with adopted General Plan policies, actions and design guidelines, which are meant to guide and manage future development and land uses in the county. Population forecasts were derived based on housing projections, which are not expected to change under the projected 2025 conditions as analyzed by Bay Area Economics in their review of EPS’s study utilized in the General Plan. As part of this project, no housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required. The project would not result in a significant increase or decrease in population. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

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

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

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.** Although no development is proposed as part of the project, any new development would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. New fire protection and emergency medical services and facilities are developed primarily in response to population growth within the County. The project would allow for a mix of uses on commercial parcels but would not increase the anticipated population growth analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Prior to development of the site, the Fire Department would review the plans to determine the adequacy of fire protection services in the area. Fire Districts have been granted the authority by the State Legislature to collect impact fees at the time a building permit is secured. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection.** General Plan Policies 5.1.2.1 through 5.1.2.3 require new development to contribute its fair share to the cost of police services. These policies would ensure that law enforcement facilities are planned and built in accordance with the need generated by the higher intensities of development. The project would allow for residential development on commercial sites throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Impacts to police protection services would be less than significant, as existing policies would ensure adequate service levels are maintained and new or expanded public facilities are compatible with adjacent land uses.

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

c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** General Plan goals and policies provide guidelines to ensure coordination with schools, parks and other services. Impact fees are collected at the time a building permit is secured to help offset any growth impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

a-b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** The existing physical conditions for the transportation system serving El Dorado County are described in detail in the General Plan EIR, with updated information regarding anticipated roadway levels of service (LOS) provided in the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the (TIM Fee SEIR) certified August 22, 2006. The General Plan EIR describes traffic impacts and specific transportation system components in the County, including the regional roadway system, state highways, major County roads, and including public transit, non-motorized transportation, and aviation. Under 2025 conditions, the project does not increase residential development, however, development will have an impact on individual parcels. At buildout, there is the potential of 30,983 new units that are in addition to what was analyzed in the 2004 General Plan EIR. However, this includes possible development on already developed commercial parcels and the General Plan has monitoring guidelines and traffic impact requirements in place should impacts exceed planned levels of service for impacted roadways. The Department of Transportation would likely require a traffic study prior to any development. The study would determine if the project would worsen the Level of Service of any roads serving the proposed project. The study would recommend mitigation measures for any increase in traffic in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

c - f. **Traffic increase, Hazard, Emergency Access and Parking:** Prior to any development, the applicant would be required to mitigate any traffic hazards, provide road improvements and to increase the road width and emergency vehicle load ratings pursuant to fire safe regulations and may be placed as conditions of approval for future development. The applicant will also be required to submit plans demonstrating compliance with the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning ordinance. There would be no impact.

g. **Alternative Transportation.** The project would allow increased intensity of residential development on commercial sites. The 2004 General Plan EIR determined that the insufficient transit capacity was significant and unavoidable under both the year 2025 and building out conditions and a Statement of Overriding Consideration was adopted with

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

the EIR. The determination was based on insufficient spaces at park-and-ride lots to serve the population. However, under 2025 conditions the project would not increase the total amount of residents nor would it increase the projected population. It is anticipated that the potential for increased intensity of land uses would not have a positive affect on transit services, as it would allow for more centralization of routes and services and would not increase the need for facilities. Under 2025 conditions, the project would not increase the severity of this previously identified impact and would have a less than significant impact on transit services. Under buildout, there is an anticipated increase in population and therefore it is probable that additional needs for transit services would be created. Prior to any new development, the El Dorado Transit Authority would be distributed the project and would determine if additional alternative transportation improvements are necessary. There would be a less than significant impact.

Finding

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

| XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|--|
| 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 | |

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

| XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|
| 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.** New or expanded onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS) and private community disposal systems would be required to serve the developments outside the service area of EID’s wastewater collection system. This project would provide allowance for multi-family development on parcels with Commercial land use designations. Under General Plan 2025 conditions and its associated population growth, all development is expected to lead to a substantial increase in OWTS resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts. This project would not result in an increase of development levels for the 2025 conditions above what has already been identified and reviewed for in the adopted General Plan. Under buildout conditions the project would result in increased OWTS flows discharge beyond those documented in the 2004 General Plan EIR. The 2004 General Plan implemented Policy 5.3.2.4, which establishes a septic system monitoring program that requires monitoring of septic systems as necessary. The proposed project would be subject to Policy 5.3.2.4, coupled with the design requirements for OWTS as imposed by the County. Therefore, impacts resulting from the proposed General Plan FAR Amendment would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

b, d, & e **New Facilities.** All future development would be approved through a Design Review application that requires an environmental review. The 2004 General Plan development assumptions provide the basis for the projections of the type, location, and capacity of County water supply demands. It has been determined that most of the increase in water demand caused by the 2004 General Plan would occur within El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) service area, while the area services by the Grizzly Flat Community Services District (South County) would experience the greatest growth in demand in terms of percentage change. Limited amounts of growth are expected in the Georgetown Public Utilities District (North County) service area. Under 2025 conditions the project would not result in increased development than what was projected under the adopted General Plan. As such, the project would not increase the demand for water supply and this impact would remain comparable to the significance of this impact as evaluated in the adopted General Plan EIR and the Supplemental EIR adopted for the Floor Area Ratio amendment on July 10, 2007. Under buildout conditions, the project would cause an impact on surface water, requiring all water purveyors to seek additional water rights. However, the adopted General Plan implemented three policies and an implementation measures (Policy 2.2.5.20, Policy 5.2.1.9, Policy 5.2.1.10, and Measure LU-C) in order to address the likelihood of surface water shortages. Policy 2.2.5.20 and Measure LU-C establish a General Plan conformity review process for all development projects. Policy 5.2.1.9 requires applicants of proposed development to submit verification that adequate surface water supply from existing water supply facilities is adequate and physically available to meet the highest demand that could be permitted by the approval on the lands in question. Policy 5.2.1.10 establishes County support of water conservation and recycling projects that can help reduce water demand and projected shortages. In addition to these General Plan provisions, the County would continue to be required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 610 and 221 regarding the identification and verification of water supply service for future development requests as part of any project consideration. Future development would be required to connect to existing facilities and demonstrate the existing capacity of facilities in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Storm Water Drainage.** Any drainage facilities for the project would be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. Impacts would be less than significant.

f & g. **Solid Waste.** Higher intensity development on commercial parcels would generate substantial additional solid waste on a site-by-site base. However, the General Plan EIR addressed solid and hazardous waste disposal under Impact 5.6-1, and determined that the impact would be less than significant under both 2025 and buildout conditions. Since the

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

project does not anticipate exceeding growth projections in the General Plan, impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

| XVII. 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. Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21083.3 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15177, the County has determined that the project is within the scope of the General Plan EIR adopted July 2004. Therefore, this initial study only looked at issues specific and unique to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Mixed-Use Amendment and current setting conditions, and does not re-evaluate issues adequately addressed in the previous General Plan EIR or Supplemental EIR completed for the Floor Area Ratio Amendment adopted on July 10, 2007. This review did not address Agriculture and Forestry, Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources, Biological Resources and Cultural Resources, Recreation, Hazards and Lake Tahoe Basin, which were previously addressed in the General Plan

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

EIR and will not be affected by this project. Therefore, this project will not degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat, threaten plant or animal communities or eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. Prior to development, additional reports and studies would be necessary to determine the potential impacts to the project site and to the neighborhood. There would be no significant impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, noise, population/housing, public services, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant.
- c. Due to the type of the proposed project, activities proposed, and general environmental conditions analyzed in the General Plan EIR, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

El Dorado County General Plan Amendment (TIM FEE) Supplemental EIR, August 2006

El Dorado County General Plan Amendment, (FAR) Supplemental EIR, July 2007

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.)

Traffic Impact Analysis, Red Hook & Sanders Mixed-Use Project, Pollock Pines; Prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc, June 26, 2007