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

INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title: Design Review Permit DR16-0001/Leave It To Us Self Storage

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

Contact Person: Efren Sanchez, Associate Planner | **Phone Number:** (530) 621-6591

Applicant's Name and Address: Marlene A. Carter, 2260 Talon Drive, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Agent's Name and Address: Marlene A. Carter, 2260 Talon Drive, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Project Engineer's Name and Address: Barbara Lebeck, P.E., 3430 Robin Lane #2, Cameron Park, CA 95682

Project Location: The property is located on the Southeast side of Business Drive, South of the intersection with Durock Road in the Burnett Business Park area of Shingle Springs.

Assessor's Parcel Number: 109-480-007 **Acres:** 7.2 acres

Sections: Sec. 11 **T:** 9N **R:** 9E | **Latitude/Longitude Coordinates:** 38.655066°/ -121.072147°

General Plan Designation: Industrial (I)

Zoning: Industrial Low- Design Review-Community(IL-DC)

Description of Project: Design Review Permit for the proposed construction and operation of a 82,800 square feet (SF) self-storage facility with 10,368 square feet (SF) of uncovered Recreation Vehicle (RV) storage in the Barnett Business Park consisting of nine storage buildings (77,400 SF), two employee-housing units, parking lot improvements, and associated site improvements.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	Industrial Light (IL) with Design Review Community (-DC) Combining Zone	Industrial (I)	Undeveloped
North	Multi-unit Residential (RM) with Planning Development (-PD) Combining Zone	Multi-family Residential (MFR)	Undeveloped
South	Industrial Light (IL) with Design Review Community (-DC) Combining Zone	Industrial (I)	Undeveloped
East	Transportation Corridor (TC) with Design Review Community (-DC) Combining Zone, and Two-Acre Residential (R2A)	Industrial(I), Multi-family Residential (MFR), and Low-Density Residential (LDR)	Rail Road, Single-family Residential
West	Industrial Light (IL) with Design Review Community (-DC) Combining Zone (-IL)	I (Industrial)	Undeveloped

Briefly describe the environmental setting: The topography of the project site area is primarily flat with elevation ranges from approximately 1370 feet to 1390 feet above mean sea level from southeast to northwest. The primary vegetation community of this site is classified as blue oak woodland and is covered with grasses, brush, and oak trees. The site contains rare plant habitat; however, none of the special-status plant species with the potential to occur were observed during the botanical survey on May 23, 2017. The subject property is at the

east side of Business Drive, within the Barnett Business Park in the Community Region of Shingle Springs area. Currently, the site is vacant and is accessed from Business Drive. Although habitat exists, no sensitive plant or animal species were found on site. The project site is located in Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1.

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

1. Community Development Services: Planning and Building Department– Building Services (Building and Grading Permits)
2. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (Building and Grading Permits)
3. El Dorado County Department of Transportation (Encroachment, Building, and Grading Permits)
4. El Dorado County Fire Department (Building and Grading Permits)
5. El Dorado Irrigation District (Building Permit, Water Meter)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by Mitigation Measures based on the earlier analysis as described in attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, pursuant to applicable standards; and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or Mitigation Measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature:		Date:	8/1/19
Printed Name:	Efren Sanchez, Associate Planner	For:	El Dorado County
Signature:		Date:	8/1/19
Printed Name:	Rommel Pabalinas, Principal Planner	For:	El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with Section 15070 to 15075 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. The applicant is requesting a Design Review permit for the construction and operation of a new self-storage facility consisting of nine (9) new storage buildings, two employee-housing units, along with parking lot and associated site improvements such landscaping, perimeter fencing, and on-site signs. Building one (1) would be approximately 13,200 square foot building with retail office space (2,700 SF) and storage (7,800 SF) on the ground level, and manager apartments on the second floor (2,700 SF). Buildings 2-9 would be approximately 8,700 square feet each and the total proposed building development for all nine buildings is approximately 82,800 square feet. The project site would also include 10,368 square feet of uncovered Recreational Vehicles (RV) storage space for a total of 30 RV's. Parking would include seven (7) parking spaces of which one will be a handicapped space, located near building 1 at the entrance of the self-storage facility (Attachment 1: Site Plan). The applicant will construct all on-site and off-site facility stub connections necessary to supply adequate water and sewer capacity required along Business Drive.

The subject property (Parcel 7) was created under Parcel Map 48-141, which was recorded on February 24, 2005 (Attachment 2: PM 48-141) based on the Barnett Business Park Tentative Parcel Map P99-0013. The recorded map also established individual building envelopes per parcel, intended to comply with the oak canopy retention standards under the previous General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. (Option A) of the *Oak Woodlands Management Plan*. The project site has an existing building envelope of 73,494 square feet (SF) on a 314,198 SF or 7.213-acre parcel. The proposed project would revise the building envelope from 73,494 SF to 246,177 SF and mitigate the removal of the existing oak trees in accordance with the new *Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP)* under *Chapter 130.39—Oak Resources Conservation* of the County Zoning Ordinance. The building envelope may be revised through a design review process as noted on Parcel Map 48/141 (Attachment 2: PM48-141).

The proposed project buildings will be of stucco wall finish with composition shingle roof. The stucco wall colors will blend with earth tone tan colors and the shingle roof will be of a neutral grey. Building one (1), a two-story building, will be the tallest building at the project site with a max height of 31-feet and situated parallel to business drive. The building pad elevation ranges from approximately 1384 to 1377 feet above sea level in a southeastern direction. The rest of the buildings at the project site will be of a lesser height (approximately 12 feet, 2 inches) as single-story buildings and the layout of these building will be perpendicular to business drive and screened from view behind building one (1). The project has been designed for consistency with the applicable development standards and zoning district standards. The buildings will conform to the prescribed setback and landscaping requirements.

The project site proposes to include a seven-foot chain-link perimeter fence with sliding gate that separates the parking lot from storage building number two (2) through nine (9). The landscaping plan illustrates what would be installed along the perimeter of the self-storage facility to provide additional vegetation screening. The landscape would include a variety of ornamental plants and preservation of some oak trees that already exists at the perimeter of the proposed development. The project site will include an irrigation drip lines to complement the proposed landscaping. The project will include a 40 square-foot monument sign, externally illuminated with up lighting near the entrance to the facility. The trash enclosure will be six-foot tall concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall with a painted metal gate at the front of the enclosure, located at the southwest corner of the project site.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

As noted above, the property is located on the east side of Business Drive, approximately 0.63 miles south at the intersection with Durock Road in the Burnett Business Park Area of Shingle Springs. This site is in the Shingle Springs community region and is within an industrial district known as the Barnett Business Park. The surrounding land uses are undeveloped industrial zoned parcels to the west and south, residential development to the east, and undeveloped multifamily residential zoned parcel to the north. The Barnett Business Park has a variety of existing land uses such as business support services, manufacturing, tech, and RV storage. The proposed project's land use is compatible with the surrounding land uses of the Barnett Business Park.

Project Characteristics

1. Transportation/Circulation

The primary access to the site would be from a proposed full access encroachment onto Business Drive, a privately maintained road fronting the project site. The project would construct Type 2 vertical Curb and Gutter along the project frontage of the property to match the improvements to the northeast of the site. The primary public driveway entrance would be located at the southwest corner of the site. A new two-lane paved driveway extending from the southwest corner to the proposed encroachment would be constructed for emergency vehicle access. Access beyond the parking lot to the entire storage facility would be gated. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District has reviewed the proposed access and circulation for the project. The DOT analyzed the submitted On-site Transportation Review, which is a document prepared by a certified transportation engineer to analyze potential impacts to traffic based on the site configuration and proposed land use. Both DOT and El Dorado County Fire Protection District recommended conditions of approval, based on the submitted On-site Transportation Review. The applicant shall obtain approval of the final design of this driveway from the Department of Transportation prior to issuance of any building permit.

2. Parking

Pursuant to Section 130.35.030.1 of the El Dorado county ordinance code, the proposed development would require seven (7) parking spaces and that one of the seven be designated as an ADA compliant accessible space. As currently designed, the proposed project would meet the minimum required seven parking spaces. The parking lot will be located at the entrance of the project site in the southwest corner right before the sliding gate that gives access to the self-storage buildings two (2) through seven (7).

3. Site Improvements, Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site is currently vacant land with no water or sewer utilities. The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) reviewed the project as part of a Facility Improvement Letter (FIL) and determined that the project would be required to obtain water and sewer service via connection to existing utilities in the area. An 8-inch water line exists in Business Drive and a 12-inch water line is located along the northern property line of the parcel. The minimum fire flow for this project will range from 1,625 GPM for three-hour duration while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. EID has determined that the existing system in the area can deliver the required fire flow necessary for sufficient fire suppression. In order to provide the 1,625 GPM fire flow, the applicant must construct a water line extension connecting to the existing 8-inch water line on Business Drive, which has the adequate capacity to serve the project. There is an 8-inch gravity sewer line located in Business Drive that has adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. The sewer line stub is located near the western corner of the parcel to be developed. There is an existing 4-inch sewer force main located in the easement along the northern property line of the parcel. The location of this force main will need to be potholed prior to approving any grading in the vicinity.

A preliminary grading and drainage report were submitted, documenting the project's impacts on potential water run-off and storm water discharge. The *Revised Preliminary Drainage Report for Leave It To Us Self-Storage 2018* (Attachment 3: Preliminary Drainage Report), was drafted to determine if the proposed building envelope modification would result in an impact to the drainage of the entire Burnett Business Park. The proposed envelope modification takes the current 1.7-acres of building envelope and expands it to 5.7-acres for the entire 7.2-acre site. The drainage in this area of the Barnett Business Park flows from the northeast, through the project site, to the southwest part of the Barnett Business Park, and into an existing detention pond located adjacent to the east of Shingle Lime Mine Road. The existing detention pond was prescribed by the *Barnett Business Park—Unit 2, Phase 2 Drainage Study of 2010*, and implemented the Detention Pond 1 as part of Parcel Map 48-141. The additional surfacing and post development of the project site will not affect the entire Barnett Business Park with a significant amount of

storm water runoff, as the detention pond was designed to store the run-off and keep discharge at or below pre-development levels.

The project's proposed construction and grading will involve cut and fill earthwork movement of the soil. As indicated in the grading plan (Attachment 4), grading of the site will involve 23,996 cubic yards (cy) of excavation (cut) and 21,473 cy of embankment (fill). This earthwork movement accounts for 10% shrinkage loss, which is estimated at 2,400 cy and would result in 21,596 total cut. The estimated difference between the total fill and cut is approximately 125 cy. This earthwork movement of the soil would occur to prepare and establish building pads, drainage, and utilities for the proposed facility. Consequently, the earthwork would also involve the removal of the project site's vegetation and oak trees as analyzed in section IV—Biological Resources of this Initial Study: Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The County Department of Transportation reviewed and provided comments to the preliminary grading and drainage report. A final complete drainage plan and detailed report will be submitted with the project's improvements during building permits to confirm the recommended plan for grading and drainage. Dry utilities such as power and phone would be extended from existing development from neighboring properties.

4. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist of on-site road encroachment, sidewalks, grading improvements; utility trenching and drainage system installation; erosion control measures; construction of facility structures, parking lot paving, landscaping, and associated improvements. Construction of all nine buildings and pavements of parking facilities would take place following compliance with all conditions of approval. The construction of the self-storage development is anticipated to occur simultaneously and will not be phased.

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 will be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency will also determine whether to approve the project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

3. If the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, 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.

    d. Setting: CEQA Guidelines Section 15125—*Environmental Setting* states that, "Generally, the lead agency should describe physical environmental conditions as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective." This environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant. The proposed development under application DR16-0001 was submitted on February 22, 2016 and the application was deemed complete by County of El Dorado Planning Staff on March 22, 2016. Environmental analysis therefore commenced on March 22, 2016, establishing the environmental baseline. For this project, with respect to biological resources, the baseline is as documented in the 2016 and 2017 reports in support of the application DR16-0001.

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

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

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

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.

CEQA Checklist Questions

a. **Scenic Vista:** The project site is located in a partially developed business park surrounded by industrial commercial land, residential development, and undeveloped multi-family residential land. No scenic vistas, as designated by the county General Plan EIR are located near the site (El Dorado County, 2003, p. 5.3-3 through 5.3-5). While the project is near US Highway 50, it is not visible from the roadway and is west of the State Scenic Highway designated portion. The project site would not be visible from any other identified public scenic vista; therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on scenic vistas.

b. **Scenic Resources:** The project site is not visible from an officially designated State Scenic Highway or county-designated scenic highway, or any roadway that is part of a corridor protection program (Caltrans, 2013). There are no views of the site from public parks or scenic vistas. There are no historic buildings in the project vicinity that are identified by the County, as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Visual Character:** The project would change the existing visual character from vacant land to developed commercial land with associated buildings, parking, landscaping, signage, and lighting. This change would result in a less than significant change in visual character as seen from surrounded commercial, residential, and vacant lots. The neighboring parcels would no longer have unimproved views across the oak woodland vacant site. Nevertheless, the El Dorado County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance have designated this land as industrial, which future development was previously anticipated when the property was designated for industrial use. A self-storage facility on the 7.2-acre property is proposed for the project site, which is an allowed zoning use and consistent with its industrial land use designation. The potential impacts related to loss of oak woodland have already been analyzed in both the Tentative Parcel Map P99-0013 project and the *Draft Biological Resources Policy Update and Oak Resources Management Plan Environmental Impact Report (2016)* document (available for review online at

https://www.edcgov.us/government/longrangeplanning/environmental/biopolicydeirjune2016/documents/Bio-Policy-DEIR-June-2016-Ch-1-thru-13.pdf). For instance, the EIR for the Oak Resources Management Plan specifies that properties, which currently support oak woodland habitats within Community Regions such as Shingle Springs are projected for development under both 2025 and 2035 scenarios. The expected development in El Dorado County through 2025 would result in a conversion of a maximum of 4,071 acres from oak woodland to developed land uses. Development through 2035 would result in a conversion of an additional 2,433 acres of oak woodland to developed land uses. The conversion of oak woodland to development would primarily affect the County-identified scenic resources and scenic vistas in a given community by decreasing the prevalence of natural habitat and resources, and increasing the presence of built environment and ornamental landscaping elements. This project site is neither a scenic resource or scenic vista. The visual impact of removing 0.50 acres of oak woodland from the project site was previously accounted for through the approval of the Barnett Business Park Tentative Map P99-0013. The remaining acreage of oak woodland (4.47-acres of proposed removal) will be mitigated by adhering to *Title 130, Article 3 Chapter 130.39—Oak Resources Conservation*, as indicated in the Biological Resources section of this Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration document.

Design elements have been incorporated into the project to soften views of the project from surrounding residential properties, and to ensure that the project is consistent with surrounding industrial commercial development. The 100-foot wide non-building buffer from the eastern property line will remain in effect from Parcel Map 48/141 and perimeter landscaping will help soften the project's aesthetics from the adjacent residential development. These design elements include landscaping and building elevations that use colors and hues consistent with surrounding residential and commercial development. The project perimeter landscape will include trees such as Interior Live Oaks, Dynamite Crape Myrtles, Oklahoma Redbud, Deodar Cedar, and Incense Cedar (Attachment 5). Thus, existing residents to the east and future residents to the north would not be looking at flat, unarticulated walls devoid of character or landscaping.

The proposed project would not be anticipated to significantly degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings in ways not anticipated for lands designated by the General Plan for industrial land uses. The project site is designated with a Design Community (-DC) combing overlay zone to ensure architectural supervision and consistency with the community design guidelines and standards. The project design, through incorporation of architectural features and styling, proposed construction materials, and colors of the physical elements, were analyzed for consistency. The project was determined to be substantially consistent with the Community Design Standards, and was reviewed for consistency with General Plan Policies as well as substantial conformance. The project impacts would be less than significant with proposed design and conditions.

d. **Light and Glare:** The lighting associated with industrial development on this site would create new sources of light and glare that would have an impact on residential development to the east. Based on the submitted lighting and photometric plan (Attachment 6: Lighting Plan), the project proposes exterior lighting that does not exceed the maximum lumen output allowed. As it relates to changing the character of this parcel from vacant land that generates no light to a lighted industrial parcel, which is similar to existing industrial development in the Burnett Business Park Area. Future outdoor lighting for new development is required conformance to Section 130.34 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of Northern America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation. This ordinance requires that no light spills over onto adjacent properties as demonstrated by a photometric study that would be reviewed for compliance during the building permit process. The impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The proposed project has the potential to result in the construction of 82,800 square feet of industrial/commercial/residential development consisting of buildings, landscape, lighting, and parking. This development is entirely consistent with the character of surrounding industrial development within the Barnett Ranch Business Park. Although, the proposed project would result in a change in the current character of the property, the property is designated and zoned for the proposed use and has incorporated design features to ensure compatibility with surrounding industrial development and soften impacts to surrounding residential development. For the "Aesthetics" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. As conditioned and with adherence to El Dorado County Code of Ordinances (County Code), applicable General Plan Policies, and the Community Design Standards, no significant environmental impacts to aesthetics would be anticipated to result from the project.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by California Department of forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				**X**
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				**X**
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				**X**
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				**X**
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				**X**

Discussion

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

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

CEQA Checklist Questions

a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** The proposed project would not convert any prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or locally important farmland to non-agricultural use. The El Dorado County Resource Conservation District has reviewed the project and did not identify important Agricultural Preserves or Districts within the project area. This property is located within a community region, business park, and is designated and zoned for the proposed use. There would be no impact.

b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The project site is not currently under Williamson Act Contract, nor would the site qualify for a contract under the Williamson Act. There are no agricultural activities within the vicinity of the project site, nor are any lands in the vicinity of the project designated or zoned for agricultural. There would be no impact.

c-d. **Non-agricultural Use or Conversion of Forest Land.** This project is located in an area designated for industrial uses. There are no agricultural opportunities available in close proximity to the project site which may be impacted by development of the proposed property. The site is not designed as Timberland Preserve Zone (TPZ) or other forestland according to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. As such, there would be no impact.

e. **Conversion of Prime Farmland or Forest Land:** The project is not within an agricultural district or located on forest land and would not convert farmland or forest land to non-agriculture use. There would be no impact.

Findings: No impacts to agricultural land are expected and no mitigation is required. For this "Agriculture" category, there would be no impact.

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

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

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

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

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

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

USEPA and CARB designate regions as “attainment” (within standards) or “nonattainment” (exceeds standards) based on their respective ambient air quality standards. The County is in nonattainment of both federal and state ozone standards and

for the state PM10 standard, and is in attainment or unclassified status for other pollutants (California Air Resources Board 2017).

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

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

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

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

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

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

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

A project would have a cumulatively significant impact if:

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

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

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

Discussion: The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) has developed a Guide to Air Quality Assessment to evaluate project specific impacts and help determine if air quality mitigation measures are needed, or if potentially significant impacts could result.

CEQA Checklist Questions

a. **Air Quality Plan:** El Dorado County has adopted the Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NOx, and O3). The project does not trip thresholds except for Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) also known as Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC). The ROG impact is almost exclusively coming from the paint used in the construction phase. Correspondence with El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) identifies that standard conditions and the condition to paint with low VOC paints (50 g/l VOC content or less) would bring thresholds of ROG and VOC to a less than significant level. AQMD ran emission models and made the determination that no additional Air Quality analysis will be required (Attachment 7: Air Quality Analysis). The EDC/State Clean Air Act Plan has set a schedule for implementing and funding transportation contract measures to limit mobile source emissions. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of either plan. Roadway improvements will require an encroachment permit and grading permit and will undergo review to determine if any further actions or approvals are needed, including any measures for sediment control. Any activities associated with future plans for grading and construction would require a Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan (FDMP) for grading and construction activities. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions to a less than significant level. Therefore, the potential impacts of the project would be anticipated to be less than significant.

b-c. **Air Quality Standards and Cumulative Impacts:** Minor roadway improvements and industrial/commercial building construction are proposed as part of the project. Although this would contribute air pollutants due to construction and possible additional vehicle trips to and from the site, these impacts would be minimal. Existing regulations implemented at issuance of building and grading permits would ensure that any construction related PM10 dust emissions would be reduced to acceptable levels. The El Dorado County AQMD reviewed the application material for this project and determined that by implementing typical conditions including Rule 215 (Architectural Coating) and 501 and 523 (New Paint Source), which are included in the list of recommended conditions, the project would have a less than significant impact. The conditions would be implemented, reviewed, and approved by the AQMD prior to and concurrently with any grading, improvement, or building permit approvals. With full review for consistency with General Plan Policies, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

d. **Sensitive Receptors:** The CEQA Guidelines identify sensitive receptors as facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others that are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools, and convalescent hospitals are examples of sensitive receptors. Near the project, there are no nearby sensitive receptors. No sources of substantial pollutant concentrations will be emitted by the commercial development, during construction or following construction. There would be no impact.

e. **Objectionable Odors:** Table 3-1 of the Guide to Air Quality Assessment (AQMD, 2002) does not list the proposed use of the parcels as a use known to create objectionable odors. The self-storage facility is not anticipated generate or produce objectionable odors as it would create nine new buildings that would enclose items typically associated with residential storage. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: The proposed project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The proposed project would not be anticipated to cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts with standard conditions of approval.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		**X**		
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			**X**	
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			**X**	
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			**X**	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			**X**	
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				**X**

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of Biological Resources information is sourced directly from technical documents prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate Biological Resources include a Botanical Survey (Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. 2017), a Botanical Resources Survey and Special-Status Wildlife Species Report (Foothill Tree Service 2016), and a Special-Status Wildlife Species Report (Foothill Tree Service 2015). These reports are incorporated by reference and appended to this document.

Regulatory Framework Related to Biological Resources

El Dorado County regulates urban development through standard construction conditions and through mitigation, building, and construction requirements set forth in the County's Municipal Code. Required of all projects constructed throughout the County, compliance with the requirements of the County's standard conditions and the provisions of the Municipal Code avoids or reduces many potential environmental effects.

State and Federal Endangered Species Acts

Special status species are protected by state and federal laws. The California Endangered Species Act (CESA; California Fish and Game Code Sections 2050 to 2097) protects species listed as threatened and endangered under CESA from harm or

harassment. This law is similar to the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA; 16 USC 1531 et seq.) which protects federally threatened or endangered species (50 CFR 17.11, and 17.12; listed species) from take. For both laws, take of the protected species may be allowed through consultation with and issuance of a permit by the agency with jurisdiction over the protected species.

California Code of Regulations and California Fish and Game Code

The official listing of endangered and threatened animals and plants is contained in the California Code of Regulations Title 14 § 670.5. A state candidate species is one that the California Fish and Game Code has formally noticed as being under review by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for inclusion on the state list pursuant to Sections 2074.2 and 2075.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. CDFW also designates Species of Special Concern that are not currently listed or candidate species.

Legal protection is also provided for wildlife species in California that are identified as "fully protected animals." These species are protected under Sections 3511 (birds), 4700 (mammals), 5050 (reptiles and amphibians), and 5515 (fishes) of the California Fish and Game Code. These statutes prohibit take or possession of fully protected species at any time. The CDFW is unable to authorize incidental take of fully protected species when activities are proposed in areas inhabited by these species. The CDFW has informed non-federal agencies and private parties that they must avoid take of any fully protected species. However, Senate Bill (SB) 618 (2011) allows the CDFW to issue permits authorizing the incidental take of fully protected species under the CESA, so long as any such take authorization is issued in conjunction with the approval of a Natural Community Conservation Plan that covers the fully protected species (California Fish and Game Code Section 2835).

California Native Plant Protection Act

The California Native Plant Protection Act of 1977 (California Fish and Game Code Sections 1900 to 1913) requires all state agencies to use their authority to implement programs to conserve endangered and otherwise rare species of native plants. Provisions of the act prohibit the taking of listed plants from the wild and require notification of CDFW at least 10 days in advance of any change in land use other than changing from one agricultural use to another, which allows CDFW to salvage listed plants that would otherwise be destroyed.

Nesting and Migratory Birds

Nesting birds are protected by state and federal laws. California Fish and Game Code (§3503, 3503.5, and 3800) prohibits the possession, incidental take, or needless destruction of any bird nests or eggs; Fish and Game Code §3511 designates certain bird species "fully protected" (including all raptors), making it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy these species except under issuance of a specific permit. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 USF §703-711), migratory bird species and their nests and eggs that are on the federal list (50 CFR §10.13) are protected from injury or death, and project-related disturbance must be reduced or eliminated during the nesting cycle.

Jurisdictional Waters

Any person, firm, or agency planning to alter or work in "waters of the U.S.," including the discharge of dredged or fill material, must first obtain authorization from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Section 401 requires an applicant for a federal license or permit that allows activities resulting in a discharge to waters of the U.S. must obtain a state certification that the discharge complies with other provisions of the CWA. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) administers the certification program in California. The RWQCB also regulates discharges of pollutants or dredged or fill material to waters of the State which is a broader definition than waters of the U.S.

California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 – Lake and Streambed Alteration Program

Diversions or obstructions of the natural flow of, or substantial changes or use of material from the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake in California that supports wildlife resources are subject to regulation by CDFW, pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. The CDFW requires notification prior to commencement of any such

activities, and a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) pursuant to Fish and Game Code Sections 1601-1603, if the activity may substantially adversely affect an existing fish and wildlife resource.

El Dorado County Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance No. 5061

El Dorado County adopted an oak resources conservation ordinance on October 24, 2017 to implement the County's Oak Resources Management Plan in compliance with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. With the exception of exempt activities listed in Section 130.39.050 of the ordinance, the requirements of this ordinance apply to both ministerial and discretionary development resulting in impacts to oak resources. For this ordinance, oak resources include oak woodlands, individual native oak trees, and heritage trees, collectively and are further defined in section 130.39.030 of this ordinance. An Oak Tree and/or Oak Woodland Removal Permit shall be a component of all discretionary projects and all nonexempt ministerial development activities with impacts to oak resources.

Methods

Sycamore Environmental completed a protocol botanical survey for APN 109-480-07 on Business Drive, El Dorado County on May 23, 2017. The survey was conducted by a qualified botanist at a time when all special-status plants with potential to occur would be expected to be evident and identifiable. The purpose of the study was to document the presence or absence of special-status plant species. The area where Layne's butterweed (*Packera layneae)* was documented on the site in 2009 was thoroughly searched. The area where 36 Layne's butterweed plants were documented in 2009 was thoroughly searched during the May 23, 2017 survey and no Layne's butterweed plants were found.

Project Setting

APN 109-480-07 (the site) is located south of Highway 50 in the community of Shingle Springs. The site is undeveloped. The site is bound by Business Drive to the northwest, an unpaved road and undeveloped land to the northeast, railroad tracks to the southeast, and undeveloped land to the southwest. The General Plan land use designation and zoning for the parcel are both Industrial. The General Plan land use designations for the surrounding APNs are multi-family residential (to the northeast), medium density residential (to the southeast), and industrial (the railroad to the southwest and northwest).

The site is in a region where oak woodlands and chaparral vegetation predominate. Vegetation on the site is blue oak woodland (Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. 2017). The County has designated "rare plant mitigation areas" to protect and mitigate for a group of special-status plants known collectively as the "Pine Hill Plants." The project site is in County rare plant Mitigation Area 1, which is defined as the rare plant soils study area. Soils included in the gabbro soils classification support the growth of pine hill endemic special status plant species. Botanical studies are required to be completed during the blooming period of March 15 to August 15 to best identify special status species. The presence of species may vary from year to year and during blooming period. The gabbro soils that provide potential habitat for the Pine Hill Plants occur on the project site.

The site provides suitable habitat for 14 special-status plant species; however, none of the special-status plant species with potential to occur were observed during the protocol botanical survey on May 23, 2017 (Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. 2017) or during an earlier biological survey on July 2, 2015 (Foothill Tree Service 2016). Layne's butterweed (*Packera layneae*) is known to have occurred on the site in 2009 (Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. 2017). As described in the 2017 botanical survey report, 36 Layne's butterweed plants were observed in the eastern portion of the site in 2009. The 2009 survey (Attachment 9) was conducted for a different owner, in support of a separate development project that did not proceed. These plants are no longer present based on the botanical surveys in 2015 and 2017.

CEQA Guideline Section 15125—*Environmental Setting* states that, "Generally, the lead agency should describe physical environmental conditions as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective. This environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant…" The proposed development under application DR16-0001 was submitted on February 22, 2016 and the application was deemed complete by County of El Dorado Planning Staff on March 22, 2016. Environmental analysis

therefore commenced on March 22, 2016, establishing the environmental baseline. For this project, with respect to biological resources, the baseline is as documented in the 2016 and 2017 reports in support of the application DR16-0001.

Special-Status Plants

The project site is located in an area defined as a Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1. Sycamore Environmental conducted a special status plant survey for the site on May 23, 2017. The report identified special-status species that had the potential to exist onsite and targeted those species during the onsite survey. The survey did not identify any special-status species on the project site.

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

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

CEQA Checklist Questions

a. **Special Status Species:** A review of the County Geographic Information System (GIS) soil data demonstrates the project is Rescue and Argonaut soils, which are similar soils derived from gabbro parent material that have the potential to support special-status species rare plants. The project site is located in an area defined as a Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1. The project applicant would be required to pay the Mitigation Fee as required by Section 130.71 of the Zoning Ordinance prior to building permit final inspection or certificate of occupancy.

Sycamore Environmental conducted a special-status plant survey for the site on May 23, 2017 (Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. 2017; Attachment 8). Their report identified 14 special-status species with the potential to occur onsite. The survey was conducted at a time of year when all special-status species with potential to occur would be evident and identifiable. All plants encountered during the survey were identified to the taxonomic level necessary to determine rarity and listing status. The 2017 survey did not identify any special-status plant species on the project site. A botanical survey was also conducted on July 2, 2015 (Foothill Tree Service 2016; Attachment 10). The 2015 survey did not identify any special-status plants species on the project site.

Biological field surveys were conducted on July 16 and July 18, 2015 (Foothill Tree Service 2016: Attachment 11). The biological survey was conducted to determine the presence or absence of special-status species or special habitats on the site, and to evaluate the project's potential impacts on these species and habitats. The survey included an inventory of wildlife species observed on the parcel. No aquatic resources such as ephemeral streams were observed during the survey. Four special-status wildlife species were identified as occurring near the project area. These species were all considered unlikely to occur on the parcel. No special-status wildlife species were found during the survey. No special-status wildlife species such as birds listed under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and/or regulated by the California Fish and Game Code were observed on the site. Birds may nest in trees, shrubs, or on the ground within the project site. The nests of raptors and most other birds are protected under the MBTA. Raptors are also protected by Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code, which makes it illegal to destroy any active raptor nest. Additionally, the USFWS and CDFW identified a number of avian species of conservation concern that do not have specific statutory protection. Avian species forage and nest in a variety of habitats throughout El Dorado County. While the trees and vegetation on and surrounding the site may provide nesting and foraging habitat for raptors and other protected birds, according to a records search and a biological field survey conducted on July 15, 2015, no active bird nests were observed on the site. A pre-construction survey as a mitigation measure (listed below) would help decrease and avoid any impacts to special-status wildlife bird species to a **less than significant level**.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: If any grading or construction activities occur during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31), a preconstruction survey for the presence of special-status bird species or any nesting bird species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 500 feet of proposed construction areas, no more than three days prior to construction activities. The survey shall be submitted to Planning Services for review. If active nests are identified in these areas, CDFW and/or USFWS shall be consulted to develop measures to avoid "take" of active nests prior to the initiation of any construction activities. Avoidance measures may include establishment of a 40-foot, fenced buffer zone using construction fencing or the postponement of vegetation removal until after the nesting season, or until after a qualified biologist has determined the young have fledged and are independent of the nest site.

Monitoring Requirement: The applicant shall conduct all construction activities outside the nesting season or perform a pre-construction survey and the necessary avoidance measures prior to initiation of construction activities. This mitigation measure shall be noted on future grading and residential construction plans. If a pre-construction survey is required, the applicant shall provide evidence of the survey with the Planning and Building Department to verify prior to issuance of grading permit.

Monitoring Responsibility: El Dorado County Planning and Building Department Planning Services

The County of El Dorado Zoning Ordinance Title 130, Article 7 Chapter 130.71—Ecological Preserve Fee, requires payment of the Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1 fee. The mitigation measure for disturbance of rare plant habitat is the same for either the presence or absence of special-status plant species on the project site. The disturbance of rare plant habitat can be mitigated by paying the standard rare plant mitigation fee. The current fee for commercial and industrial development in Mitigation Area 1 is $0.59 per square foot. With the payment of the fee, impacts to rare plants will decrease. Also, as a conservative precaution, a pre-construction survey as a mitigation measure (listed below) would help decrease and avoid any impacts to rare plants habitat to a **less than significant level.**

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey within 14 days prior to clearing or grading operations to look for potential Layne's butterweed (*Packera Layneae)* plants or other rare plants species. If no Layne's butterweed plants or rare plants are observed, a letter report shall be prepared to document the results of the survey, and no additional measures are recommended. If Layne's butterweed plants or rare plants are present, then the applicant shall coordinate with the Pine Hill Ecological Preserve Manager and staff to facilitate collection of seeds and plants on site. The collected material shall be transplanted under the discretion of the Pine Hill Ecological Preserve Manager or a qualified professional to the Pine Hill Ecological Preserve land.

Monitoring Requirement: Planning Services shall verify the completion of the requirement prior to the issuance of grading and building permits in coordination with the applicant and Pine Hill Ecological Preserve Manager.

Monitoring Responsibility: El Dorado County Planning and Building Department, Planning Services.

b. **Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities:** No riparian habitat, waters, or wetlands were observed on the parcel during the botanical and biological surveys conducted in 2015 and 2017. There is no aquatic habitat on the site to support amphibians or fish. Vegetation on the site consists of blue oak woodland. The County

regulates oak canopy removal, as described below in the *Local Policies* section. With implementation of the In-lieu Fee payment for removal of oak canopy, impacts to sensate natural community would be less than significant.

c. **Federally Protected Wetlands:** No riparian habitat, waters, or wetlands were observed on the parcel during the botanical and biological surveys conducted in 2015 and 2017. There are no waters or wetlands shown on the USGS quad map or the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory map. No waters or wetlands are visible on aerial or ground level photographs. No federally protected wetlands or waters regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act occur on the site. The Project will have no impact on protected wetlands and waters.

d. **Migration Corridors:** Migratory Deer Herd Habitats occur within some areas of El Dorado County. The project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any migratory deer herd habitats as shown in the El Dorado County General Plan. This project site is located in an urbanized area, adjacent to roadways, industrial/commercial, and residential development. Wildlife does not generally have access to this area given the project sites is within an established business park, and thus it is devoid of wildlife corridors. As such, impacts to wildlife corridors is considered to be less than significant.

e. **Local Policies:** Local protection of biological resources includes oak woodland preservation, rare plants and special-status species, and wetland preservation with the goal to preserve and protect sensitive natural resources within the County. The biological resource report for this project reveals that the natural community at the site contains 4.82 acres of Oak Woodland canopy, and that the Project will remove 92.7% of the canopy (4.47 acres).

California Tree and Landscape Consulting, Inc. prepared an Arborist Report for Oak Woodland Resources dated February 14, 2018 (Attachment 10) that demonstrates project consistency with the Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance 5061 and the County's Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP) adapted October 24, 2017, which regulates removal of individual oak woodlands and oak canopy. The total impacted oak woodland area that requires mitigation is 3.97 acres (4.47 acres minus 0.50), because 0.50 acres of oak woodland area has been pre-mitigated with the implementation of Parcel Map 48/141 (Attachment 2). The total Oak Woodland disturbance mitigation fee requires mitigation is 3.97 acres x 2 = 7.94 total acres required for Oak Mitigation. The 7.94 acres will require mitigation at the cost of $8,285.00 per acre, for a total mitigation fee of $65,782.90.

Additionally, there is one Heritage Tree with a 39-inch diameter Blue Oak that meets the definition of a Heritage Tree, which was found to be in fair condition and is proposed to be removed. The mitigation fee for Heritage trees is $459 per diameter inch. The mitigation fee for this tree is $17,901.00.

The total mitigation fee required for the proposed oak woodland disturbance and Heritage Tree on the site is **$83,683.90.** With the implementation of the prescribed Conditions of Approval, the impacts would be less than significant. The project would be subject to ORMP and compliance with the ORMP program will be applied as a Condition of Approval.

f. **Adopted Plans**: This project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The Project's mitigation for impacts to oak resources is in accordance with the El Dorado County Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance No. 5061. Protected and sensitive and natural resources/areas within El Dorado County include: Recovery Plan Area for California Red-legged Frog, Pine Hill Preserve, Migratory Deer Herd Habitats and Sensitive Terrestrial Communities as listed in the California Natural Diversity Database. The project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to any of these Protected and Sensitive Natural Habitat areas. There would be no impact.

FINDING: No jurisdictional wetland or riparian areas are present at the project site. There are no special-status plants or wildlife species detected at the project site. This project would be anticipated to have less than significant impact on Biological Resources with the proposed mitigation measure for special status species. The project is subject to applicable conditions of approval.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			**X**	
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			**X**	
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			**X**	
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			**X**	

Data Source/Methodology:

The following analysis of cultural resources information is taken directly from technical documents prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate cultural resources include a cultural resources records search performed at the North Central Information Center (2015). The record search conducted looked at maps for cultural resource records and survey reports in El Dorado County within a 1/8-mile radius of the proposed project area.

Regulatory Setting

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is the nation's master inventory of known historic resources. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service and includes listings of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. The criteria for listing in the NRHP include resources that:

A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history (events);
B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (persons);
C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (architecture); or
D. Have yielded or may likely yield information important in prehistory or history (information potential).

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

California Register of Historical Resources

Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 establishes the CRHR. The register lists all California properties considered to be significant historical resources. The CRHR includes all properties listed as or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including properties evaluated under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The criteria for listing are similar to those of the NRHP. Criteria for listing in the CRHR include resources that:

1. Are associated with the events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
2. Are associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic values; or
4. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The regulations set forth the criteria for eligibility as well as guidelines for assessing historical integrity and resources that have special considerations.

The California Register of Historic Places

The California Register of Historic Places (CRHP) program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archeological and cultural significance, identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes, determines eligibility for state historic preservation grant funding and affords certain protections under the California Environmental Quality Act. The criteria for listing in the CRHP include resources that:

A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
B. Are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history.
C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.
D. Have yielded, or have the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

The State Office of Historic Preservation sponsors the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), a statewide system for managing information on the full range of historical resources identified in California. CHRIS provides an integrated database of site-specific archaeological and historical resources information. The State Office of Historic Preservation also maintains the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), which identifies the State's architectural, historical, archeological and cultural resources. The CRHR includes properties listed in or formally determined eligible for the National Register and lists selected California Registered Historical Landmarks.

Public Resources Code (Section 5024.1[B]) states that any agency proposing a project that could potentially impact a resource listed on the CRHR must first notify the State Historic Preservation Officer, and must work with the officer to ensure that the project incorporates "prudent and feasible measures that will eliminate or mitigate the adverse effects."

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that, in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission.

Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code stipulates that whenever the commission receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, it shall immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The decedents may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within 24 hours of their notification by the Native American Heritage Commission. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

CEQA and CEQA Guidelines

Section 21083.2 of CEQA requires that the lead agency determine whether a project may have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources. A unique archaeological resource is defined in CEQA as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that there is a high probability that it:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, and there is demonstrable public interest in that information;
- Has a special or particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.
- Although not specifically inclusive of paleontological resources, these criteria may also help to define "a unique paleontological resource or site."

Measures to avoid, conserve, preserve, or mitigate significant effects on these resources are also provided under CEQA Section 21083.2.

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines notes that "a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." Substantial adverse changes include physical changes to the historic resource or to its immediate surroundings, such that the significance of the historic resource would be materially impaired. Lead agencies are expected to identify potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of a historic resource before they approve such projects. Historic resources are those that are:

- listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1[k]);
- included in a local register of historic resources (Public Resources Code Section 5020.1) or identified as significant in an historic resource survey meeting the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(g); or
- determined by a lead agency to be historically significant.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 also prescribes the processes and procedures found under Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.95 for addressing the existence of, or probable likelihood of, Native American human remains, as well as the unexpected discovery of any human remains within the project site. This includes consultation with the appropriate Native American tribes.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 provides further guidance about minimizing effects to historical resources through the application of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures must be legally binding and fully enforceable.

The lead agency having jurisdiction over a project is also responsible to ensure that paleontological resources are protected in compliance with CEQA and other applicable statutes. Paleontological and historical resource management is also addressed in Public Resources Code Section 5097.5, "Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historical Sites." This statute defines as a misdemeanor any unauthorized disturbance or removal of a fossil site or remains on public land and specifies that state agencies may undertake surveys, excavations, or other operations as necessary on state lands to preserve or record paleontological resources. This statute would apply to any construction or other related project impacts that would occur on state-owned or state-managed lands. The County General Plan contains policies describing specific, enforceable measures to protect cultural resources and the treatment of resources when found.

Record Searches

This section describes the existing cultural resource setting and potential effects from project implementation within the project area and the surrounding areas. The results are based on a records search at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) conducted on June 10, 2015. To identify historic properties and/or resources, a review of the State of California Office of Historic Preservation records, base maps, historic maps, and literature for El Dorado County on file was conducted. The review of information indicates that the proposed project area and adjacent area contains no recorded prehistoric archaeological sites and no historic-period resources listed with the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS).

The NCIC results indicate that four (4) cultural resources study reports on file at their office cover a portion of the search area.

In this part of the El Dorado County, archaeologists locate prehistoric-period habitation sites adjacent to streams or n ridges or knolls, especially those with southern exposure (Moratto 1984:290). This region is known as the ethnographic-period territory of the Nisenan, also called the Southern Maidu. The Nisenan maintained permanent settlements along major rivers in the Sacramento Valley and foothills; they also periodically traveled to higher elevations to hunt or gather plants (Wilson and Towne 1978: 387:389). The proposed project search area is situated in the Sierra Nevada foothills about one mile west of Shingle Creek. Given the extent of known cultural resources and environmental setting, there is low potential for locating prehistoric-period cultural resources in the vicinity of the proposed project area.

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

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

CEQA Checklist Questions

a.-b. Hi**storic and Archeological Resources.** A complete records search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) found no prehistoric-period cultural resources and zero (0) historic-period cultural resources in the project area. Neither historic or Archeological resources are currently on the project site, based on four (4) other cultural resources study reports on file at the CHRIS office that covers portions of the search area. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Paleontological Resources.** The proposed project area is not located in an area that is considered likely to have paleontological resources present. Fossils of plants, animals, or other organisms of paleontological significance have not been discovered within the project area. In this context, the project would not result in impacts to paleontological resources or unique geologic features. In the event subsurface paleontological sites are disturbed during grading activities on the site, standard conditions of approval requiring that all work activities shall be stopped in the event of an unanticipated discovery would ensure that impacts are less than significant.

d. **Human Remains.** No human remains are known to exist within the project site. However, there is the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as grading, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. Accordingly, this is a potentially significant impact. However, if human remains were discovered, implementation of standard conditions of approval to address accidental discovery of human remains would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

FINDING: No significant cultural resources have been identified on the project site. Due to the lack of any identified prehistoric-period or historic-period cultural resources and paleontological sites on the project site, impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant. Also See Tribal Cultural Resources section.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				**X**
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			**X**	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				**X**
iv) Landslides?				**X**
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			**X**	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			**X**	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?			**X**	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				**X**

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of Geology and Soils is derived directly from technical documents prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate Geology and Soils include a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Environmental Solutions 2017) and a Geotechnical Engineering Report and Geotechnical Engineering Report Update (Wallace Kuhl and Associates 2008). These reports are incorporated by reference and appended to this document.

Environmental Setting

An updated Geotechnical Soils Report was completed by Wallace Kuhl and Associates Inc (2008). The report analyzed geologic and soil and rock conditions on the proposed project site. The following information is based off their Geotechnical Report.

Geology

The property is underlain by volcanic and metavolcanic rock formation as identified by the California Department of Conservation: Mines and Geology publication, "Generalized Geologic Map of the Folsom 15-Minute Quadrangle." Based on the map, the Copper Hill Volcanics formation is exposed on the property, consisting of mostly mafic to andesitic pyroclastic

and metavolcanic rocks, lava, and pillow lava, with subordinate felsic porphyritic and pyroclastic rocks (Wallace Kuhl and Associates Inc 2008)

The Generalized Geology Map of the Folsom 15-Minute Quadrangle indicates the west branch of the Bear Mountains Fault is located approximately 1000 feet east of the proposed El Dorado Hills Shopping Center site and represents the westernmost fault within the "Foothills Fault Zone." The site is not identified within Alquíst-Priolo Fault Study Zone, meaning that the State has not identified this portion of the Foothills Fault Zone as being active within the last 11,000 years. The Bear Mountains Fault is mapped as a pre-Quaternary fault (not active within the last 1.6 million years), except for the "Rescue Lineament," which may have been active in late Quaternary time. The Rescue Lineament is located about eight miles northeast of the eastern boundary of the site. (Wallace Kuhl and Associates 2008)

Soil and Rock Conditions

On March 15, 2007 an engineering geologist from Wallace Kuhl and Associates observed test pits excavated with a Caterpillar 325 D excavator**.** Our site reconnaissance and test pits indicate that in general the northern half of the site and the western frontage of the site have a surface layer of rocky artificial fill material. The fill material consists of silty sandy cobbles and gravels extending to a depth of approximately one to five feet and is underlain by Copper Hills Volcanics Rock of the Copper Hills Volcanics formation are exposed at the southeaster portion of the site. The Copper Hills Volcanics consist of moderately fractured, slightly weathered to hard fine to medium grained rock. The fractures observed were filled with sandy clay material.

The test pits excavated on March 15, 2007 on the southeastern portion of the site (Test pit 5 and 6), and the northern most test pit (Test Pit 1), encountered very hard rock conditions at a depth of approximately eight to ten feet below existing grade. These test pits were terminated at that depth due to difficult excavation conditions. Rock exposed in Test Pits 5 and 6 was intensely fractured and portions of the sidewalls caved into the exaction (Wallace Kuhl and Associates Inc 2008)

Discussion:

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

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

CEQA Checklist Questions

a. **Seismic Hazards:**

i) According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, there are no Alquist-Priolo fault zones within the west slope of El Dorado County (DOC, 2007). However, a fault zone has been identified in the Tahoe Basin and Echo Lakes area. The West Tahoe Fault extends onshore as two parallel strands. In the lake, the fault has clearly defined scarps that offset submarine fans, lake-bottom sediments, and the McKinney Bay slide deposits (DOC, 2016). There is clear evidence that the discussed onshore portion of the West Tahoe Fault is active with multiple events in the Holocene era and poses a surface rupture hazard. However, because of the distance, approximately 75 miles, between the project site and these faults, there would be no impact.

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

iii) El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity. There are no landslide, liquefaction, or fault zones (Wallace Kuhl and Associates Inc 2008). There would be no impact.

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

b. **Soil Erosion:** For development proposals, all grading activities onsite would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance including the implementation of pre- and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). Implemented BMPs are required to be consistent with the County's California Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to eliminate run-off and erosion and sediment controls. Any grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. Any future construction would require similar review for compliance with the County SWPPP. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Geologic Hazards:** Based on the Seismic Hazards Mapping Program administered by the California Geological Survey, no portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone or those areas prone to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides (DOC, 2013). Therefore, El Dorado County is not considered to be at risk from liquefaction hazards. Lateral spreading is typically associated with areas experiencing liquefaction. Because liquefaction hazards are not present in El Dorado County, the county is not at risk for lateral spreading. All grading activities would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. **Expansive Soils:** Expansive soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. The central portion of the county has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions have a low rating. Linear extensibility is used to determine the shrink-swell potential of soils. All development is required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance and development plans have implemented Seismic construction standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Septic Capability:** Public sewer would serve the proposed project. The El Dorado Irrigation District would provide sewer service. There would be no impact resulting from septic systems.

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

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			**X**	
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			**X**	

Background/Science

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

GHG Sources

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

Regulatory Setting

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

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

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the *California Climate Solutions Act of 2006* (Stats. 2006, ch. 488) (Health & Safety Code, Section 38500 et seq.). AB 32 requires a statewide GHG emissions

reduction to 1990 levels by the year 2020. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to implement and enforce the statewide cap. When AB 32 was signed, California's annual GHG emissions were estimated at 600 million metric tons of CO_2 equivalent ($MMTCO_2e$) while 1990 levels were estimated at 427 $MMTCO_2e$. Setting 427 $MMTCO_2e$ as the emissions target for 2020, current (2006) GHG emissions levels must be reduced by 29 percent. CARB adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan in December 2008 establishing various actions the state would implement to achieve this reduction (CARB, 2008). The Scoping Plan recommends a community-wide GHG reduction goal for local governments of 15 percent.

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

Analysis Methodology

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDCAQMD) prefers the use of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) for quantification of project-related GHG and criteria pollutant emissions. CalEEMod is a statewide model providing a uniform GHG analysis platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals. It quantifies direct emissions from construction and operation (including vehicle use), and indirect emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use. The software incorporates the most recent vehicle emission factors from the Emission Factors (EMFAC) model provided by CARB, and average trip generation factors published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The model uses and quantifies mitigation measures reduction benefits found in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's (CAPCOA) document *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measure (2010)*, and is accepted by CARB.

Impact Significance Criteria

CEQA does not provide clear direction on addressing climate change. It requires lead agencies identify project GHG emissions impacts and their "significance," but is not clear what constitutes a "significant" impact. As stated above, GHG impacts are inherently cumulative, and since no single project could cause global climate change, the CEQA test is if impacts are "cumulatively considerable." Not all projects emitting GHG contribute significantly to climate change. CEQA authorizes reliance on previously approved plans (i.e., a Climate Action Plan (CAP), etc.) and mitigation programs adequately analyzing and mitigating GHG emissions to a less than significant level. "Tiering" from such a programmatic-level document is the preferred method to address GHG emissions. El Dorado County does not have an adopted CAP or similar program-level document; therefore, the project's GHG emissions must be addressed at the project-level.

Unlike thresholds of significance established for criteria air pollutants in EDCAQMD's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* (February 2002) ("CEQA Guide"), the District has not adopted GHG emissions thresholds for land use development projects. In the absence of County adopted thresholds, EDCAQMD recommends using the adopted thresholds of other lead agencies which are based on consistency with the goals of AB 32. Since climate change is a global problem and the location of the individual source of GHG emissions is somewhat irrelevant, it's appropriate to use thresholds established by other jurisdictions as a basis for impact significance determinations. Projects exceeding these thresholds would have a potentially significant impact and be required to mitigate those impacts to a less than significant level. Until the County adopts a CAP consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, and/or establishes GHG thresholds, the County will follow an interim approach to evaluating GHG emissions utilizing significance criteria adopted by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to determine the significance of GHG emissions.

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) was utilized due to the close proximity to the County of El Dorado.

Discussion

CEQA does not provide clear direction to addressing climate change. It requires lead agencies identify project GHG emissions impacts and their "significance," but is not clear what constitutes a "significant" impact. As stated above, GHG

impacts and inherently cumulative, and because no single project could cause global climate change, the CEQA test is if impacts are "cumulatively considerable." Not all projects emitting GHG contribute significantly to climate change. CEQA authorizes reliance on previously approved plans (i.e., a Climate Action Plan (CAP), etc.) and mitigation programs adequately analyzing and mitigating GHG emissions to a less than significant level. "Tiering" from such a programmatic-level document is the preferred method to address GHG emissions. El Dorado County does not have an adopted CAP or similar program-level document; therefore, the project's GHG emissions must be address at the project-level.

Unlike thresholds of significance established for criteria air pollutants in EDCAQMD's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* (February 2002) ("CEQA Guide"), the District has not adopted GHG emissions thresholds for land use development projects. In the absence of County adopted thresholds, EDCAQMD recommends using the adopted thresholds of other lead agencies, which are based on consistency with the goals of AB 32. Since climate change is a global problem and the location of the individual source of GHG emissions is somewhat irrelevant, it is appropriate to use thresholds established by other jurisdictions as a basis for impact significance determinations. Projects exceeding these thresholds would have a potentially significant impact and be required to mitigate those impacts to a less than significant level. Until the County adopts a CAP consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, and/or establishes GHG thresholds, the County will follow an interim approach to evaluating GHG emissions utilizing significance criteria adopted by the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) to determine the significance of GHG emissions.

SLOAPCD developed a screening table using CalEEMod, which allows quick assessment of projects to "screen out" those below the thresholds as their impacts would be less than significant.

These thresholds are summarized below:

Significance Determination Thresholds	
GHG Emission Source Category	**Operational Emissions**
Non-stationary Sources	1,150 $MTCO_2e/yr$ OR 4.9 MT $CO_2e/SP/yr$
Stationary Sources	10,000 $MTCO_2e/yr$

SP = service population, which is resident population plus employee population of the project

Projects below screening levels identified in Table 1-1 of SLOAPCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook (pp. 1-3, SLOAPCD, 2012) are estimated to emit less than the applicable threshold. For projects below the threshold, no further GHG analysis is required.

a. The proposed Design Review that would allow for the construction and operation of a self-storage facility. Structures would include nine (9) new storage buildings, two employee-housing units, parking lot improvements, and associated site improvements. Building 1 would be approximately 13,200 square foot building with retail office space (2,700 SF) and storage (7,800 SF) on the ground level, and manager apartments on the second floor (2,700 SF). Buildings 2-9 would be approximately 8,700 square feet each and the total proposed building development for all nine buildings is approximately 82,800 square feet. The project site would also include 10,368 square feet for RV storage space for a total of 30 RV storage spaces. Parking would include seven (7) spaces, located near building 1 at the entrance of the self-storage facility. The applicant provided an Air Quality Analysis (Attachment 7: Air Quality Analysis) that was prepared using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod, v 2013.2.2). The model concluded the daily construction emissions would not exceed 59 lbs/day for Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and 29 lbs/day for Nitrogen Oxides (NOx). This is below the 82 lbs/day threshold for each as detailed in the AQMD's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment: Determining Significance of Air Quality Impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act, February 2002* ("CEQA Guide"). Additionally, the model concluded operational emissions of ROG would be less than 5 lbs/day and NOx would be less than 2 lbs/day; which is also below the 82 lbs/day threshold from the CEQA Guide.

   The Analysis also indicated the annual construction GHG emissions would not exceed 337 metric tons of CO2 equivalent/year (MTCO2e/yr). This is below the Sacramento Regional GHG Thresholds for annual construction emissions of 1,100 MTCO2e/yr. Additionally, the model concluded operational GHG emissions would be less than 329 MTCO2e/yr, which is below the annual GHG operational threshold of 1,100 MTCO2e/yr. Because data from

projects in El Dorado County, along with the other counties in the Sacramento region, were used to develop the regional thresholds, it is AQMD's opinion that these regional GHG thresholds represent "substantial evidence" for CEQA purposes and are appropriate for use as CEQA thresholds of significance. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. Because any construction-related emissions would be temporary and below the minimum standard for reporting requirements under AB 32, the proposed project's GHG emissions would have a negligible cumulative contribution towards statewide and global GHG emissions. The proposed project would not conflict with the objectives of AB 32 or any other applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Cumulative GHG emissions impacts are considered to be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

FINDING: The project would result in less than significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions. For this Greenhouse Gas Emissions category, there would be no significant adverse environmental effect as a result of the project.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			**X**	
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			**X**	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			**X**	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				**X**
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				**X**
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				**X**
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			**X**	
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			**X**	

Discussion

EMSL Analytical, Inc prepared a Project Lifecycle Management analysis for naturally occurring asbestos on-site on April 22, 2010. The Analysis evaluated levels of naturally occurring Asbestos on-site. The analysis states that no asbestos was detected on-site (EMSL Analytical 2010)

Additionally, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was completed by Environmental Solutions (2017). The assessment analyzed a variety a potential environmental concerns. Within their analysis they reviewed records from the Department of Toxic Substances Control and the California USEPA sites. The analysis found no significant hazard and hazardous waste impact that the project could create or expose (Environmental Solutions 2017).

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

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;

- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

CEQA Checklist

a-b. **Hazardous Materials:** The project proposes the construction and operation of a self-storage facility. Nine (9) new storage building structures with a total proposed building development of 82,000 square foot (SF) would include two employee-housing units, parking lot improvements, and associated site improvements. Building 1 would be approximately 13,200 square foot building with retail office space (2,700 SF) and storage (7,800 SF) on the ground level, and manager apartments on the second floor (2,700 SF). Buildings 2-9 would be approximately 8,700 square feet each and the total proposed building development for all nine buildings is approximately 82,800 square feet. The project site would also include 10,368 square feet for RV storage space for a total of 30 RV spaces. Construction may involve the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as construction materials, paint, fuels, and landscaping materials. The majority of these hazardous materials would occur primarily during construction and/or routine intermittent maintenance. Any uses of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials. However, the project would not be anticipated to introduce, transport, store, or dispose of hazardous materials in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Hazardous Material near Schools:** There are no public schools within ¼ mile of the project site. Buckeye Elementary School is located within 2.32 miles of the project site; however, the proposed project would not include any operation that would use acutely hazardous materials in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

d. **Hazardous Sites:** No parcels within EDC are included on the Cortese List, which lists known hazardous sites in California. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 (DTSC, 2015). There would be no impact with the approval of the proposed project.

e-f. **Aircraft Hazards, Private Airstrips:** According to the County of El Dorado Airport Land Us Compatibility Plan, the project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. The project is not located near a public or private airstrip. As such, the project would not be subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan and there would be no immediate hazard for people working in the project area or safety hazard resulting from airport operations and aircraft over-flights in the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would be anticipated to occur within these categories.

g. **Emergency Plan:** The project was reviewed by the El Dorado County Transportation District and El Dorado County Fire Protection District. The proposed project would not impair implementation of any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. All businesses would be required to implement individual emergency response plans as part of their normal operations. This impact would be considered less than significant.

h. **Wildfire Hazards:** The project site is in an area of high fire hazard for wildland fire pursuant to Figure 5.8-4 of the 2004 General Plan Draft EIR. The El Dorado County General Plan Safety Element precludes development in area of high wildland fire hazard unless such development can be adequately protected from wildland fire hazards as demonstrated in a Fire Safe Plan prepared by a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) and approved by the local Fire Protection District and/or California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. Both the El Dorado County Fire Protection District and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) have jurisdiction of reviewing the application. A Wildland Fire Safe Plan is required for the project to demonstrate an adequate fire system for purpose of fire protection with items such as, fire sprinkler and firefighter water, fire hydrants, sprinkler systems, and specific building materials, as needed. With the incorporation of these requirements, the impacts of wildland fire would be less than significant.

FINDING: The proposed project would not be anticipated to expose the area to significant hazards relating to the use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. Any proposed future use of hazardous materials would be subject to review and approval of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan issued by the Environmental Management — Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Division. The project would not be anticipated to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, nor is it anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. For this "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" category, impacts would be less than significant.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			**X**	
a. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			**X**	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			**X**	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			**X**	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			**X**	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			**X**	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			**X**	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			**X**	
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			**X**	
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			**X**	

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of hydrology and water quality is based off technical documents prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate hydrology and water quality include a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Environmental Solutions 2017), and a Geotechnical Engineering Report and Geotechnical Engineering Report Update (Wallace Kuhl and Associates 2008).

Discussion

A Preliminary Drainage Report for Leave It To Us Self-Storage was completed by Lebeck Young Engineering, Inc (2018). The purpose of the report was to determine what if any environmental hydrology and water quality impacts would result from the project with the proposed building envelope modification. The assessment analyzed the previously mitigated original building envelope of 1.7 acres (23%) of the property and compared it to the increased proposed building envelope of 5.7 acres (78%). The 5.7 acres is 78% of the existing 7.2-acre property. The existing building envelope (1.7 acres) was already analyzed and mitigated via the Barnett Business Park Unit 2—Parcel Map 48/141 with the construction of detention pond 1 located downstream from the subject property on the east side of Shingle Lime Mine Road. The Preliminary Drainage Report (2018) takes into consideration the new proposed 5.7 acres of building envelope. The results from the Preliminary Drainage Report (2018) show an insignificant increase in storm water run-off; therefore, no on-site detention pond should be required.

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

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

CEQA Checklist

a. **Water Quality Standards:** Erosion control would be required as part of the building and grading permit. Operation of the proposed project would not involve any uses that would generate wastewater. Storm water runoff from potential development would contain water quality protection features in accordance with a potential National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit, as deemed applicable. The project would not be anticipated to violate water quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Groundwater Supplies:** The geology of the Western Slope portion of El Dorado County is principally hard, crystalline, igneous, or metamorphic rock overlain with a thin mantle of sediment or soil. Groundwater in this region is found in fractures, joints, cracks, and fault zones within the bedrock mass. These discrete fracture areas are typically vertical in orientation rather than horizontal as in sedimentary or alluvial aquifers. Recharge is predominantly through rainfall infiltrating into the fractures. Movement of this groundwater is very limited due to the lack of porosity in the bedrock. Wells are typically drilled to depths ranging from 80 to 300 feet in depth. There is no evidence that the project will substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. Existing public water infrastructure would support the project. The project is not anticipated to affect potential groundwater supplies above pre-project levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

c-f. **Drainage Patterns:** The site is currently vacant. A grading permit through the Planning and Building Department will be required to address grading, erosion and sediment control for any future construction. Construction activities would be required to adhere to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control, and Sediment Ordinance. This includes the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize degradation of water quality during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

g-j. **Flood-related Hazards:** The project site is not located within any mapped 100-year flood areas as shown on Firm Panel Number 06017C0725E, revised September 26, 2008, and would not result in the construction of any structures that would impede or redirect flood flows (FEMA, 2008). No dams that would result in potential hazards related to dam failures are located in the project area. The risk of exposure to seiche, tsunami, or mudflows would be remote. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: The proposed project would be required to address any potential erosion and sediment control. As conditioned and with adherence to County Code Section 110.14, no significant hydrological impacts are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Hydrology" category, impacts would be less than significant.

X. **LAND USE PLANNING.** *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.

CEQA Checklist

a. **Established Community:** The project would not divide an established community. The proposed use for the site is consistent with the adjacent uses in the business park. The project is proposed on property designated by the County's General Plan as industrial and all impacts associated with industrial projects at this location have been considered in the General Plan EIR, therefore, there would be no impact to an established community.

b. **Land Use Consistency:** The parcel is zoned Industrial Light with a Design Community (IL-DC) combining zone. The intent of the –DC combining zone is to ensure architectural supervision and consistency with the EDC Community Design Standards, which is used to evaluate the architectural and site design in industrial districts. This Design Review Permit Application DR16-0001 is the process used by Planning Services for verifying conformance with El Dorado County Standards. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Habitat Conservation Plan:** The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted Natural Community Conservation Plan or any other conservation plan. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted conservation plan. There would be no impact.

FINDING: The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan. There would be no impact to land use goals or standards resulting from the project.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				**X**
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				**X**

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of mineral resources is based off technical documents prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate mineral resources include a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Environmental Solutions 2017) and a Geotechnical Engineering Report and a Geotechnical Engineering Report Update (Wallace Kuhl and Associates 2008).

Discussion

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

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

CEQA Checklist

a-b. **Mineral Resources:** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present (El Dorado County General Plan, Figure CO-1). Review of the California Department of Conservation Geologic Map data showed that the project site is not within a mineral resource zone district. There would be no impact.

FINDING: No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the proposed project either directly or indirectly. For this "Mineral Resources" category, there would be no impacts.

XII.NOISE. *Would the project result in:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			**X**	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			**X**	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			**X**	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			**X**	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?				**X**
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				**X**

Regulatory Setting:

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

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

Determination of Significance

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.

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

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

Each of the noise levels specified above shall be lowered by five dB for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring impulsive noises. These noise level standards do not apply to residential units established in conjunction with industrial or commercial uses (e.g., caretaker dwellings).

The County can impose noise level standards which are up to 5 dB less than those specified above based upon determination of existing low ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site.

In Community areas the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving property. In Rural Areas the exterior noise level standard shall be applied at a point 100' away from the residence. The above standards shall be measured only on property containing a noise sensitive land use as defined in Objective 6.5.1. This measurement standard may be amended to provide for measurement at the boundary of a recorded noise easement between all effected property owners and approved by the County.

*Note: For the purposes of the Noise Element, transportation noise sources are defined as traffic on public roadways, railroad line operations and aircraft in flight. Control of noise from these sources is preempted by Federal and State regulations. Control of noise from facilities of regulated public facilities is preempted by California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulations. All other noise sources are subject to local regulations. Non-transportation noise sources may include industrial operations, outdoor recreation facilities, HVAC units, schools, hospitals, commercial land uses, other outdoor land use, etc.

CEQA Checklist

a. **Noise Exposures:** The proposed project will not expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or Zoning Ordinance. The construction of new structures would require the use of trucks and minor fill and grading, which may result in short-term noise impacts to surrounding neighbors. These activities require an encroachment permit and restricted to construction hours per the General Plan. The project is not expected to generate noise levels exceeding the performance standard contained within Chapter 6 of the 2004 General Plan. The noise associated with the project would be less than significant.

b. **Groundborne Shaking:** Future construction may generate short-term ground borne vibration or shaking events during project construction, which includes grading activities and building construction. Adherence to the time limitations of construction activities, which would be incorporated as a condition of the project, to 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM Monday through Friday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM on weekends and federally recognized holidays would limit the ground shaking effects in the project area. The future daily operations of the project is anticipated to produce minimal vibration or shaking events. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

c. **Permanent Noise Increases:** The project would not significantly increase the ambient noise levels in the area in excess of the established noise thresholds. Any permanent ongoing noise would be intermittent and within confined areas (indoor and outdoor) of the property, and, as such, would not be anticipated to exceed established General Plan noise thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. **Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels:** The project would include construction activities for the grading, construction, and implementation of Best Management Practice (BMP). The short-term noise increases would potentially exceed the thresholds established by the General Plan. Standard Conditions of Approval would limit the hours of construction activities to 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am to 5:00pm on weekends and federally recognized holidays. Adherence to the limitations of construction would be anticipated to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

e-f. **Aircraft Noise:** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or in the immediate vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airport is the Cameron Park Airport, which is located approximately 3.20 miles northwest of the project site. There would be no impacts.

FINDING: With adherence to the County of El Dorado General Plan Policy and Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.37 (Noise Standards), no significant direct or indirect impacts to noise levels are expected either directly or indirectly. For this Noise category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			**X**	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				**X**
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				**X**

Discussion

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

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

CEQA Checklist

a. **Population Growth:** The proposed project includes the construction of two employee-housing units. The project may induce some population growth in the area directly by proposing commercial/industrial development that would generate employment. However, potential employees would most likely come from the community of Shingle Springs or nearby communities. Few employees are likely to come from areas farther away. The project is consistent with the land use designation under the County General Plan, which anticipates population growth in the County based on these designations. Therefore, anticipated population growth would not be altered by this project. The project would utilize existing infrastructure, and therefore would not require new infrastructure that may indirectly induce population growth. Impacts related to population growth would be less than significant.

b. **Housing Displacement:** The project site is currently vacant. No existing housing stock would be displaced by the proposed project. There would be no impact.

c. **Replacement Housing:** The proposed project will not displace any people. There would be no impact.

FINDING: The project would not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the proposed design review request, as this industrial/commercial land use was considered in the 2004 General Plan. For this "Population and Housing" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?			**X**	
b. Police protection?			**X**	
c. Schools?			**X**	
d. Parks?			**X**	
e. Other government services?				**X**

Discussion

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

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

CEQA Checklist

a. **Fire Protection:** The El Dorado County Fire Protection provides structural fire protection services to the project area. Planning Staff requested comments or conditions of approval from the El Dorado County Fire Protection, yet the Fire District did not respond with any concerns or comments. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fires protection services, but would not prevent them from meeting their response times for the project or its designated service area any more than exists today. The Fire District would review the project improvement plans for conformance with their regulation regarding adequate fire flow, vegetation and fuel modification, potential use of hazardous materials, and sprinkler and fire alarm requirements prior to issuance of final occupancy for a building permit. Upon fulfillment of their regulations, impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection:** The El Dorado County Sheriff's Department would provide law enforcement services to the proposed development. The development of commercial square footage on the project site may result in a small increase in calls for service but would not significantly affect the Department. The project applicant would be responsible for the payment of development fees to the Department to offset any project impacts. As a result, impacts would be considered less than significant.

c. **Schools:** School services in the Shingle Springs area are provided by the Buckeye Union Elementary School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The proposed project is a commercial development with two employee-housing units, which by itself would not generate an increase in student population requiring additional facilities. As discussed in the Population and Housing section, the project may attract new employees, but most would come from the surrounding area. The project is not expected to attract a significant number of new residents. Future development would be required to pay impact fees for new facilities adopted by both districts, which would mitigate any potential impacts of the project. The impact would be less than significant.

d. **Parks:** The proposed project is a commercial project with two employee-housing units and would not generate a need for parks. As such, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

e. **Other Government Services:** No other government services would be required because of the proposed commercial project. There would be no impact.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. There would be insignificant levels of increased demands to services anticipated as a result of the project. For this Public Services category, impacts would be less than significant.

XV. RECREATION.				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			**X**	
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			**X**	

Discussion

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

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.

CEQA Checklist

a-b. **Parks and Recreational Services:** The project does not include any increase in permanent population that would contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur. The commercial development with two employee-housing units would not generate an increase demand for park services; therefore, it would not require construction or expansion of additional facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: Less than significant impacts to open space or park facilities would result as part of the project. For this Recreation category, impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			**X**	
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			**X**	
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				**X**
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			**X**	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			**X**	
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			**X**	

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

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

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

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

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

According to the transportation element of the County General Plan, Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions. Level of Service is defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council). There are some roadway segments that are excepted from these standards and are allowed to operate at LOS F, and the closest road segment is located 1.19 miles away on Cameron Park Drive from Robin Lane to Coach Lane. According to Policy TC-Xe, "worsen" is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

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

Parking

Pursuant to the El Dorado County ordinance code, the project is required to provide 7 parking spaces. The proposed project will meet the parking requirement and provide 7 parking spaces. The project will include 6 standard parking spaces, and (1) handicap accessible spaces.

Traffic Assessment

An On-site Transportation Review of the Leave It To us Self Storage project was conducted by T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. (TKTPMP) dated February 29, 2018 (Attachment 12). The purpose of this study is to identify potential environmental impacts to transportation facilities as required by the California Environmental Quality Act and to test if the project is consistent with the El Dorado County's requirements for approval.

Level of Service

Analysis of transportation facility significant environmental impacts is based on the concept of Level of Service (LOS). The LOS of a facility is a qualitative measure used to describe operational conditions. LOS ranges from A (best), which represents minimal delay, to F (worst), which represents heavy delay and a facility that is operating at or near its functional capacity. Levels of Service for this study were determined using methods defined in the *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010*.

Project impacts were determined by comparing conditions with the proposed project to those without the project and the cumulative impacts of the proposed projects in the area. The Transportation and Circulation Policies contained in the County General Plan establish a framework for review of thresholds of significance and identification of potential impacts of new development on the County's road system. These policies are enforced by the application of the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Guidelines, the County Design and Improvements Standards Manual, and the County Encroachment Ordinance, with review of individual development projects by the Transportation and Long Range Planning Divisions of the Community Development Agency. A substantial adverse effect to traffic would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
Result in or "worsen" Level of Service (LOS) F traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.
- According to General Plan Policy TC-Xe, The term "worsen" is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use of occupancy permit for the development project:
    - A 2 percent increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour or p.m. peak hour or daily, or
    - The addition of 100 or more daily trips, or
    - The addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.

Discussion: The Transportation and Circulation Policies contained in the County General Plan establish a framework for review of thresholds of significance and identification of potential impacts of new development on the County's road system. These polices are enforced by the application of the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Guidelines, the County Design and Improvements Standards Manual, and the County Encroachment Ordinance, with review of individual development project by the Transportation and Long Range Planning Division of the Community Development Agency. A substantial adverse effect to traffic would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
- Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or

- Result in or worsen Level of Service (LOS) 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.

CEQA Checklist

a. **Traffic Increases:** No substantial traffic increases would result from the proposed project, as determined by the projected number of new trips to the site. Transportation consultant firm T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. (TKTPM) completed an on-site and off-site transportation review (Attachment 11), which found that the daily trips generated by the proposed use during AM and PM Peak hours would be within the acceptable levels set by the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Guidelines. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Levels of Service Standards:** Level of service standards during AM and PM peak hours were found to be acceptable by the on-site transportation review conducted by T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. The project is anticipated to generate 142 daily vehicle trips, and 16 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. The project is situated south of US 50 between the Cameron Park Drive and South Shingle Road interchange, and the project is expected to disperse its trips east and west via Durock Road by multiple connecting intersections. Subsequently, none of these intersections are expected to experience more than 10 peak hour trips or 100 daily trips. The addition of project traffic will not change the level of service at the intersections and the intersections would continue to operate acceptably. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Air Traffic:** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.

d. **Design Hazards:** T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. evaluated the project for potential hazards in their traffic analysis, which included a sight distance evaluation and a preliminary traffic safety evaluation. The study found that the project would not create or exacerbate hazards in the area, nor were there any hazards that might impact the project, site distance was checked in the field and found to be more than adequate. It is recommended that the county approve the project without any transportation or traffic related conditions beyond the payment of applicable fees. According to the project site plan there appears to be adequate sight distance on-site to facilitate safe and orderly circulation. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access:** The project has one ingress/egress point. The primary public driveway entrance would be located at the southwest corner of the site, which would connect to Business Drive, which is currently a privately maintained road. The entrance to the self-storage facility will be gated. The internal turning radius were designed to meet the El Dorado County Fire Department requirements (40'inner and 56" outer radius); the turning radius for RV's (26' inner and 41.4' outer radius) was also checked and found to be adequate. Impacts would be less than significant.

f. **Alternative Transportation.** The project would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs relating to alternative transportation. There are no public transit or bicycle lanes at this property or along Business Drive. The proposed project will have no impact on adopted polices, plans, or programs regarding public transit or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: The project would not exceed the thresholds for traffic identified within the General Plan. For this Transportation/Traffic category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of tribal cultural resources is derived from technical documents prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate tribal cultural resources include a cultural resources records search performed at the North Central Information Center (2007) and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Environmental Solutions 2017). These documents are incorporated by refence and attached to this document.

Discussion

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

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

CEQA Checklist

a, b**.** **Tribal Cultural Resources:** The United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC) was notified of the proposed project and given access to all project documents on March 23, 2016, via certified mail. No other tribes requested to be notified of proposed projects for consultation in the project area at the time. In response to a request from Marcos Guerrero of the UAIC, dated June 2, 2016, the Cultural Resources Study for the project was sent to the tribe via email. No further information or other requests were received from the UAIC, and no other requests for formal consultation were received for this project. Pursuant to the Cultural Resources Study prepared by Historic Resources Associates (2015), the geographic area of the project site is not known to contain any resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or considered significant by a California Native American tribe. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: No significant TCRs are known to exist on the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change to a TCR and impacts would be less than significant with standards conditions of approval for potential discovery of cultural resources.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			**X**	
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			**X**	
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			**X**	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			**X**	
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			**X**	
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			**X**	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			**X**	

Discussion

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

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

a. **Wastewater Requirements**: Wastewater treatment would be provided for the site by El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). The Regional Water Quality Control Board sets treatment requirements for the collection, processing, and disposal of waste, which EID must comply. It has been determined that the proposed project would not require any additional equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of wastewater treatment. There is an 8-inch gravity sewer line located in Business Drive. This sewer line has adequate capacity at this time. A service stub is located near the western corner of the parcel to be developed. There is an existing 4-inch sewer force main located in an easement along the northern property line of the parcel. To receive service from this line, the location of this force main will need to be potholed prior to approving any grading in the vicinity. EID will need to review and approve any proposed grading

and/or structures that are proposed in the vicinity of this sewer line. As the project would utilize EDUs already accounted for by the EID, the project would not lead to the EID's wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) exceeding treatment requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Construction of New Facilities:** An 8-inch water line exists in Business Drive and a 12-inch water line is located along the northern property line of the project site. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District has determined that the minimum fire flow for this project is 1,625 GPM for three-hour duration while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. According to the District's hydraulic model, the existing system can deliver the required fire flow. To provide this fire flow and receive service, the project applicants must construct a water line extension connecting to the water line. There is an 8-inch gravity sewer line located in Business Drive that has adequate capacity to serve the project. The location of the force main will need to be potholed prior to approving any grading in the vicinity. The project would connect to this sewer line with appropriate pressure reduction as determined by the EID; no facilities expansion would be required as a result of this connection. Given this fact, there will not be a need to expand water or wastewater facilities as a result of this project. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **New Stormwater Facilities:** Any drainage facilities needed for future construction would be built in conformance with the County of El Dorado Drainage Manual, as determined by departmental standards, during the grading and building permit process. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. **Sufficient Water Supply:** The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) reviewed the project as part of a Facility Improvement Letter (FIL) and determined that water and sewer utilities are available to serve the site. The project as proposed would not require any additional EDUs of water supply. The minimum fire flow for this project is 1,625 GPM for three-hour duration while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. According the District's hydraulic model, the existing system can deliver the required fire flow. In order to provide this fire flow and receive service, the project applicant must construct a water line extension to the identified water lines. With these on-site and off-site improvements impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Adequate Wastewater Capacity:** The existing EID facilities are adequate to serve the proposed project with no expansion of either the infrastructure or the wastewater treatment plant. Impacts to wastewater facilities would be less than significant.

f-g. **Solid Waste Disposal and Requirements:** El Dorado Disposal distributes municipal solid waste to Forward Landfill in Stockton and Kiefer Landfill in Sacramento. Pursuant to El Dorado County Environmental Management Solid Waste Division staff, both facilities have sufficient capacity to serve the County. Recyclable materials are distributed to a facility in Benicia and green wastes are sent to a processing facility in Sacramento. County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting and loading of solid waste and recyclables. This project does not propose to add any activities that would generate additional solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: No significant utility and service system impacts would be expected with the project, either directly or indirectly. For this Utilities and Service Systems category, impacts would be less than significant.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. *Does the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			**X**	
b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			**X**	
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			**X**	

Discussion

a. No substantial evidence contained in the project record has been found that would indicate that this project would have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment. As conditioned or mitigated, and with adherence to County permit requirements, this project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of California history, pre-history, or tribal cultural resources. Any impacts from the project would be less than significant due to the design of the project and required standards that would be implemented prior to DR16-0001 or with the building permit processes and/or any required project specific improvements on the property.

b. Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as *two or more individual effects, which when considered together, would be considerable or which would compound or increase other environmental impacts.*

The project would not involve development or changes in land use that would result in an excessive increase in population growth. Impacts due to increased demand for public services associated with the project would be offset by the payment of fees as required by service providers to extend the necessary infrastructure services. The project would not be anticipated to contribute substantially to increased traffic in the area and the project would not require an increase in the wastewater treatment capacity of the County. Due to the size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts anticipated related to 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, 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, either no impacts, or less than significant impacts would be anticipated.

As outlined and discussed in this document, as conditioned and with compliance with County Codes, this project would be anticipated to have a less than significant project-related environmental effect which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Based on the analysis in this study, it has been determined that the project would have less than significant cumulative impacts.

c. Based on the discussion contained in this document, no potentially significant impacts to human beings are anticipated to occur with respect to potential project impacts. The project would not include any physical changes to the site, and any future development or physical changes would require review and permitting through the County. Adherence to these standard conditions would be expected to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

FINDINGS: It has been determined that the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts. The project would not exceed applicable environmental standards, nor significantly contribute to cumulative environmental impacts.

INITIAL STUDY ATTACHMENTS

Attachments: (1) Site Plan; (2) Parcel Map PM 48-141; (3) Preliminary Drainage Report; (4) Preliminary Grading and Utility Plan; (5) Landscape Plan; (6) Lighting Plan; (7) Air Quality Analysis; (8) Biological Site Assessment 2017; (9) Biological Site Assessment 2009; (10) Biological Survey 2016; (11) Arborist Report for Oak Woodland Resources 2018; and (12) On-site Transportation Review of the Leave It To us Self Storage

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

CAPCOA Guide (August 2010). Available at: http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-QuantificationReport-9-14-Final.pdf

California Air Resources Board (CARB). (2008). *Climate Change Scoping Plan.* Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/adopted_scoping_plan.pdf

California Air Resources Board (CARB). (2017). *Area Designations Maps/State and National.* Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm.

California Attorney General's Office. (2010). Addressing Climate Change at the Project Level. Available at: http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/GW_mitigation_measures.pdf

California Department of Conservation (CDC). (2008). *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program: El Dorado County Important Farmland 2008*. Available at: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/eld08.pdf.

California Department of Conservation (CDC). (2013a). Important Farmland Categories webpage. Available at: www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/mccu/Pages/ map_categories.aspx.

California Department of Conservation (CDC). (2013b). The Land Conservation Act. Available at: www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). (2015). *DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List)*. Available at: http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm.

California Energy Commission. (2006). *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004, Staff Final Report*. Publication CEC-600-2006-013-SF.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). (2015). Scenic Highway Program FAQs: Caltrans Landscape Architecture Program. Available at: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/ LandArch/scenic/faq.htm.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). (2013). *California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways*. Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy.htm.

California Geological Survey. (2007). Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Maps. Available at: http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/WH/regulatorymaps.htm.

California Geological Survey. (2013). Seismic Hazards Zonation Program. Retrieved April 15, 2015 available at: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/shzp/Pages/affected.aspx.

California Code of Regulations. *Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.* Title 14, Section 15000, et seq. 14 CCR 15000

California Office of Emergency Services. 2015. Business Plan/EPCRA 312. Available at: www.caloes.ca.gov/for-businesses-organizations/plan-prepare/hazardousmaterials/hazmat-business-plan.

El Dorado County. (2016). *Draft Biological Resources Policy Update and Oak Resources Management Plan Environmental Impact Report*. State Clearinghouse No. 2015072031. Placerville, CA: El Dorado County Planning Services.

El Dorado County. (2003). *El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. State Clearinghouse No. 2001082030. Placerville, CA: El Dorado County Planning Services.

El Dorado County. (2004, July 19). *El Dorado County General Plan: A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief*. Placerville, CA: El Dorado County Planning Services.

El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District. (2002). *El Dorado County APCD- CEQA Guide.* Available at: https://www.edcgov.us/Government/AirQualityManagement/documents/Chapter2_RF6.pdf

El Dorado County. (2005, July 21). Asbestos Review Areas, Western Slope, El Dorado County, California. Available at: http://www.edcgov.us/Government/AirQualityManagement/Asbestos.aspx.

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD). (2000). *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District*. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/DRDB/ED/CURHTML/R101.HTM.

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD). (2002). *Guide to Air Quality Assessment: Determining the Significance of Air Quality Impacts Under the California Environmental Quality Act*. Available at: http://www.edcgov.us/Government/AirQualityManagement/Guide_to_Air_Quality_Assessment.aspx.

El Dorado County Geographic Information System (GIS) Data. Placerville, CA: Esri ArcGIS. Available at: El Dorado County controlled access data GISDATA\LIBRARIES.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). (2008). FEMA Map Service Center, Current FEMA Issued Flood Maps: El Dorado County, California, unincorporated area, no. 06017C1025E. Available at: http://map1.msc.fema.gov/idms/IntraView.cgi?KEY=94926033&IFIT=1.

Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). (2008, June 19). *Technical advisory: CEQA and climate change: Addressing climate change through California Environmental Quality Act Review*. Sacramento, CA. Available at: http://www.opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf.

Kroeber, A.L. (1925). *Handbook of the Indians of California. Bulletin 78.* Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington, DC. Smithsonian Institution.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). (2010). Construction GHG Emissions Reductions. Available at: http://airquality.org/ceqa/cequguideupdate/Ch6FinalConstructionGHGReductions.pdf

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). (2013). Storm Water Program, Municipal Program. Available at: www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal.shtml.

National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP). (2009). Background and History. Available at: www.nehrp.gov/about/history.htm.

North Central Information Center. (June 2015). *Record search Results for 109-480-07.* Sacramento, CA.

San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). (2012, April). A Guide for Assessing The Air Quality Impacts For Projects Subject To CEQA Review. Available at: http://www.slocleanair.org/images/cms/upload/files/CEQA_Handbook_2012_v1.pdf.

Sycamore Environmental Consulting, Inc. (June 2017). *Botanical Survey Results for APN 109-480-07 on Business Drive, Shingle Springs, El Dorado County, CA.*

T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. (February 29, 2018). *Technical Memo, Leave It To Us Self Storage On-site Transportation Review.* Available at: El Dorado County Planning Commission Legistar

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Conservation Service and Soil Service. (1974). *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California*. Available at: http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_MANUSCRIPTS/california/el_doradoCA1974/EDA.pdf

U.S. Department of the Army (2007). *Corps of Engineers Regulation.* Sacramento, CA.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2014). Summary of the Energy Policy Act. Available at: www2.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-energy-policy-act.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2015). The Green Book Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants. Available at: www.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook.

U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC). (2014). LEED v4 for Building Design and Construction Addenda. Updated October 1, 2014. Available at: www.usgbc.org/resources/leed-v4-building-design-and-construction-redline-current-version.

U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC). (2015). LEED Overview. Available at: www.usgbc.org/leed