

FINAL FINDINGS

Design Review Permit DR24-0008/Diamond Springs Village Apartments – Phase II As Approved by the Planning Commission on January 9th, 2025

1.0 CEQA FINDINGS

- 1.1 This project has been found to be Statutorily Exempt from the requirements of CEQA pursuant to Section 15268, Ministerial Projects. As discussed in the findings below the project has been found to be consistent with the requirements set forth in California Senate Bill 35 (SB-35) making the project ministerial. The project proposes the construction and operation of a 31-unit affordable housing project including one manager's unit and one office/community room within four multi-unit housing buildings, with 61 off-street parking spaces, landscaping, and open space/common areas.
- 1.2 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Planning and Building Department, Planning Services Division, at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.

2.0 GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS

2.1 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.1.2.

The site is designated under the General Plan as Multi-Family Residential (MFR). The MFR land use designation identifies those areas suitable for high-density, single family, and multi-family design concepts such as apartments, single-family attached dwelling units, and small-lot single-family detached dwellings. Lands identified as MFR shall be in locations with the highest degree of access to transportation facilities, shopping and services, employment, recreation, and other public facilities. The minimum allowed density is five dwelling units per acre, with a maximum density of 24 dwelling units per acre. Except as provided in Policy 2.2.2.3, this designation is considered appropriate only within Community Regions and Rural Centers.

Rationale: The project is consistent with the MFR General Plan land use designation (Exhibit D). The MFR General Plan land use designation permits a multi-family residential density range between five (5) dwelling units and 24 dwelling units per acre. The project site is 5.71 acres and is consistent with the minimum MFR density of approximately five (5) dwelling units per acre. The site is within the Diamond Springs and El Dorado Community Region of the county, with access to public infrastructure and community services to serve the project consistent with the requirements of this policy.

2.2 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.5.21.

General Plan Policy 2.2.5.21 requires that development projects be located and designed in a manner that avoids incompatibility with adjoining land uses.

Rationale: The project site is adjacent to existing multi-unit residential uses to the west and south, a multi-unit residential property currently under construction to the west and southwest (Diamond Springs Village Apartments – Phase I) and the existing single-family residences to the north and east (Exhibit B). To ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses, the project has included several architectural and site design features to minimize impacts including building setbacks, landscape screening, and full cut-off, downward-directed lighting. The Community Design Guidelines are not objective standards and cannot be applied to an SB 35 project. The project is compatible with General Plan Policy 2.2.5.21.

2.3 **The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 5.2.1.2.**

General Plan Policy 5.2.1.2 requires that adequate quantity and quality of water for all uses, including fire protection, be provided for with discretionary development.

Rationale: This policy is only applied to discretionary development. However, the project was reviewed by the Diamond Springs El Dorado Fire Protection District (Fire District) and the water purveyor, El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), for adequate water and wastewater capacity to serve the needs of the project. The project would connect to existing water and wastewater service from EID, extending water and sewage service from Black Rice Road and Deuce Drive.

The project will not exceed the service abilities of the facilities and utilities in the area. This project would be required to make required improvements and connect to applicable EID infrastructure in order to obtain water and wastewater service. An EID meter award letter would be required as proof of rights to these services prior to issuance of building permit. As part of current development practices and as outlined instandard, non-discretionary conditions of approval by both the Fire District and EID, fire suppression standards and design will be coordinated between the Fire District and EID prior to issuance of a building permit.

2.4 **The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 5.2.1.3.**

General Plan Policy 5.2.1.3 requires that all multi-family residential development projects may be required to connect to public water systems if reasonably available when located within Community Regions.

Rationale: This project is located within the Diamond Springs and El Dorado Community Region and will be connected to the public water system via EID, who has deemed the project feasible in their Facility Improvement Letter (FIL). The project is compatible with General Plan Policy 5.2.1.3.

2.5 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 6.2.3.2.

Policy 6.2.3.2, Adequate Access for Emergencies, requires that the applicant demonstrate that adequate access exists, or can be provided to ensure that emergency vehicles can access the site and private vehicles can evacuate the area.

Rationale: County Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Fire District reviewed the application materials and site plan for adequate access for emergencies. DOT requested two (2) project-specific conditions of approval (COA), ensuring the project encroachments remain consistent with County Standard Plan 103C, and that all roads shall be constructed as shown on the conceptual site plan. The Fire District provided no comment regarding any issues for emergency access. The project is compatible with General Plan Policy 6.2.3.2.

2.6 This project is consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4.

General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires all new non-exempt development projects that would result in impacts to oak resources adhere to the standards of the Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP).

Rationale: The project includes the removal of approximately one native oak (blue oak) tree. Approximately one 8” blue oak tree will be removed as detailed in the project Biological Resources and Wetland Assessment Technical Memorandum (Exhibit N). Both removal and retention of Oak Resources will be consistent with all applicable standards found in the ORMP. Apart from impacts to Heritage Trees, individual valley oak trees and valley oak woodlands, the ORMP exempts affordable housing projects for lower income households when those projects are located within an urbanized area. This project is an affordable housing project located in an urbanized area as shown on the U.S. Census Bureau map (Exhibit P).

2.7 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xa

Except as otherwise provided, the following TC-Xa policies shall remain in effect indefinitely, unless amended by voters:

1. Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land

shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service (LOS) F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange, or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.

Rationale: The project will create five (5) or more residential units. Due to the SB-35 status of the project, a Transportation Impact Study could not be required of the project.

2. The County shall not add any additional segments of U.S. Highway 50, or any other highways and roads, to the County's list of roads from the original Table TC-2 of the 2004 General Plan that are allowed to operate at LOS F without first getting the voters' approval.

Rationale: This is not applicable as the Project is not requesting any modifications to Table TC-2.

3. intentionally blank (Resolution 125-2019, August 6, 2019)
4. intentionally blank (Resolution 159-2017, October 24, 2017)
5. The County shall not create an Infrastructure Financing District unless allowed by a 2/3rds majority vote of the people within that district.

Rationale: This is not applicable as the Project is not requesting the County create an Infrastructure Financing District.

6. intentionally blank (Resolution 159-2017, October 24, 2017)
7. Before giving approval of any kind to a residential development project of five (5) or more units or parcels of land, the County shall make a finding that the project complies with the policies above. If this finding cannot be made, then the County shall not approve the project in order to protect the public's health and safety as provided by state law to assure that safe and adequate roads and highways are in place as such development occurs.

Rationale: The project would create more than five residential units and the finding is made that the project complies with the policies of TC-Xa.

2.8 General Plan Policy TC-Xb does not apply to the project.

To ensure that potential development in the County does not exceed available roadway capacity, the County shall:

- A. Every year prepare an annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) specifying expenditures for roadway improvements within the next 10 years. At least every five years prepare a CIP specifying expenditures for roadway improvements within the next 20 years. Each plan shall contain identification of funding sources sufficient to develop the improvements identified;
- B. At least every five years, prepare a Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program specifying roadway improvements to be completed within the next 20 years to ensure compliance with all applicable level of service and other standards in this plan; and
- C. Annually monitor traffic volumes on the county's major roadway system depicted in Figure TC-1.

Rationale: This policy is not applicable as this policy refers to the county preparing a CIP, preparing a TIM Fee Program, and monitoring traffic volumes.

2.9 The General Plan Policy TC-Xc does not apply to the project.

Developer paid traffic impact fees (TIF) combined with any other available funds shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development during peak hours upon any highways, arterial roads, and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county (Resolution 201-2018, September 25, 2018).

Rationale: This policy is not applicable as this policy directs how the County will pay for building the necessary road capacity.

2.10 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xd.

LOS for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Table TC-2 shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. LOS will be as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgement of DOT, which shall consider periods including, but not limited to,

Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.”

Rationale: This is an SB-35 project and cannot be required to provide a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) to evaluate specific consistency with this policy.

2.11 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xe.

For the purposes of this Transportation and Circulation Element, “worsen” is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

- A. A 2 percent increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or
- B. The addition of 100 or more daily trips, or
- C. The addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.

Rationale: This is an SB-35 project and cannot be required to provide a TIS to evaluate specific consistency with this policy.

2.12 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xf.

At the time of approval of a tentative map for a single-family residential subdivision of five or more parcels that worsens (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the County shall do one of the following: (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain LOS standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the development plus forecasted traffic growth at 10-years from project submittal; or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County’s 10-year CIP.

For all other discretionary projects that worsen (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the County shall do one of the following: (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain LOS standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element; or (2) ensure the construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County’s 20-year CIP.

Rationale: This is an SB-35 project and cannot be required to provide a TIS to evaluate specific consistency with this policy.

2.13 General Plan Policy TC-Xg does not apply to the project.

Each development project shall dedicate right-of-way, design and construct or fund any improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project. The County shall

require an analysis of impacts of traffic from the development project, including impacts from truck traffic, and require dedication of needed right-of-way and construction of road facilities as a condition of the development. This policy shall remain in effect indefinitely unless amended by voters.

Rationale: This is an SB-35 project and cannot be required to provide a TIS to evaluate specific consistency with this policy.

2.14 This project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xh.

All subdivisions shall be conditioned to pay the TIF fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued for any parcel created by the subdivision.

Rationale: The project is eligible for, but has not obtained, a TIF Fee Offset. If an offset is not obtained, this project will pay TIF Fees at the time a building permit is issued.

2.15 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy HO-1.5.

General Policy HO-1.5 directs higher density residential development to Community Regions and Rural Centers.

Rationale: The project site has a MFR General Plan Designation which allows for higher-density multi-unit residential development. The MFR land use designation permits a density range of five (5) dwelling units to 24 dwelling units per acre. The project site is 5.71 acres. The project would be at a net density of approximately 5.4 dwelling units per acre, which meets the prescribed gross density for the General Plan MFR Land Use Designation. The project site is within the El Dorado Diamond Springs Community Region.

2.16 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy HO-1.7.

This policy requires the County give highest priority for permit processing to development projects that provided housing affordable to very low- or low-income households.

Rationale: This project is being processed under the streamlined provisions of SB-35 and will provide affordable housing for low- and very low- income households. Permit processing timelines meet or exceed stat requirements.

2.17 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy HO-1.18.

This policy directs the County to develop incentive programs/partnerships to encourage

private development of affordable housing for very-low, low and moderate income households.

Rationale: The project may be eligible for a TIM Fee Offset under Board Policy B-14 (TIM Fee Offset for Development with Affordable Housing) which is considered for projects with at least 20 percent of the housing units are targeted for low to moderate-income households.

3.0 ZONING FINDINGS

3.1 The proposed use is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance (Title 130 of the County Ordinance Code).

The project site is zoned Multi-unit Residential-Planned Development (RM-PD). The project has been found consistent with the allowed uses and applicable objective development and design standards of Title 130 as more fully outlined below.

3.2 The project is consistent with Section 130.24.030 (Residential Zone Development Standards).

Rationale: The project conforms to the site development standards for building height and minimum building setbacks. The maximum building height in the RM base zone is 50 feet. The project proposes a total of four (4) one- to three-story buildings with a maximum building height of 35 feet and 11 inches. Standard setbacks for building structures within the RM zone are 20 feet for the primary front setback, 10 feet for the secondary front setback, five feet for the side setback, and 10 feet for the rear setback. According to the project site plan (Exhibit R), all proposed structures meet these requirements. The proposed uses and structures are consistent with all applicable development standards.

3.3 The project is consistent with Table 130.24.020 (Residential Zone Use Matrix).

Zoning Ordinance Table 130.24.020 prescribes allowed uses and permit requirements for the RM Zone District.

Rationale: As shown on Table 130.24.020, multi-unit residential uses are allowed by right in the RM zone.

3.4 The project is consistent with Chapter 130.33: Landscaping Standards.

Chapter 130.33 provides objective standards for landscaping plans including plant types and sizes, landscaped buffer areas and parking area shade requirements. In addition, the County adopted the 2015 California Model Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance

(MWELo) on August 27, 2019 as an additional requirement to ensure submitted landscape plans comply with the objective water conservation standards found in the MWELo.

Rationale: The Preliminary Landscape Plan (Exhibit S) is consistent with the objective landscaping standards in both Chapter 130.33 and the MWELo. As conditioned (COA 3), final landscape plans shall demonstrate consistency with all applicable provisions of both Chapter 130.33 and the MWELo prior to issuance of a building permit.

3.5 **The project is consistent with Chapter 130.34: Outdoor Lighting.**

Chapter 130.34 (Outdoor Lighting) of the Zoning Ordinance identifies objective design standards for the elimination of excess nighttime light and glare.

Rationale: The project is consistent with Chapter 130.34. Based on the applicant's preliminary lighting plan (Exhibit M) and detailed lighting specifications, proposed light fixtures will be located, adequately shielded, and directed to prevent any direct light falling outside property lines or into the public right-of-way consistent with applicable provisions of Chapter 130.34 and the County's adopted 2015 Outdoor Lighting Standards (COA 2).

3.6 **The project is consistent with Chapter 130.36: Signs.**

Chapter 130.36 (Signs) provides parcel-specific requirements for sign location, size, number, type, and design based on location within the County and based on the individual zone district(s) of each parcel. Table 130.36.070.1a (Community Region Area Signage Standards for Permanent On-Site Signs - Residential and Agricultural Zone Districts) summarizes allowed sign types, number and sizes as allowed in various zone districts within Community Regions. According to this table, one on-site non-illuminated freestanding sign is allowed in the RM zone district per subdivision or neighborhood, limited to 12 square feet in size and up to eight feet in height.

Rationale: All proposed signage shall be consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 130.36, including Table 130.36.070.1a (Community Region Area Signage Standards for Permanent On-Site Signs - Residential and Agricultural Zone Districts).

3.7 **The project is consistent with Chapter 130.37: Noise Standards.**

Chapter 130.37, Noise Standards, requires that noise created by new proposed non-transportation noise sources be mitigated so as not to exceed the noise level standards of Table 130.37.060.1 for noise-sensitive uses.

Rationale: The project is residential in nature and is consistent with surrounding multi-

unit residential developments. Pursuant to Section 130.37.020.I construction activities during daylight hours is exempt for noise standards. Project construction shall occur during daylight hours (COA 6).

3.8 The project is consistent with Chapter 130.39: Oak Resources Conservation.

Chapter 130.39 of the Zoning Ordinance incorporates the provision of the ORMP and establishes conservation and mitigation measures for impacts to Oak Resources on all privately-owned lands within the unincorporated area of the County at or below the elevation of 4,000 feet where Oak Resources are present.

Rationale: The project includes the removal of approximately one native oak (blue oak) tree. Approximately one 8” blue oak tree will be removed as detailed in the project Biological Resources and Wetland Assessment Technical Memorandum (Exhibit N). Both removal and retention of Oak Resources will be consistent with all applicable standards found in the ORMP. Apart from impacts to Heritage Trees, individual valley oak trees and valley oak woodlands, the ORMP exempts affordable housing projects for lower income households when those projects are located within an urbanized area. This project is an affordable housing project located in an urbanized area as shown on the U.S. Census Bureau map (Exhibit P).

4.0 SENATE BILL 35 FINDINGS

4.1 Has the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) determined that the local agency is subject to SB-35?

Rationale: El Dorado County has seen insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and/or have not submitted to the latest Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR) (2019) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (Exhibit G). El Dorado County has been determined to be subject to SB-35 by the HCD.

4.2 Is the project a multi-family housing development (2 or more units)?

Rationale: The project is a multi-unit residential development consisting of 31 attached residential units.

4.3 Has the applicant dedicated the applicable minimum percentage (50%) of units in the project to households making below 80% of the area median income (AMI)?

Rationale: The project proposes to dedicate 100% of the units to be affordable for households at or less than 80% of the AMI consistent with applicable provisions of SB-35.

4.4 Does at least 75% of the perimeter of the site adjoin parcels currently or formerly developed with “urban uses”?

Rationale: SB-35 defines “urban uses” as any current or former residential, commercial, public institutional, transit or transportation passenger facility, or retail use, or any combination of those uses. The adjacent parcel to the west is phase one of the same affordable housing development and is currently under construction. The parcel to the south includes similarly constructed multi-family residential. All other adjacent parcels have been developed with detached single-family residences. All surrounding parcels are within the Placerville-Diamond Springs Urban Area (Exhibits B & P). Therefore, as defined by SB-35, the project is 100 percent surrounded by urban uses.

4.5 If the site is in an unincorporated area, is the parcel entirely within the boundaries of an “urbanized area” or “urban cluster”?

Rationale: After the 2020 Census, the United States Census Bureau (Bureau) no longer distinguishes between different types of urban areas. The Bureau no longer labels areas as either urbanized areas or urban clusters. The Bureau now uses housing units to measure urbanization and to identify qualifying urban areas. The project site is located entirely within the 2020 Census-designated Placerville-Diamond Springs Urban Area (Exhibit P).

4.6 Does the site have either zoning or a general plan designation that allows for residential use or a combination of residential and commercial uses?

Rationale: The General Plan Land Use Map designates the parcel as MFR (Exhibit D). The parcel also contains a corresponding zoning designation of RM-PD (Exhibit E). The General Plan and zoning designations allow residential uses at the proposed project site. The project is therefore consistent with this requirement.

4.7 Does the project not involve a subdivision of land?

Rationale: The project does not involve the subdivision of land.

4.8 Does the project meet density requirements, “objective zoning standards,” and “objective design review standards”?

Rationale: The MFR land use designation (Exhibit D) has a minimum density requirement of five (5) units per acre and a maximum density requirement of 24 units per acre. The project meets these standards, proposing 5.4 units per acre. As proposed and conditioned, all residential structures meet applicable objective development and design standards as more fully described in the above General Plan, Zoning, and SB-35 Findings.

4.9 **SB-35 requires that the project will be outside of the following areas, according to Government Code section 65913.4(a)(6):**

a. Coastal zone.

Rationale: The project is not located within a coastal zone.

b. Prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance.

Rationale: The project is not located on prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance as mapped by the California Department of Conservation (California Department of Conservation, Important Farmland Finder, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>, last accessed July 21, 2020).

c. Wetlands as defined under 1993 federal law.

Rationale: Under Phase 1 of the project (PD17-0002), an on-site mesic meadow was identified (Exhibit N) as a non-jurisdictional wetland and mitigation measures were incorporated in compliance with the adopted Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (ISMND) (Exhibit T). The report was then updated with addendums in May 2024 and September 2024 confirming the lack of any jurisdictional wetland as defined under SB-35. Therefore, the project not within a wetland.

d. Earthquake fault zone.

Rationale: The California Department of Conservation of Mines and Geology lists no Alquist-Priolo fault zones within the west slope of El Dorado County, which includes the project site. The project is not within a fault zone.

e. Very high fire hazard severity zones.

Rationale: The project is primarily located within a high fire hazard severity zone, with a small southeast portion of the site in a moderate fire hazard severity zone. A Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Fire Protection Plan (plan) was submitted by the applicant, prepared by Ronald A Philips. The plan was

reviewed and signed by Braden Stirling, Fire Marshall for the Diamond Springs Fire Protection District, and Jeff Hoag, CAL Fire Battalion Chief (Exhibit O). The project is not within a very high fire hazard severity zone and otherwise has received local fire review approval.

f. Hazardous waste site.

Rationale: The project site is not listed on, or in proximity to, hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5.

g. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated flood plain or floodway.

Rationale: The project parcel is designated as Flood zone X on Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps, which indicates areas not located within a 100-year floodplain. The project is not within any FEMA designated flood plain or floodway.

h. Protected species habitat.

Rationale: The Biological Resource & Wetland Assessment Technical Memorandum (Exhibit N) submitted by the applicant does not identify any protected species habitat on the project site.

i. Lands under a conservation easement.

Rationale: The project parcel is not under a conservation easement within an adopted natural community conservation plan.

j. Land designated for conservation in a habitat conservation plan.

Rationale: The project parcel is not within a habitat conservation plan.

k. A site that would require demolition of (a) housing subject to recorded rent restrictions, (b) housing subject to rent control, (c) housing occupied by tenants within the past 10 years, or (d) a historic structure placed on a local, state, or federal register.

Rationale: The project site is currently undeveloped and would not require the demolition of any structures.

l. A site that previously contained housing occupied by tenants within the past 10 years.

Rationale: The project site is currently undeveloped and has not been occupied by tenants within the past 10 years.

m. A parcel of land governed by the Mobilehome Residency Law, the Recreational Vehicle Park Occupancy Law, the Mobilehome Parks Act, or the Special Occupancy Parks Act.

Rationale: The project parcel is undeveloped and is not governed by the Mobilehome Residency Law, the Recreational Vehicle Occupancy Law, the Mobilehome Parks Act, or the Special Occupancy Parks Act.

4.10 Has the project proponent certified that either the entire development is a “public work” for purposes of prevailing wage law, or the construction workers will be paid at least prevailing wage?

Rationale: The project applicant has certified that all construction workers employed in the execution of the development will be paid at least prevailing wage rates.

4.11 Has tribal consultation with applicable Native American tribal organization(s) been successfully concluded with a determination that the project would not harm, or potentially harm, Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) pursuant to Government Code Sections 65913.4(b)(3)(A) through 65913.4(b)(3)(D)?

Rationale: During the Pre-Application process (PA24-0006), Native American tribal consultation was successfully concluded pursuant to the provisions of AB 168, as specified in Government Code Sections 65913.4(b)(3)(A) through 65913.4(b)(3)(D). The County solicited tribal consultation with interested Native American tribal organizations on April 12, 2024 and sent SB-35 project notification, via certified mail, to affected tribes on the then-current NAHC tribal contact list.

Of the seven tribal organizations included in the County’s solicitation letter, only two tribal organizations, the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) and Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, responded with a request to consult regarding the project. UAIC provided information on specific language to incorporate into a condition of approval, or a Tribal Cultural Resources Chapter of an initial study or other CEQA document (COA 5).

Due to this project being eligible for processing under SB-35, no CEQA process is required. The Single Springs band of Miwok Indians requested to be added as a consulting party in identifying any Tribal Cultural Properties (TCPs) that may exist within the project’s Area of Potential

Effects (APE). The applicant supplied biological report was provided to the Shingle Spring Band of Miwok Indians on June 7, 2024; however, no additional correspondence was received.

This project met tribal consultation requirements through the initial PA24-0006 Pre-Application process.