Exhibit V

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FILE: DR-R18-0001

PROJECT NAME: Saratoga Retail Phase 2

NAME OF APPLICANT: Peter L. Navarra

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 120-690-07 and 120-690-08 **SECTION:** 2 **T:** 9N **R:** 8E

LOCATION: The property is located on the west side of El Dorado Hills Boulevard and south of the intersection with Saratoga Way in the El Dorado Hills Area. Supervisory District 1.

☐ **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT: FROM: TO:**

☐ **REZONING: FROM: TO:**

☐ **TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP** ☐ **SUBDIVISION TO SPLIT ACRES INTO LOTS SUBDIVISION (NAME):**

☐ **SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW:**

☒ **OTHER:** Design Review

REASONS THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

☐ **NO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS WERE IDENTIFIED DURING THE INITIAL STUDY.**

☒ **MITIGATION HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED WHICH WOULD REDUCE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.**

☐ **OTHER:**

In accordance with the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), State Guidelines, and El Dorado County Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, the County Environmental Agent analyzed the project and determined that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment. Based on this finding, the Planning Department hereby prepares this MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION. A period of thirty (30) days from the date of filing this mitigated negative declaration will be provided to enable public review of the project specifications and this document prior to action on the project by COUNTY OF EL DORADO. A copy of the project specifications is on file at the County of El Dorado Planning Services, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667.

This Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted by the Planning Commission on August 23, 2018.

_____

Executive Secretary

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

INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title: DR-R18-0001/Saratoga Retail Phase 2

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

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

Applicant's Name and Address: Peter J. Navarra, 3220 Northrop Ave. Sacramento, CA 95864

Project Agent's Name and Address: Dana J. Moore, 785 Orchard Drive, Suite 110 Folsom, CA 95630

Project Engineer's Name and Address: Chris Schulze TSD Engineering, Inc. 785 Orchard Drive, Suite 110 Folsom, CA 95630

Project Location: The property is located on the west side of El Dorado Hills Blvd at the intersection with Saratoga Way in the El Dorado Hills area.

Assessor's Parcel Number: 120-690-07, 120-690-08 **Acres:** 0.748/0.962 acres (1.71 acres total)

Sections: Sec. 2 **T:** 9N **R:** 8E | **Latitude/Longitude Coordinates:** 38.655066°/ -121.072147°

General Plan Designation: Commercial (C)

Zoning: Community Commercial- Design Review-Community(CC-DC)

Description of Project: Design Review Permit Revision to reduce the square footage by 6,883 square feet, and revise Building 3 to include a drive-thru aisle to Design Review Permit DR08-0003/The Shops at El Dorado Hills, which was approved by the Planning Commission on January 22, 2009. Building 2A is proposed as a retail commercial building of 5,500 square feet and Building 3 would decrease its square footage to 4,658 with the change from restaurant to a drive-thru restaurant.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	CC-DC	C	Undeveloped
North	CC-DC	C	Commercial Development
South	CC/TC	C/AP	US Highway 50 Access Ramp
East	CC-DC	C	Commercial Development
West	RM-DC (Multi-unit Residential) (Design Review-Community)	MFR (Multifamily Residential)	Multi-family Residential

Briefly describe the environmental setting: The project site is comprised of two undeveloped lots totaling approximately 1.71 acres in size at an elevation of approximately 630-feet above sea level. The site is situated at the west side of El Dorado Hills Blvd at the intersection with Saratoga Way in the El Dorado Hills area. The project sight has been roughly graded and used for Caltrans staging for U.S. Hwy 50 interchange work; there are no trees on the property. No sensitive plant or animal species were found onsite. The project site is located in Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2. No cultural resources exist onsite.

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

1. Community Development Services – 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 Hills 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	X	Air Quality
	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality
	Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise
	Population / Housing		Public Services		Recreation
X	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: 07/16/18

Printed Name: Efren Sanchez, Assistant Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: FOR MEL PABALINAS FOR MIKE NIHAN Date: 7/16/18

Printed Name: Michael Nihan, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with Sections 15070 to 15075 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project.

Project Description

The proposed project is a Design Review Permit in accordance with Ordinance Code Section 130.52.030, for a site plan which includes the construction of two commercial buildings. Building 2A would be approximately 5,500 square feet and building 3 would be approximately 4,658 square feet. Building 3 would be utilized as a commercial restaurant (likely Chick-fil-A) with a drive-thru aisle. Building 2A is proposed as a retail commercial building without a drive-thru aisle. **Figures 1 and 2** present the project vicinity and regional location. **Figure 3** presents the proposed project.

The El Dorado County Planning Commission approved Design Review Permit DR08-0003 on January 22, 2009, which approved the Shops at El Dorado Hills. The development included a 13,368 square foot Walgreens store served by a drive thru and two buildings totaling approximately 17,000 square feet. The applicant proposes to revise the Design Review permit to reduce the square footage of the two buildings by approximately 7,000 square feet and revise the layout to alter one building to include a drive-thru aisle.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The property is located on the west side of El Dorado Hills Blvd at the intersection with Saratoga Way in the El Dorado Hills Area. The site is in El Dorado Hills community region and is within a commercial district. The surrounding land uses are residential development to the west and northwest, commercial development to the north and east, and road development (US Highway 50) and commercial development across US Highway 50 to the south.

Project Characteristics

1. Transportation/Circulation

   The primary access to the site would be from an existing encroachment onto Saratoga Way, a County maintained road. The project will include two additional driveways to serve the site; one full access drive south of the main site driveway, and one egress-only driveway at the south end of the project site. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) and the El Dorado Hills Fire Protection District has reviewed the proposed access and circulation for the project. The DOT analyzed the submitted focused traffic analysis and recommend standard conditions of approval. The applicant shall obtain approval of the final design of this driveway from the Department of Transportation prior to issuance of any building permit for Buildings 2A or 3.

2. Parking

   Pursuant to Section 130.35.030.1 of the El Dorado county ordinance code, the proposed development of the two buildings would require 35 parking spaces and one RV Space. As currently designed, the proposed project would provide a total of 60 parking spaces, including two RV spaces and one truck loading stall; an exceedance of 27 stalls over the required amount of parking. In addition, the Walgreens site contains many more spaces than required. With reciprocal parking rights there are a total of 44 additional spaces. In addition to vehicle parking, the proposed project would include thirteen (13) bicycle parking racks (TSD Engineering 2018).

3. Pedestrian Access

The site would provide two main access points for pedestrians. One access point connects to Saratoga Way on the property's western boundary. The second access point connects to the parking lot of the adjacent Walgreens property. The pedestrian access points connect in the middle of the site and allow for continuous pedestrian access throughout the project site. Both pedestrian aisles would provide crosswalks when intersecting driveways and streets. Additionally, each building would have sidewalks constructed around their exterior with accessible pedestrian ramps that include handrails and guardrails. A sidewalk is proposed to be extended along the projects southern boundary on Saratoga Way to connect with the existing sidewalk of Walgreens to the north.

4. Design/Landscaping

The proposed project would be designed to blend with the surrounding development. Both buildings would have landscaping on the exterior, which would provide an aesthetic backdrop similar to Walgreens. A variety of retaining walls and decorative fences would be developed throughout the site. The walls and fencing would partially shield the development from neighboring residences and roadways (**Table 1**). The entirety of the drive-thru would be shielded by the retaining wall and decorative fence planted with vines. Additional features include: an open patio on the eastern side or building 2A, bicycle racks, overhead trellis along pedestrian walkways and ornate landscaping features. The proposed development would be consistent with the El Dorado Design and Improvement Standards Manuel (DISM). The landscaping plan would comply with the provisions of water efficiency landscaping standards set forth in California Government Code Sections 65591 through 65599 and the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.

Table 1: Retaining Wall and Decorative Fence Features

Retaining walls/Decorative Metal Fence			
Number	**Length**	**Height**	**Location**
Retaining Walls with Decorative Metal Fence on top			
1	50± Feet	0.5 - 2.5± Feet	Northwestern Portion of Site at the Southwestern End of Building 2A. Adjacent to Saratoga Way.
2	150± Feet	0.5 – 6.7± Feet	Southeastern Portion of the Site Along the Entirety of the Eastern Side of Building 3. Adjacent to El Dorado Hills Boulevard.
3	100± Feet	0.5 – 6.7± Feet	Southeastern Portion of the Site Along the Entirety of the Southern Side of Building 3. Adjacent to Highway 50 West Bound On-Ramp
4	75± Feet	0.5 – 2.5± Feet	Southwestern Portion of the Site Along Saratoga Way
Decorative Metal Fence Without Retaining Wall			
5	250± Feet	3± Feet	Eastern Portion of the Site Connecting to the Retaining Wall East of Building 3. Adjacent to El Dorado Hills Boulevard.
6	50± Feet	3± Feet	Surrounding Open Patio East of Building 2A

Source: TSD Engineering 2018.

5. Utilities and Infrastructure

There are existing electrical facilities that would be extended within the parcel of the project. Domestic water service is available at the site but requires upgrades of a 10-inch water line to provide both fire flow and receive service, as required by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Part of the existing 10-inch water line and associated dedicated easement conflict with a proposed building; therefore, coordination for the abandonment of easement shall be conducted with EID prior to any grading activity occurs on site. The

site has a 21-inch gravity sewer line abutting the southern property line, which has the adequate capacity for the proposed buildings.

6. Lighting

The lighting design includes pole mounted parking lot lights and exterior lighting. All lighting would be designed to minimize light/glare impacts to the adjacent properties by ensuring that all exterior lighting and pole-mounted parking lot and driveway lighting be shielded and directed downward. Light-emitting diode (LED) luminaires would be used for all of the proposed outdoor lighting. Lighting would be consistent with the Eldorado County Lighting Standards set fourth in Chapter 130.34 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.

7. Building 3 Drive-Thru

The project would develop Building 3 as a drive-thru restaurant. The drive-thru would be located on the southeast corner of Building 3, adjacent to the US Highway 50 West bound on-ramp and El Dorado Hills Boulevard. The drive-thru call box would be located on the southern portion of the site facing US Highway 50. The call box was strategically located facing US Highway 50, because the highway constitutes a substantial source of noise in the area and would minimize the negligible noise produced by the call box. The most likely tenant for Building 3 would be Chick-Fil-A, which would employ approximately 15 workers per shift, with two shifts per business day. Note: Chick-Fil-A is currently not open on Sundays.

8. 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 and landscaping, and associated improvements. Both building and grading permits would be required. The project site has been previously mass graded and a subterranean storm water retention vault installed under entitlement permit(s) associated with the adjacent Walgreens drug store.

9. Previous Technical Reports/Studies

Numerous technical reports and studies have been conducted on the subject property for the proposed development. **Table 2** lists the studies that have been prepared and a summary of each study.

Table 2: Technical Report Summary

Study	Company	Summary of Report and Recommendation
Air Quality Analysis	Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc	This analysis evaluated potential air quality impacts from the development of "The Shops" mixed-use shopping center. Emissions were evaluated for the construction and operation of the proposed project. The evaluation determined that the project would result in a less than significant impact on air quality with the implementation of standard regulations and recommended mitigations.
Records Search	North Central Information Center	This records search included review of the State of California Office of Historic Preservation records, base maps, historic maps, and literature of El Dorado County. Records search found no resources within the proposed project area and recommended standard conditions to the project.

Jurisdictional Determination Approval	The Department of the Army	Letter from the Department of the Army. The letter states that the site does not contain any features regulated by the Corps of Engineers.
Project Lifecycle Management Analysis	EMSL Analytical, Inc	Analysis evaluated levels of naturally occurring Asbestos on-site. Analysis states that no Asbestos was detected during the analysis
Geotechnical Engineering Report	Wallace Kuhl & Associates Inc	The report evaluated the sites physical properties of soil and rock to determine site design. Report recommended specific site design features.
Update of Geotechnical Engineering Report	Wallace Kuhl & Associates Inc	This updated Geotechnical Engineering Report reviewed revised site plan to determine if the previous geotechnical engineering reports for the project remain applicable. The review determined that the previous recommendations from the original Geotechnical Engineering Report are still applicable.
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment	Environmental Solutions	The intent of the Phase I assessment was to identify associated recognized environmental conditions associated with the project site and surrounding land uses. The assessment revealed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions, historic recognized environmental conditions, controlled recognized environmental conditions, or de minimis conditions in connection with the subject property.
Special-Status Plant Survey	ECORP Consulting Inc.	The Purpose of the special-status plant survey was to identify special status plant species. The survey identified potential for special-status species to exist on site, however did not identify any special-status plant species on-site.
Noise Analysis	HELIX Environmental Planning	This noise analysis assessed operational impacts of a previous iteration of the proposed project (Previous iteration of project included one additional building with a drive-through). Analysis determined that the project will not generate noise-levels above El Dorado County standards.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis	HELIX Environmental Planning	Analysis preformed modeling to determine the net operational greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed project. The analysis determined that the greenhouse gas emission impacts resulting from the project would be less than significant.
Transportation Impact Study	Kimley Horn	This study documents the results of a transportation impact study completed for a previous proposal of the Saratoga Retail Phase 2 project. The report will act as a conservative analysis, because the previous proposal had an additional drive-through restaurant and subsequently a higher generation of traffic.

Traffic Analyses	Kimley Horn	The purpose of the evaluation was to complete a Near-Term (2026) analysis and provide an interim-year snapshot of the worst-case conditions. This analysis conservatively assumes the existing geometries for the study intersections, along with traffic volumes growth expected by 2026. The Near-Term (2026) volumes were approximated using straight-line growth interpolation between Existing (2017) and Cumulative (2035) volumes per the original study. The study determined that with implementation of their recommended mitigations the project will result in a less than significant impact on transportation and circulation.

10. CEQA Section 15183. Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning.

    a. CEQA mandates that projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. This streamlines the review of such projects and reduces the need to prepare environmental studies.

    b. In approving a project meeting the requirements of this section, a public agency shall limit its examination of environmental effects to those which the agency determines, in an initial study or other analysis:

        1. Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located,

        2. Were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent,

        3. Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or

        4. Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.

    c. This Project is consistent with the EDC General Plan and the Commercial Zone District and is therefore entitled to the application of CEQA Section 15183. Notwithstanding this consistency this Initial Study in some cases addresses cumulative impacts which are not project specific in nature in order to address questions raised by the County Planning Commission and public.

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.

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:** A review of the Important Public Scenic Views identified in the El Dorado County General Plan revealed that the only scenic vista near the project site would be from southbound Salmon Falls Road between US Highway 49 and the Folsom Reservoir towards the south and west. The project site is located east of Salmon Falls Road and would not affect views at this scenic vista. 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 Highways:** The nearest state scenic highway to the project would be US Highway 50 from Placerville to South Lake Tahoe. The project site is located over 17 miles west of this portion of US Highway 50. The proposed project would be visible from US Highway 50 in the El Dorado Hills area, which is not a scenic corridor. Because the project is not located adjacent to a designated scenic highway, it would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

c. **Visual Character:** The project would significantly 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 residential property west and northwest of the site, which would no longer have unimpeded views across the vacant Phase II of the site towards development east of the site and hillside views in the background. Nevertheless, the El Dorado County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance has designated this land as commercial, with anticipated potentially significant impacts in the General Plan EIR (available for review online at http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm or at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667) resulting from the development of land associated with commercially zoned property adjacent to residentially zoned property.

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 commercial development. These design elements

include landscaping, articulated/stepped walls, tower elements of varying heights, arches, stone veneer on retaining walls, trellises with creeping vines, and relatively large windows as seen from residential development to the west. Other design elements include the use of colors and hues consistent with surrounding residential and commercial development. Thus, residents would not be looking at flat, unarticulated walls devoid of character or landscaping and monotone color schemes typical of the rear walls of commercial buildings.

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 commercial 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 commercial development on this site would create new sources of light and glare that would have an impact on residential development to the west. As it relates to changing the character of this parcel from vacant land that generates no light to a lighted commercial parcel, which is similar to existing commercial development in the area. All 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 10,158 square feet of commercial development consisting of buildings, landscape, lighting, and parking. This development is entirely consistent with the character of surrounding commercial development. 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 commercial 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 an urban community and 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. **Non-agricultural Use.** This project is located in an area designated for commercial uses. There are no agricultural opportunities available in close proximity to the project site which may be impacted by development of the proposed property. As such, 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**	

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of air quality is sourced directly from technical documentation prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate air quality include an Air Quality Analysis (Sycamore Environmental Consultants 2008), a Project Lifestyle Management Analysis (EMSL Analytical 2010), a Traffic Analysis Report (Kimley Horn 2018), and a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis (Helix Environmental Planning 2017). These reports are incorporated by reference and appended to this document.

Environmental Setting:

Climate in the El Dorado Hills area is characterized by hot, dry summers and cold, rainy winters. During summer's longer daylight hours, plentiful sunshine provides the energy needed to fuel photochemical reactions between Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_X) and Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG), which result in Ozone (O_3) formation. High concentrations of O_3 are reached in the area due to intense heat, strong and low morning inversions, greatly restricted vertical mixing during the day, and daytime subsidence that strengthens the inversion layer. At this time, the greatest pollution problem in the area is from NO_X.

El Dorado County has two distinct air quality settings, which are recognized as two separate air basins, the Mountain Counties Air Basin and the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District 2002). The project site is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB). The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws in the project area. As required by the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) has published various air quality planning documents as discussed below to address requirements to bring the APCD into compliance with the federal and state ambient air quality standards. The Air Quality Attainment Plans are incorporated into the State Implementation Plan, which is subsequently submitted to the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the federal agency that administrates the Federal Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended in 1990.

Ambient air quality is described in terms of compliance with state and national standards, and the levels of air pollutant concentrations considered safe, to protect the public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect people most sensitive to respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The USEPA has established national ambient air

quality standards (NAAQS) for seven air pollution constituents. As permitted by the Clean Air Act, California has adopted more stringent air emissions standards (CAAQS) and expanded the number of regulated air constituents.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified for any state standard. An "attainment" designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations do not violate the standard for that pollutant in that area. A "nonattainment" designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once.

The project site is in the western portion of El Dorado County which is within the MCAB. Air Quality within the County is monitored and regulated by the El Dorado County AQMD. The status of the MCAB with respect to attainment with Federal and California ambient air quality standards for criteria pollutants are summarized in **Table 3**.

Table 3. Mountain Counties Air Basin Federal and State Air Quality Attainment Status

Pollutant	Average Time	Federal Standards	Federal Attainment Status	California Standards	State Attainment Status
Ozone	1-Hr. 8-Hr.	-- 0.07 ppm	Non-Attainment	0.09 ppm 0.07 ppm	Non-Attainment
Carbon Monoxide	1-Hr. 8-Hr.	35.0 ppm 9.0 ppm	Unclassified/ Attainment	20.0 ppm 9.0 ppm	Unclassified
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual 1-Hr.	0.053 ppm 0.100 ppm	Unclassified/ Attainment	0.030 ppm 0.18 ppm	Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide	1-Hr. 3-Hr. 24-Hr. Annual	75 ppb -- 0.14 ppm 0.03 ppm	Unclassified	0.25 -- 0.04 ppm --	Attainment
PM_{10}	Annual 24-Hr.	-- 150 $\mu g/m^3$	Unclassified	20 $\mu g/m^3$ 50 $\mu g/m^3$	Non-Attainment
$PM_{2.5}$	Annual 24-Hr.	12 $\mu g/m^3$ 35 $\mu g/m^3$	Non-Attainment (Western) Unclassified/Attainment (Eastern)	12 $\mu g/m^3$ –	Unclassified
Lead	30-Day Calendar Quarter	– 1.5 $\mu g/m^3$	Unclassified/ Attainment	1.5 $\mu g /m^3$ –	Attainment

Source: CARB 2017
ppm = parts per million
$\mu g/m^3$ = micrograms per cubic meter
N/A = not available

The MCAB is currently in non-attainment for federal 8-hour ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ standards (western El Dorado County). The MCAB is in non-attainment for state 1-hour and 8-hour ozone and PM_{10} standards. Concentrations of all other pollutants are unclassified or in attainment for state and federal standards.

The El Dorado County AQMD prepared a Guide to Air Quality Assessment (AQMD 2002) which establishes assessment threshold of significance screening criteria which are used for this Initial Study. The guide sets both qualitative and quantitative significance criteria for projects. A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

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

An Air Quality Analysis was prepared for the proposed project in 2008. The air quality analysis evaluated potential air quality impacts resulting from the original development of "The Shops" mixed-use shopping center. Emissions for the construction and operation of the mixed-use shopping center were evaluated. The analysis concluded that the independent and cumulative air quality impacts resulting from the project are less than significant with implementation of the El Dorado County AQMD standards and Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 (Sycamore 2008). In addition, there is a net reduction in the Average Daily Trips (ADT) noted between the previously proposed 2017 project (i.e., two drive-through restaurants) and the currently proposed project (as reflected in the 2018 hybrid traffic impact report) (Kimley Horn 2018).

A Product Lifecycle Management (PLM) Analysis was performed on the project site in 2010 by EMSL Analytical to test for Asbestos on the project site. The PLM Analysis did not discover any Asbestos on site (EMSL Analytical 2010). To ensure the project has little to no impact on toxic air contaminants, the applicant will implement Mitigation Measure AQ-3 or AQ-4.

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 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 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 original submittal of the project which simulated a worst case build out scenario 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 revised project would have one less building and drive-through. The conditions would be implemented, reviewed, and approved by the AQMD prior to and concurrently with any grading, improvement, or building permit approvals. Additionally, the project will implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 to ensure the project does not exceed the fuel usage and diesel fuel usage limits. The site will implement Mitigation Measure AQ-3 or AQ-4 to ensure the project creates little to no impact on toxic air contaminants. With implementation of the mitigations and conditions the project would have a less than significant impact on air quality standards.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project will implement the following mitigation measures to reduce the projects potential significant impacts related to air quality to a less than significant level.

AQ-1. Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (Best Management Practices).

During construction of the project, the construction contractor shall implement the following measures as part of the basic dust control procedures best management practices.

- Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads.
- Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered.
- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. ν
- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes [required by California Code of Regulations, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.
- Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be running in proper condition before it is operated.

AQ-2: Documentation of presence or absence of naturally occurring asbestos

Prior to the issuance of any grading permit the property owner/operator shall submit to the El Dorado County AQMD a report prepared by a California-registered geologist that documents the presence or absence of Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA). If El Dorado County AQMD agrees that NOA is not present on-site then no additional avoidance measures are required. If El Dorado County AQMD agrees that NOA is present on-site then the property owner/operator shall prepare and implement an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall be reviewed and approved by El Dorado County Environmental Management and AQMD prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall include best management practices (BMP) for implementing the asbestos dust control measures identified in the El Dorado County Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control and Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan.

-OR-

AQ-3: Known presence of NOA

If presence of NOA is assumed, then the property owner/operator shall prepare and submit to the El Dorado County Environmental Management and AQMD an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall include BMPs for implementing the asbestos dust control measures identified in the El Dorado County Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control and Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan.

Project construction would comply with all applicable El Dorado County AQMD rules during construction including, but not limited to, Rules 215, 223, 223-1, and 224, which are described below.

- Rule 215 Architectural Coatings; defines the quantities of ROGs permitted for use in new construction.
- Rule 223 Fugitive Dust (General) and Rule 223-1 Fugitive Dust (Construction); 223 limits manmade fugitive dust to the property line of the construction site, and Rule 223-1 requires a Fugitive Dust Control Plan be prepared and submitted to the AQMD prior to ground disturbing activities.
- Rule 224 Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt; defines the types of cutback and emulsified asphalts permitted for use in El Dorado County.

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 requested parcel map would not generate or produce objectionable odors. The projects worst case scenario build out situation was reviewed by the Air Quality Management District and the determination was made the impact would be less than significant.

FINDING: The proposed project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-01, and AQ-02 or AQ-03 the proposed project would not be anticipated to cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts.

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 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Environmental Solutions 2017), a Special-Status Plant Survey (ECORP Consulting 2006) and a letter from the US Army Corps of Engineers (2007). 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

Environmental Solutions conducted a site reconnaissance and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in 2017. The purpose of the assessment was to identify recognized environmental conditions associated with the project site. The assessment included hydrologic conditions and wetlands research. ECORP Consulting conducted a plant inventory for the project site on September 20, 2006. The purpose of the study was to document the presence or absence of special-status plant species.

Project Setting

The subject property is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Park Drive and El Dorado Hills Boulevard. Saratoga Way delimits the subject property to the west, El Dorado Hills Boulevard delimits the subject property to the east, ramps to US Highway 50 delimit the subject property to the south, and an adjacent site delimits the subject property to the north. The adjacent site to the north is occupied by a Walgreens Pharmacy, to the east are commercial and retail developments and to the west are residential developments. The site is vacant with sparse vegetation consisting of primarily annual grasses.

Wetlands

Site reconnaissance and review of the US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Wetlands Inventory online map were conducted by Environmental Solutions on June 21, 2017. These sources indicated that the project site is not in an area mapped as a potential wetlands area and there were no mapped bodies of water indicative of possible wetlands on the property (Environmental Solutions 2017). The Department of the Army sent a letter dated March 30, 2007, regarding the project site. The letter states that the site does not appear to have hydric soils and lacks any apparent interstate or foreign commerce connection and as such the site does not contain any features currently regulated by the Corps of Engineers.

Special-Status Plants

The project site is located in an area defined as a Rare Plant Mitigation Area. ECORP Consulting conducted a special status plant survey for the site on September 20, 2006. 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:** The proposed project represents an urban infill project on a site that has been previously disturbed due to development activities in the area associated with Highway 50 and adjacent roadways. The site has been rough graded and is relatively level with no significant vegetation. The only vegetation onsite consists of annual grassland. No tress exist onsite. There are no natural communities, plant or animal, that exist onsite. A highway, a major road, surrounds the site and a collector road, and as such, human activities would tend to scare sensitive animal species from the site. The site is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2, and the applicant during phase I of the project prepared a special status plant survey (Special-Status Plant Survey for Westside Commercial, El Dorado County, California. ECORP Consulting, Inc. Environmental Consultants, September 20, 2006). This report is available for review in the project file located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA. 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. No impacts to special-status species or sensitive natural communities would occur as a result of this project.

b-c. **Riparian Habitat and Wetlands:** Site reconnaissance and review conducted by Environmental Services confirmed that the site does not contain any riparian or wetland habitat in the proximity of the site that would be impacted by the proposed project. Thus, there would be no impact to riparian or wetland habitat.

d. **Migration Corridors:** Migratory Deer Herd Habitats occur within some areas of El Dorado County. The project site does not include, nor it is 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 major roadways, and residential and commercial development. Wildlife does not generally have access to this area given the project sites urban character, 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 the IBC overlay, 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 project is not located in the IBC. As discussed above in (a), there are no significant biological resources on the project site. There would be no impact.

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. 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 impacts to protected species, habitat, wetlands, or oak trees were identified for this project. For this Biological Resources category, impacts would be less than significant.

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 (2007) and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed by Environmental Solutions (2017). These reports are incorporated by reference and appended to this document.

Regulatory Setting

State and federal legislation requires the protection of historical and cultural resources. In 1971, President's Executive Order No. 11593 required that all federal agencies initiate procedures to preserve and maintain cultural resources by nomination and inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. In 1980, the Governor's Executive Order No. B-64-80 required that state agencies inventory all "significant historic and cultural sites, structures, and objects under their jurisdiction which are over 50 years of age and which may qualify for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." Section 15064.5(b)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that projects that cause "…physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired" shall be found to have a significant impact on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, an historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. When a project could impact a resource, it must be determined whether the resource is an historical resource, which is
defined as a resource that:

(A) is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and,

(B) Meets any of the following criteria: 1) is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage; 2) is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; 3) embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or 4) has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Cultural Background

Following is a brief summary providing a context in which to understand the background and relevance of resources that may occur in the general project area. This section is not intended to be a comprehensive review of the current resources available;

rather, it serves as a general overview. Further details can be found in ethnographic studies, mission records, and major published sources.

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.

Southern Maidu

At the time of European contact, the Southern Maidu tribe of California Native Americans, previously referred to as the Nisenan, occupied the project vicinity. The Southern Maidu occupied the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American rivers and the lower drainages of the Feather River, bounded by the west bank of the Sacramento River to the west, the crest of the Sierra Nevada to the east, a few miles south of the American River to the south. The northern boundary is not well established due to the Southern Maidu's linguistic similarity with neighboring groups but extended somewhere between the Feather and Yuba rivers (Kroeber 1925; Wilson and Towne 1978).

The Southern Maidu constructed villages on natural rises along streams and rivers ranging in size from three to fifty houses. The houses were typically dome or conical shaped and covered with earth, tule mats, or grasses, and major villages contained a semi-subterranean dance house structure covered by earth, tule, and brush (Wilson and Towne 1978). The Southern Maidu subsistence base varied and included gathering seeds and seasonal plant resources, hunting, and fishing. The Southern Maidu were not dependent on one staple, as their territory provided abundant year-round sources of different food. Acorns were a primary food source and were stored in granaries, in addition to buckeye nuts, digger and sugar pine nuts, and hazelnuts. Ethnographic reports indicate the Southern Maidu obtained large game such as deer, antelope, tule elk, mountain lions, and black bears, by game drives, snares, decoys, deadfalls, and bows and arrows. Rabbits and other small game were hunted with sticks, blunted arrows, traps, snares, nets, fire, and rodent hooks.

The Southern Maidu political organization was centered on the tribelet and each village was governed by a headman who served as an advisor and whose position was typically passed on patrilineally, although some chiefs were chosen by the villagers (Beals 1933; Wilson and Towne 1978). Very little contact existed for the Southern Maidu outside of their tribelet area, and outside contact was typically only for ceremonies, trade, and warfare (Beals 1933). Southern Maidu disposed of their dead by cremation and then burial, usually on the morning after the person died. The deceased person's property would be burned and their house moved or destroyed. After the cremation, the bones and ashes would be gathered and buried in the village cemetery. When a death occurred away from the person's village, they would be cremated where they died and their remains returned to their village to be buried (Wilson and Towne 1978).

Historic Background

The history of the northern Central Valley and Sierra Nevada foothills can be divided into several periods of influence; pertinent historic periods are briefly summarized below.

Spanish Period

The arrival and expansion of the Spanish did not have a significant effect on the Southern Maidu way of life, as contact with the Spanish was limited, and only in the southern edge of their territory. Spanish exploration of the greater Southern Maidu territory occurred when José Canizares explored the adjacent Plains Miwok territory in 1776. There is no recorded history of any Southern Maidu being removed and forced into the Spanish Mission system as neophytes, unlike their Miwok neighbors (Wilson and Towne 1978). There are numerous accounts of neophytes fleeing the missions, and a series of "Indian Wars"

broke out when the Spanish tried to return them to the missions (Johnson 1978). The Southern Maidu received some of the escaped mission neophytes and felt pressure on their southern borders from displaced Miwok villages.

Mexican Period

With the declaration of Mexican independence in 1821, Spanish control of Alta California ended, although little change actually occurred. Political change did not take place until mission secularization in 1834, when Native Americans were released from missionary control and the mission lands were granted to private individuals. Shoup and Milliken (1999) state that mission secularization exposed Native Americans to further exploitation by outside interests, often forcing them into a marginal existence as laborers for large ranchos. Following mission secularization, the Mexican population grew as the native population continued to decline. Anglo-American settlers began to arrive in Alta California during this period and often married into Mexican families, becoming Mexican citizens, which made them eligible to receive land grants. In 1846, on the eve of the U.S.-Mexican War (1846 to 1848), the estimated population of Alta California was 8,000 non-natives and 10,000 Native Americans. However, these estimates have been debated. Cook (1976) suggests the Native American population was 100,000 in 1850; the U.S. Census of 1880 reports the Native American population as 20,385.

European Expansion

Jedediah Smith was the first to explore the Central Valley in 1828, but other fur-trapping expeditions soon followed. In the late 1820s, American trappers, as well as ones from the Hudson's Bay Company, began establishing camps in the Southern Maidu territory to trap beavers, an occupation that was said to have been peaceful (Wilson and Towne 1978). During this period, Native American populations were declining rapidly, due to an influx of Euro-American diseases. In 1832, a party of trappers from the Hudson's Bay Company, led by John Work, traveled down the Sacramento River unintentionally spreading a malaria epidemic to Native Californians. This epidemic wiped out much of the Southern Maidu, and survivors moved into the hills. Four years later a smallpox epidemic decimated local populations and it is estimated that up to 75 percent of the Southern Maidu population died (Cook 1955).

After the upheaval of the Bear Flag Revolt in 1846, John Sutter sent James Marshall to construct a sawmill in the Sierra Nevada foothills at Coloma in 1847 (Severson 1973). In January of 1848, Marshall discovered gold near the Southern Maidu village of "Culloma" (Coloma), which marked the start of the Gold Rush. The influx of miners and entrepreneurs increased the population of California, not including Native Californians, from 14,000 to 224,000 in just four years. This, in turn, stimulated commercial growth in the Sacramento Valley as eager entrepreneurs set up businesses to support the miners and mining operations. When the Gold Rush was over, many miners settled in the area and established farms, ranches, and lumber mills.

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 March 21, 2007. 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 several resources located within the general vicinity of the site including, one resource labeled 'Clarkson Village' located approximately 1 mile east of the proposed project site, a residence approximately ½ mile northwest of the site, and historic properties or features between 0.5 to 1 mile from the site (NCIC 2007)

Given the recorded resources and the know patterns of local historic land use, there is low to moderate potential for identifying historic-period, prehistoric or ethnohistoric-period cultural resources in the *El Dorado Hills Shopping Center* project area.

CEQA Checklist Questions

a. **Historic or Archeological Resources.** Review of records, maps and literature at the North Central Information Center indicate no historic resource on the project site. However, there is the possibility that previously unknown historic resources exist below the ground surface. Therefore, implementation of standard cultural resource constructing mitigation (Mitigation Measure CUL-1) would ensure that this impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Avoid and minimize impacts to previously unknown historic resources

It is possible that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown, buried historic resources. In the event that buried historic resources are discovered during construction, construction operations shall stop within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The project applicant shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The archaeologist shall make recommendations concerning appropriate measures that will be implemented to protect the resources, including but not limited to excavation and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Historic resources could consist of, but are not limited to, stone, wood, or shell artifacts, structural remains, privies, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.

b. **Pre-Historic Resources.** As discussed in (a.), a cultural resources records search was prepared for the property. No prehistoric resources have been identified near the project site, nor are any expected to exist onsite. The NCIC concluded that given the environmental setting there is low to moderate potential for pre-historic or ethnohistoric-period Native American sites in the project area. In addition, as discussed above, there has been significant previous disturbance to the site due to the construction of US Highway 50 and the Saratoga Way. This disturbance has resulted in rough grading of the site that would have removed any cultural materials. However, there is the possibility that subsurface excavation activities may encounter previously undiscovered archaeological resources. The implementation of standard cultural resource construction mitigation (Mitigation Measure CUL-2) would ensure that this impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Avoid and minimize impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources

It is possible that ground-disturbing activities during project development may uncover previously unknown archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources are discovered during construction, construction operations shall stop within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The project applicant shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The archaeologist shall make recommendations concerning appropriate measures that would be implemented to protect the resources, including but not limited to, excavation and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Archaeological resources could consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.

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. However, if significant paleontological resources are discovered, implementation of mitigation measure CUL-1 will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

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 are discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CUL-03: Avoid and minimize impacts related to accidental discovery of human remains.

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5; Health and Safety Code § 7050.5; Public Resources Code § 5097.94 and § 5097.98 must be followed. If during the course of project development there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken:

1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance within a 100-foot radius of the potentially human remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the "most likely descendant" (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work within 48 hours, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains, and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98.

2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the most likely descendant or on the project site in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:
    - The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission.
    - The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation.
    - The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

FINDING: No significant cultural resources have been identified on the project site. The site has been previously disturbed, it is determined that there are no significant historic or pre-historic resources on the subject property that would be affected by the project. Standard conditions of approval would apply in the event of accidental discovery during any future construction. This project would be anticipated to have a less than significant impact with mitigations CUL-1, CUL-2 and CUL-3 within the Cultural Resources category. 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 El Dorado County (DOC, 2007). The nearest such faults are located in Alpine and Butte Counties. 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. 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.

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**	

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of greenhouse gas emissions is taken directly from technical documents prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate greenhouse gases include an Air Quality Analysis (Sycamore Environmental Consultants 2008), a Project Lifestyle Management Analysis (EMSL Analytical 2010), a Traffic Analysis Report and Supplement (Kimley Horn 2018), and a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis (Helix Environmental Planning 2017). These reports are incorporated by reference and appended to this document.

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

Helix Environmental Planning, Inc. prepared an Air Quality Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis dated October 26, 2017 for the previous proposed project, which included one additional building and an additional drive-thru restaurant. The revised project would eliminate one building and eliminate one drive-thru restaurant, and would therefore emit less GHG emissions. The revised project is a reduced iteration, therefore there is no need for a new Air Quality Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis and the analysis prepared October 26, 2017 is suitable for use with the smaller, revised project.

Construction Assumptions

Construction sources of GHG emissions include heavy construction equipment, worker vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and water use. Emissions are assessed using the CalEEMod Version 2016.3.1.

Operation Assumptions

Operational impacts were estimated using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.1. Operation emissions were estimated for both the existing entitlement (DR08-0003) and the previously proposed project, which included an additional building and drive-thru. Operational emission sources included energy use (electricity and natural gas); area sources (landscaping equipment); mobile sources; solid waste generation; and water conveyance and treatment. The emissions from mobile sources associated with the project were calculated based on the trip rates provided in the Saratoga Retail Phase 2 Transportation Impact Study (TIS) (Kimley Horn 2018), CalEEMod default trip lengths, and emission factors from EMFAC2014. Solid waste generation requires treatment and disposal of solid waste which produces emissions of methane. Water-related GHG emissions are from the conveyance and treatment of water.

The project would be required to comply with the 2016 Title 24 Energy Code; the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen); the Assembly Bill (AB) 341 solid waste diversion target of 75 percent; reduction of potable water use by 20 percent when compared to the statewide average; low-flow water and bathroom fixtures; reduction of wastewater generation by 20 percent; weather-based irrigation systems; provide areas for storage and collection of recyclables and yard waste.

Findings

The analysis included the project's potential GHG emissions (Attachment 1). The study used California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) found the net operational emissions total 626 $MTCO_2E$ and concluded that such emissions are less than significant and mitigation is unwarranted.

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDCAQMD) reviewed the applicant's Air Quality Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis and concurs with its findings and conclusions.

Conclusion

Short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHG and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of the proposed project. Construction emissions have been included with the operational emissions in order to present a worst-case scenario. The proposed project is incorporating various features and mitigation measures identified above that would reduce the project's annual operational GHG emissions by at least **626** MTCO2e/yr. These features and mitigation measures are consistent with those suggested by the Office of the Attorney General and CAPCOA. Therefore, the proposed project's GHG emissions would be less than significant.

CEQA Checklist

a. **Generate greenhouse gas emission:** Based on the findings of the Air Quality Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis prepared by HELIX environmental Planning on October 26, 2017 the projects net operational emissions total will be 626 $MTCO_2E$. These emission levels meet the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) standards, therefore the project will result in a less than significant impact to greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation is unnecessary.

b. **Conflict with applicable plan, policy or regulation:** The County of El Dorado has not developed a climate action plan for GHG emission reduction. However, in 2008, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the Resolution No. 29- 2008, *Environmental Vision for El Dorado County* (Vision), which proposes implementation of goals addressing positive environmental changes. The goals include, but are not limited to, improving air quality, reducing landfill dependence, increasing renewable energy and recycling and encouraging sustainable practices throughout local governments (EDC 2008). The Vision includes goals on; transportation, traffic and transit; planning and construction; waste; energy; air quality; water quality; education, outreach and awareness; and agriculture.

Project construction emissions would be temporary and result in substantially less emissions than the Bright-line Threshold, as displayed in Table 3. Project operation would not exceed the *De Minimis* Threshold, as depicted in Table 5. Therefore, project operation would be consistent with the Vision adopted by El Dorado. The project would promote energy efficiency by complying with 2016 Title 24 energy requirements. The project would implement water conservation strategies to reduce indoor and outdoor water use by 20% (compliance with CALGreen Standards) and would reduce solid waste generation by 75% to be consistent with AB 341. With the incorporation of these measures the project would be consistent with the Vision's goals to promote energy efficiency, reduce waste and increase recycling. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation and would result in 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**

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of Hazards and Hazardous Materials is derived from technical documents prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate Hazards and Hazardous Materials include a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Environmental Solutions 2017), a Project Lifecycle Management Analysis (EMSL Analytical 2010), and a Geotechnical Engineering Report and Geotechnical Engineering Report Update (Wallace Kuhl and Associates 2008).

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 may involve transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as construction materials, paints, fuels, landscaping materials, and building cleaning supplies. The majority of the use of these hazardous materials would occur primarily during construction. 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. Prior to any use of hazardous materials, the project would be required to obtain a Hazardous Materials Business Plan through the Environmental Management - Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Division of EI Dorado County. If the commercial facilities will store reportable quantities of hazardous materials (55 gallons) or generate hazardous waste, prior to commencing operations the owner/operator must obtain a Hazardous Materials Business Plan through the Environmental Management - Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Division of EDC. The project includes COAs from the Division that require a Hazardous Materials Business Plan, obtaining a hazardous waste generator identification number from the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, training all employees to properly handle hazardous materials and wastes, and implementing proper hazardous materials and hazardous waste storage methods, if applicable, to insure the project follows proper procedures for any materials considered to be hazardous. The site is not located in an area of naturally occurring asbestos (El Dorado County, 2005). 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. Kinder Care Learning Center is located within 0.15 miles of the project site; however, the proposed project would not include any operation that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. Additionally, according to an analysis prepared by EMSL Analytical Inc, no naturally occurring asbestos has been detected on-site. There would be no impact.

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 EDC Zoning Map, the project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. The project is not located in the vicinity of 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 Hills Fire Department. 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 is a commercial infill project located within an urban area that has adequate infrastructure in terms of fire hydrants, fire flow, and roadways. The project site is located within a moderate fire

hazard area, which would not generally be subjected to wildland fires as it is surrounded by existing development and roadways. The project will be required to meet all requirements of the El Dorado Hills Fire Department. The project will incorporate measures specified in the County Fire Hazard Ordinance, which includes riles and regulations covering emergency access, signing, numbering, and emergency water, fire hazard impacts are considered to 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 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 site hydrology.

ES reviewed subsurface data from investigations on a nearby site. The former Wetsel- Oviatt Sawmill was located approximately 3.3-miles south of the subject property. In a report dated October 30, 2008 by AMEC Geomatrix, Inc. entitled "*Third Quarter 2008 Groundwater Monitoring Report"* groundwater was reported to be at a depth of approximately 5.10 to 13.40 feet below ground surface (bgs).

Shallow groundwater generally flows in directions subparallel to the ground surface slopes and under the influence of gravity toward points of discharge such as creeks, swamps, drainage swales, or pumped groundwater wells. Based upon review of the topographic map, the presumed groundwater flow direction in the uppermost water bearing unit across the subject property would be to the east, towards and unnamed creek located approximately 0.17-miles east of the subject property. East is only the presumed groundwater flow direction and only physical testing can accurately state the true groundwater flow direction (Environmental Solutions 2017). The following analysis is based off of the site assessment conducted by Environmental Solutions.

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:** The project proposes to construct commercial/retail buildings. Commercial/retail uses would not directly discharge any wastewater or other effluent into streams. Wastewater generated by future land uses would be collected by EID's Wastewater Treatment Plant. Wastewater from the project site would be treated and discharged in accordance with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) waste discharge requirements. The impact is less than significant.

b. **Groundwater Supplies:** There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project as soil types on the project site are not generally conducive to groundwater recharge (volcanic bedrock), and the site represents a relatively small are in terms of recharge capability. The project is required to connect to the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) water line (see Utility and Services Systems category). There would be no draw from groundwater sources in the area with the approval of this project and impacts in this category would be less than significant.

c-f. **Drainage Patterns:** The proposed project would not significantly alter or change any existing on site or off site drainage patterns. Currently drainage from the site, in the form of sheet flow, would flow to surrounding streets and drainage ditches. These patterns will remain post project, as all drainage from the site would be channeled to existing drainage infrastructure through the proposed storm drain system as shown on preliminary grading and drainage plans. Impacts in this category would be less than significant.

The project would require coverage under the Regional Water Quality Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. Construction activities subject to this permit include clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Section A of the

Construction General Permit describes the elements that must be contained in a SWPPP including, site map(s), Best Management Practices (BMPs), a visual and chemical monitoring program; and a sediment monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the CWA Section 303(d) list for sediment. Implementation of an approved SWPPP would reduce the potential for impact to 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 require an encroachment permit through the EDCTD and site improvement and grading permit through Building Services Division that would address 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 project is proposed on property designated by the County's General Plan as commercial and all impacts associated with commercial projects at this location have been considered in the General Plan EIR (available for review at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667), therefore, there would be no impact to an established community.

b. **Land Use Consistency:** The parcel is zoned Community Commercial with a Design Community (CC-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 commercial districts. The project is a commercial infill project on commercially designated and zoned property. The project is consistent with the General Plan; therefore, there would be no impact.

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). Approximately 8.19 miles to the northeast from the proposed project are MRZ-2-classified areas, and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. There are no current mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect existing uses. 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**

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of noise is derived directly from technical documents prepared for the proposed project. The technical documents used to evaluate Noise include a Traffic Analysis Report and Supplement (Kimley Horn 2018) and a Noise Analysis (Helix Environmental Planning 2017).

Setting

The proposed project is located on a 0.75-acre site bounded by Saratoga Way to the west, El Dorado Hills Boulevard to the east, and the on-ramp for US Highway 50 to the south. An estimated 13,368 square foot Walgreens exists to the north of the site, residential land uses exist to the west of the site across Saratoga Way, and an approximate 90,000 square foot shopping center is located east of the site across El Dorado Hills Boulevard. The site is currently vacant with no above-ground structures. The predominant existing noise sources near the proposed project area are generally from El Dorado Hills Boulevard and the US Highway 50 on-ramp.

Noise-sensitive land uses (NSLU) are land uses that may be subject to stress and/or interference from excessive noise, including residences, hospitals, schools, hotels, resorts, libraries, sensitive wildlife habitat, or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute of the environment. Noise receptors are individual locations that may be affected by noise. NSLUs in the project vicinity include multi-family residences to the west across Saratoga Way, with the nearest residences approximately 100 feet west of the project boundary.

The main source of noise for the project would originate from the drive-thru proposed for Building B. The drive-thru would be located on the southeast corner of the building, adjacent to the US Highway 50 west bound on-ramp and El Dorado Hills Boulevard. The drive-thru speaker box would be located on the southern portion of the site facing US Highway 50. The speaker box was strategically located facing US Highway 50, because the highway is a substantial source of noise in the area

and would stifle the negligible noise produced by the speaker box. The remaining noise produced from the drive-thru would emit towards a busy, five (5) lane portion of El Dorado Boulevard. Other sources of noise from the site would originate from the two buildings on site and the parking for those buildings. As mentioned above, Building 3 is in the southeast corner of the site adjacent to US Highway 50 and El Dorado Boulevard. The two busy streets would muffle noise produced from the building to a negligible level. Building 2A would be designed to face El Dorado Boulevard with its main entrance on the east side of the building. The pedestrian traffic into and out of the building and its subsequent noise would be directed towards the east away from the residences to the west. Building 2A would additionally provide a buffer between the parking lot and residences.

Noise Assessment

An Environmental Noise Assessment was prepared for the project on August 31, 2017 (Helix Environmental Planning 2017). This noise assessment was prepared for a previous iteration of the project, which included an additional building and one additional drive-thru. The revised project is a reduced iteration of the previous proposed project, therefore there is no need for a new Noise Assessment and the previously prepared noise assessment will be used as a conservative measurement.

Modeling of the exterior noise environment for this report was accomplished using Computer Aided Noise Abatement (CadnaA) version 2017 and Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5. CadnaA is a model-based computer program developed by *DataKustik* for predicting noise impacts in a wide variety of conditions. CadnaA assists in the calculation, presentation, assessment, and mitigation of noise exposure. It allows for the input of project-related information, such as noise source data, barriers, structures, and topography to create a detailed model for the prediction of outdoor noise impacts.

The TNM was released in February 2004 by the US Department of Transportation (USDOT), and calculates the daytime average hourly LEQ from three-dimensional model inputs and traffic data (Caltrans 2004).

For traffic noise, the one-hour LEQ noise level is calculated utilizing peak-hour traffic; peak-hour traffic volumes can be estimated based on the assumption that 10 percent of the average daily traffic would occur during a peak hour. The model-calculated one-hour LEQ noise output is the equivalent to the CNEL (Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement, November 2009).

Nosie Standards

Table 6-1 of the County General Plan regulates the maximum allowable noise exposure from transportation noise sources to existing land uses. These noise standards include a maximum of 45 dBA LEQ worst-case hour for residential interior spaces and 60 dBA CNEL for residential outdoor activity areas.

Table 6-2 of the General Plan regulates standards for operational noise exposure limits for NSLUs, not including transportation noise sources. These standards are depicted in **Table 4**, *Noise Level Performance Protection Standards for Noise Sensitive Land Uses Affected by Non-Transportation Sources*.

The drive-through order window proposed for building 3 would likely be in operation during nighttime hours (past 10 p.m.). Therefore, the drive-through speaker noise must be below the County's lowest limit of 40 dBA LEQ during nighttime hours.

As stated in the General Plan, construction occurring between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays, and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on weekends, and federally recognized holidays is exempt from the noise standards outlined in the County General Plan.

Table 4 Noise Level Performance Protection Standards for Noise Sensitive Land Uses Affected by Non-Transportation Sources[1]

Noise Level Descriptor	Daytime (7 a.m. to 7 p.m.)		Evening (7 p.m. to 10 p.m.)		Night (10 p.m. to 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

Source: El Dorado County General Plan, Noise Element, Table 6-2.
Each of the noise levels specified above shall be lowered by 5 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 approximately 100 feet 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.

[1] 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 uses, etc.

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.

CEQA Checklist

a. **Noise Exposures:** An Environmental Noise Assessment dated August 31, 2017 (Attachment 2: Helix 2017) was submitted for the previous iteration of the project. The noise analysis evaluated project-related noises and determined that the operations of the project's HVAC units, drive-through speaker and project traffic to nearby Saratoga Way would not generate noise levels above County Standards.

b. **Groundborne Shaking:** The project may generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction, however, those impacts are temporary and would be confined to standard construction hour limitation, as described in d) below. The nearest sensitive land use to groundborne vibrations or noise are the residences west of the project site across Saratoga Way, which are approximately 100 feet away or more. It is unlikely that residences would experience groundborne vibrations or noise impacts at that distance. The impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Permanent Noise Increases:** The project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, due mainly to vehicle traffic generated by the proposed commercial development; however, this development would occur in an area of substantial commercial development, adjacent to busy roadways (El Dorado Hills Boulevard and

US Highway 50). The noise levels the project would generate would not be greater than those generated by the shopping center to the east and by traffic on Saratoga Way, El Dorado Hills Boulevard, and Highway 50. The contribution of the project to noise levels would be relatively minor.

The Environmental Noise Assessment (Helix Environmental Planning 2017) analyzed the existing ambient noise environment in the project vicinity and defined it as primarily created by traffic noise emanating from Saratoga Way. The Environmental Noise Assessment utilized trip generation and distribution from the Transportation Impact Study. Noise levels generated by existing traffic on Saratoga Way, the nearest roadway to the affected Noise Sensitive Land Uses (NSLU), are approximately 45 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). Although traffic noise for nearby NSLUs would increase perceptibly, noise levels would remain below the General Plan Noise Element standards of 60 dBA CNEL for residential exterior use areas. Impacts would be less than significant.

The noise generated from the speaker box for the proposed drive-through restaurant (Building 3) is directed south toward the onramp to US Highway 50 at approximately 280 feet east from nearby NSLUs, noise levels were determined to be less than significant.

Analysis using a typical rooftop commercial HVAC unit was analyzed for the project buildings. The unit used in this analysis is a Carrier Centurion Model 50 PG03-12 with a sound rating of 80 dBA sound power. This unit produces noise levels of 45 dBA LEQ at 50 feet, which would be reduced by at least 5 dBA by standard parapet walls installed on a building's roofline. A single 10-ton HVAC unit is commonly required for every 350 square feet of habitable space (ASHRAE Handbook 2012). Using this calculation, two units for the Chick-fil-A restaurant (Building 3), and two units for the retail building (Building 2A) would be required. Based on the site plan, the closest NSLU to the project is approximately 120 feet from the retail building's single HVAC unit. A single unit mounted on a rooftop with a standard parapet would emit a noise level of 40 dBA LEQ at 50 feet. Noise levels at the nearest NSLU would therefore be less than the County's 45 dBA LEQ nighttime limit for non-transportation noise sources. The impact 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 air strip. 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 project may induce some population growth in the area directly by proposing commercial development that would generate employment. However, potential employees would most likely come from the community of El Dorado Hills and 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 will not displace any existing housing. 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 commercial land use was considered in the 2004 General Plan and would be considered an infill project. 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 Hills Fire Department provides structural fire protection services to the project area. They did not respond with any concerns that the project would significantly affect their ability to provide adequate fire protection. 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 COAs regarding adequate fire flow, vegetation and fuel modification, and sprinkler and fire alarm requirements prior to issuance of final occupancy for a building permit. Upon fulfillment of the conditions of approval, 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 El Dorado Hills Satellite Sheriff Station is located at 981 Governors Drive approximately 2.2 miles north of the project site. The development of commercial square footage on the project site may result in a small increase in calls for service but would not significantly impact 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, this impact would be considered less than significant.

c-e. **Schools:** School services in the El Dorado Hills area are provided by the Buckeye Union Elementary School District and the El Dorado Union High School District. The proposed project is a commercial, 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 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 as a result 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 project 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**

Data Source/Methodology

The following analysis of traffic and transportation is based off of a Transportation Impact Study and a Supplemental Traffic Analysis Report prepared for the proposed project (Kimley Horn 2018).

Setting

The project site is undeveloped but located in an area with commercial and residential development. The site is adjacent to El Dorado Hills Boulevard to the east, Saratoga Way to the west, and the US Highway 50 on-ramp to the south. Access to the site is provided at the existing main site driveway intersection with Saratoga Way. Two additional driveways will serve the site; one full access driveway south of the main site driveway, and one egress-only driveway at the south end of the project site.

Parking

Pursuant to the El Dorado County ordinance code, the project is required to provide 35 parking spaces and one RV Spaces. The proposed project will exceed the parking requirement and provide a total of 63 parking spaces. The project will include 53 standard parking spaces, three (3) compact spaces, four (4) handicap accessible spaces, two (2) RV parking spaces, and 1 loading space. Of the 53 standard spaces, six (6) spaces will be for fuel efficient vehicles, four (4) spaces will be electric vehicle charging capable and one space will be electrical van charging capable. In addition, the project would include 13 bicycle parking racks.

Roadway System

The following are descriptions of the primary roadways in the vicinity of the project.

US Route 50 (US-50) is an east-west freeway located south of the project area. Generally, US-50 serves all of El Dorado County's major population centers and provides connections to Sacramento County to the west and the State of Nevada to the east. Primary access to the project area from US Highway 50 is provided at the El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road interchange. Within the general project area, US Highway 50 currently serves approximately 98,000 vehicles per day (vpd) west of El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road.

Latrobe Road is a north-south arterial roadway that provides a primary connection to US Highway 50 for western El Dorado County. North of US Highway 50, Latrobe Road becomes El Dorado Hills Boulevard. This roadway carries approximately 28,750 vpd also with three travel lanes in each direction.

El Dorado Hills Boulevard is a north-south arterial roadway that provides a primary connection to US-50 for western El Dorado County. South of US Highway 50, El Dorado Hills Boulevard becomes Latrobe Road. This roadway carries approximately 27,200 vpd with three through lanes in each direction.

Saratoga Way is currently a two-lane roadway which parallels the north side of US Highway 50 and terminates approximately 2,500-feet east of the El Dorado County/Sacramento County line. This roadway has long been planned as a four-lane divided facility (to be initially constructed as a two-lane roadway) providing vital connectivity between El Dorado Hills and Folsom, north of US Highway 50. Saratoga Way currently serves approximately 1,500 vpd just west of El Dorado Hills Boulevard.

Airports

No private or public airports are located within the El Dorado Hills area. The nearest public use airport is Cameron Airpark, located approximately 5-miles east of the project site. Cameron Airpark is not a commercial service airport.

Emergency Access

El Dorado County identifies most major streets in the county as emergency evacuation routes. No aspect of the proposed project would modify these streets in a way that would preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. The minimum width available for driving or turning movements through the parking lot is 25-feet, to provide sufficient access for fire trucks.

Traffic Assessment

A Transportation Impact Study was prepared for a previous proposal of the Saratoga Retail Phase 2 project on May 3, 2017 by Kimley Horn. The previous iteration of the project included an additional drive-through restaurant, subsequently the report will provide a conservative analyses with a worst-case scenario projection. The purpose of this study is to identify potential environmental impacts to transportation facilities as required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

A supplemental transportation impact analysis was completed for Saratoga Retail Phase 2 by Kimley Horn on July 12, 2018. The study is supplemental to the previously completed traffic impact analysis mentioned above. The purpose of this evaluation was to complete a Near-Term (2026) analysis to provide an interim-year snapshot of the worst-case conditions. Conservatively, this analysis assumes the existing geometries for the study intersections, along with traffic volume growth expected by 2026. The Near-Term (2026) volumes were approximated using straight-line growth interpolation between Existing (2017) and Cumulative (2035) volumes per the original traffic study.

Trip Generation

Kimley-Horn completed a trip generation study in a manner consistent with the methodology contained in the *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). In addition, unique local trip

generation rate (trips per thousand square feet) were developed using data collected at the following three Chick-Fil-A locations with drive through facilities:

1. 2679 East Bidwell Street, Folsom, CA
2. 4644 Madison Avenue, Sacramento, CA
3. 2354 Sunrise Boulevard, Rancho Cordova, CA

The local trip generation data was collected on April 17, 2018, between the hours of 6:00 A.M. and 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 P.M. The trip generation data is included in Attachment 3. The calculated trip generation rates for the proposed project are presented in **Table 5**.

Table 5 -- Trip Generation Data

Existing Chick-fil-A Location	Building Floor Area (KSF)	Generation Rate	
		AM	PM
2354 Sunrise Blvd, Rancho Cordova	4.86	11.9	26.8
4644 Madison Ave, Sacramento	4.67	13.3	34.4
2679 E Bidwell Street, Folsom	4.48	18.4	54.6
Average		14.5	38.6

Source: Kimley Horn, Transportation Impact Analysis 2018.

The anticipated trip generation characteristics for the proposed project are presented in **Table 6**. As only A.M. and P.M. trip generation data was collected, ITE code 934 (Fast Food Restaurant with Drive Through) was used to approximate the daily trips generated by the restaurant use.

Table 6: Proposed Project Trip Generation Characteristics

Land Use (ITE Code)	Size (ksf)	Daily Trips	AM Peak-Hour					PM Peak-Hour				
			Total Trips	In		Out		Total Trips	In		Out	
				%	Trips	%	Trips		%	Trips	%	Trips
Chick-fil-A	4,658	2,312	68	53%	36	47%	32	180	64%	115	36%	65
Shopping Center (820)	5.5	1,032	27	62%	16	38%	11	86	48%	41	52%	45
Subtotal Trips:		3,344	95		52		43	266		156		110
Internal Trip Reduction	5%	-167	-5		-3		-2	-13		-8		-5
Net New Driveway Trips		3,177	90		49		40	253		148		104
Pass-By/Diverted Trip Reduction	15%	-477	-13		-7		-6	-38		-22		-16
Net New External Trips:		2,700	76		42		34	215		126		89

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, ITE.

As shown in table 6, the proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 2,700 new daily trips, with 76 and 215 trips occurring during the A.M. and P.M. peak-hours, respectively.

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.

Existing (2017) Plus Proposed Project

Kimley Horns 2017 Transportation Impact Study analyzed the existing conditions (2017) of intersections, roadways and freeway facilities in the vicinity of the project and the existing conditions plus the proposed project. **Table 7** presents the existing intersection operating conditions and the existing conditions with the proposed project included.

Table 7: Existing (2017) plus Proposed Project Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Existing (2017)		Existing (2017) plus Proposed Project	
			Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way/Park Dr	Signal	AM	12.9	B	26.4	C
		PM	22.6	C	38.5	D
El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 WB Ramps/ Park Dr	Signal	AM	30.9	C	29.7	C
		PM	44.2	D	52.5	D
Latrobe Rd @ US-50 EB Ramps	Signal	AM	14.5	B	14.9	B
		PM	13.7	B	14.1	B
Latrobe Rd @ Town Center Blvd	Signal	AM	16.3	B	17.9	B
		PM	48.3	D	49.2	D
Latrobe Rd @ White Rock Rd	Signal	AM	33.2	C	34.4	C
		PM	33.4	C	33.3	C
White Rock Rd @ Windfield Wy/ Town Center Blvd	Signal	AM	11.9	B	11.9	B
		PM	13.9	B	13.9	B
White Rock Rd @ Post St	Signal	AM	23.5	C	23.9	C

		PM	43.7	D	44.6	D
Saratoga Wy @ Mammouth Wy/ Walgreens Dwy	SSSC	AM	10.6	B	18.8	C
		PM	11.1	B	15.8	C
Saratoga Wy @ Main Project Site Dwy	SSSC	AM	8.6	A	9.4	A
		PM	8.8	A	9.6	A
Saratoga Wy @ Arrowhead Dr	SSSC	AM	9	A	9	A
		PM	9	A	9.1	A

Source: Kimley Horn 2017
Notes: Side Street Stop Controlled (SSSC) intersection LOS corresponds to the worst approach.

As reflected in table 7 above, the addition of the proposed project to the existing (2017) conditions does not result in any significant impacts to intersections. The Transportation Impact Study prepared by Kimley Horn in 2017 states that the addition of the proposed project to the existing conditions does not result in any significant impacts to roadway segments and freeway facilities (Kimley Horn 2017).

Cumulative (2035) Plus Proposed Project Conditions

The number of trips estimated to be generated by the proposed project were determined using the ITE *Trip Generation Manual* and were then assigned to the roadway network based on existing traffic volumes, output from the County's travel demand model, and professional judgment. Using these volumes, levels of service were determined at the study facilities. Cumulative (2035) plus Proposed Project peak-hour turn movement volumes are presented in Figure 13 of Attachment 7.

Table 8: Cumulative (2035) plus Proposed Project Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Cumulative (2035)		Cumulative (2035) Plus Proposed Project	
			Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way/Park Dr	Signal	AM	57.6	E	**89.3**	**F**
		PM	72.8	E	77.2	E
El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 WB Ramps/ Park Dr	Signal	AM	47.7	D	53.2	D
		PM	59.3	E	61.3	E
Latrobe Rd @ US-50 EB Ramps	Signal	AM	12.6	B	12	B
		PM	13.4	B	13.1	B
Latrobe Rd @ Town Center Blvd	Signal	AM	22.8	C	22.7	C
		PM	75.3	E	74.7	E
Latrobe Rd @ White Rock Rd	Signal	AM	55.4	E	53.2	D
		PM	68.2	E	66.4	E
White Rock Rd @ Windfield Wy/ Town Center Blvd	Signal	AM	30.5	C	30.9	C
		PM	40.8	D	41.3	D
White Rock Rd @ Post St	Signal	AM	72.5	E	78.7	E
		PM	78.7	E	58	E
Saratoga Wy @ Mammouth Wy/ Walgreens Dwy	SSSC	AM	11	B	11.8	B
		PM	13.6	B	14.6	B
Saratoga Wy @ Main Project Site Dwy	SSSC	AM	10.7	B	15.2	C
		PM	20.5	C	24	C
Saratoga Wy @	SSSC	AM	30.7	D	32.8	D

Arrowhead Dr		PM	35.2	E	37.8	E

Bold represents unacceptable operations. Shaded represents significant impact.
Side Street Stop Controlled (SSSC) intersection LOS corresponds to the worst approach.

Near-Term (2026) Levels of Service

Kimley Horn prepared a Supplemental Analysis that examined Near-Term (2026) analysis. **Table 10** lists the Intersection level of service listed in the analysis.

Table 9: Near-Term (2026) Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Near-Term (2026)		Near-Term (2026) plus Proposed Project	
			Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way/ Park Dr	Signal	AM	33.2	C	36.9	D
		PM	70.4	E	**92.7**	**F**
El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 WB Ramps/ Park Dr	Signal	AM	33.1	C	33.7	C
		PM	58	E	61.7	E
Latrobe Rd @ US-50 EB Ramps	Signal	AM	15.4	B	15.1	B
		PM	12	B	12.2	B
Latrobe Rd @ Town Center Blvd	Signal	AM	22.6	C	21.4	C
		PM	84.6	F	**82.5**	**F**
Latrobe Rd @ White Rock Rd	Signal	AM	57.4	E	57.6	E
		PM	66	E	65.3	E
White Rock Rd @ Windfield Wy/ Town Center Blvd	Signal	AM	19.7	B	19.7	B
		PM	23.6	C	23.7	C
White Rock Rd @ Post St	Signal	AM	84.6	F	92.4	F
		PM	51.5	D	50.7	D
Saratoga Wy @ Mammouth Wy/ Walgreens Dwy	SSSC	AM	2.1 (13.4 EB)	B	2.0 (15.0 EB)	C
		PM	3.2 (20.6 EB)	C	4.0 (35.8)	E
Saratoga Wy @ Main Project Site Dwy	SSSC	AM	0.4 (9.1 WB)	A	1.1 (9.4 WB)	A
		PM	0.9 (13.6 WB)	B	2.2 (19.1 WB)	C
Saratoga Wy @ Arrowhead Dr	SSSC	AM	0.5 (10.9 EB)	B	0.5 (10.9 EB)	B
		PM	0.4 (12.4 EB)	B	0.4 (12.5)	B

Source: Kimley Horn 2018
Notes: **Bold** represents unacceptable conditions.

The supplemental traffic analysis states that the Near-Term (2026) plus proposed project conditions will not have a significant impact on roadway segments or freeway facilities.
As reflected in the Kimley Horn Traffic Analysis and Transportation Study (Attachment 7) the proposed project will create a significant impact at the following intersections:

- El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Saratoga Way/Park Drive
- Latrobe Road and Town Center Boulevard

Table 11: Intersection Levels of Service Near-Term (2026) Plus Proposed Project Mitigated Conditions

ID	Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Near-Term (2026)		Near-Term (2026) plus Proposed Project		Near-Term (2026) plus Proposed Project Mitigations	
				Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
1	El Dorado Hills Blvd@ Saratoga Way/Park Dr	Signal	AM	33.2	C	36.9	D	37.2	D
			PM	70.4	E	92.7	F	46.5	D
2	El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 WB Ramps/Park	Signal	AM	33.1	C	33.7	C	35.6	D
			PM	58.0	E	61.7	E	49.3	D
3	Latrobe Rd @ US-50 EB Ramps	Signal	AM	15.4	B	15.1	B	14.9	B
			PM	12.0	B	12.2	B	13.4	B
4	Latrobe Rd @ Town Center Blvd	Signal	AM	22.6	C	21.4	C	20.1	C
			PM	84.6	F	82.5	F	66.4	E
5	Latrobe Rd @ White Rock Rd	Signal	AM	57.4	E	57.6	E	56.5	E
			PM	66.0	E	65.3	E	76.6	E
7	White Rock Rd @ Post St	Signal	AM	86.4	F	92.4	F	93.1	F
			PM	51.5	D	50.7	D	60.7	E

Source: Kimley Horn 2018.

CEQA Checklist

a,b. **Traffic Increases:** This project is located on the northwest corner of the US Highway 50 interchange with El Dorado Hills Boulevard and southwest corner of El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Saratoga Way, in El Dorado Hills. The project seeks to encroach onto Saratoga Way, a County maintained road. The Traffic Study prepared by Kimley Horn established and analyzed existing and future traffic conditions based on additional traffic generated by the proposed development of the Saratoga Retail project. Results of this study are incorporated by reference to this document and are on file with El Dorado County Planning Services, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. The report was circulated to the El Dorado County Department of Transportation and Long Range Planning Division of Community Development Services. Both agencies concurred with the findings of the report.

Access to the site is provided at the existing main site driveway intersection with Saratoga Way. Two additional driveways will serve the site; one full access driveway south of the main site driveway, and one egress-only driveway at the south end of the project site. These driveway will distribute traffic onto area roadways as described in the traffic study.

Based on the County's requirements, six different scenarios were analyzed for the traffic study. These scenarios included:

1. Existing (2017) Conditions
2. Existing (2017) plus Proposed Project Conditions
3. Cumulative (2035) Conditions
4. Cumulative (2035) plus Proposed Project Conditions
5. Near-Term (2026) Conditions
6. Near-Term (2026) plus Proposed Project Conditions

The study found that the project would be expected to generate approximately 2,700 new daily trips, with 76 new trips occurring during the AM peak-hour, and 215 new trips occurring during the PM peak-hour based on trip generation rates contained in the *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition,* published by the Institute of Transportation

Engineers (ITE). The traffic study identified two intersections that the proposed project could create a significant impact on, however with implementation of mitigation measures M1 and M2 (listed above) the impact would be decreased to a less than significant level.

For all other discretionary projects that worsen (Defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C] traffic on the County road system, the County shall condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element. All 2004 General Plan Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees for all projects shall be paid at the building permit stage. (Press Release August 8, 2017, Measure E updates)

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project would implement the following mitigation measures to reduce the projects potential significant impacts related to traffic and transportation to a level less than significant impact.

M1. Intersection #1, El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way/Park Drive

This intersection operates at acceptable LOS E during the PM peak-hour without the project, and the project results in LOS F. Consistent with the findings of the previous Saratoga Retail Phase 2 Cumulative (2035) Conditions analysis [1], the impacts at this intersection can be mitigated by off-site improvements including optimization of the Latrobe Road coordinated signal system and the restriping of the westbound Town Center Boulevard approach to include one left-through lane, and two right-turn lanes, with a permitted-overlap phase for the westbound right-turns. The El Dorado Hills Town Center Apartments project is responsible for, among other things, the lane designation and signal phasing mitigations described above. This mitigation affects an approach on a privately-owned roadway, and therefore, the improvement should be coordinated with the County and the property owner. As shown in **Table 13,** this mitigation measure result in the intersection operating at LOS D during the PM peak-hour. Therefore, ***this impact is less than significant***.

M2. Intersection #4, Latrobe Road and Town Center Boulevard

This intersection operates at Los F during the PM peak-hour without the project, and the project contributes more than 10 trips. Consistent with the findings of the previous Saratoga Retail Phase 2 Cumulative (2035) Conditions analysis[1], the impact at this intersection can be mitigated by optimization of the Latrobe Road coordinated signal system, along with the following improvements: the restriping of the westbound Town Center Boulevard approach to include one left-through lane, and two right-turn lanes, with a permitted-overlap phase for the westbound right-turns. The El Dorado Hills Town Center Apartments project is responsible for, among other things, the lane designation and signal phasing mitigations described above. This mitigation affects an approach on a privately-owned roadway, and therefore, the improvement should be coordinated with the County and the property owner. As shown in **Table 13**, this mitigation measure results in the intersection operating at LOS E during the PM peak-hour. Therefore, ***this impact is less than significant***.

Table 13 - Intersection Levels of Service Near-Term (2026) Plus Proposed Project Mitigated Conditions

ID	Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Near-Term (2026)		Near-Term (2026) plus Proposed Project		Near-Term (2026) plus Proposed Project Mitigated	
				Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
1	El Dorado Hills Blvd @ Saratoga Way/Park Dr	Signal	AM	33.2	C	36.9	D	37.2	D
			PM	70.4	E	**92.7**	**F**	46.5	D
2	El Dorado Hills Blvd @ US-50 WB Ramps/ Park	Signal	AM	33.1	C	33.7	C	35.6	D
			PM	58.0	E	61.7	E	49.3	D
3	Latrobe Rd @ US-50 EB Ramps	Signal	AM	15.4	B	15.1	B	14.9	B
			PM	12.0	B	12.2	B	13.4	B
4	Latrobe Rd @ Town Center Blvd	Signal	AM	22.6	C	21.4	C	20.1	C
			PM	**84.6**	**F**	**82.5**	**F**	66.4	E
5	Latrobe Rd @ White Rock Rd	Signal	AM	57.4	E	57.6	E	56.5	E
			PM	66.0	E	65.3	E	76.6	E
7	White Rock Rd @ Post St	Signal	AM	**86.4**	**F**	**92.4**	**F**	**93.1**	**F**
			PM	51.5	D	50.7	D	60.7	E

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:** Kimley-Horn and Associates, 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, as long as project landscaping is maintained in such a manner so as not to obstruct sight distance along Saratoga Way. According to the project site plan there appears to be adequate sight distance on-site to facilitate safe and orderly circulation. There would be no impact.

e. **Emergency Access:** Fire Safe Regulations state that on-site roadways shall "provide for safe access for emergency wildland fire equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently, and shall provide unobstructed traffic circulation during a wildfire emergency…" All project roadways shall be designed and constructed in accordance with these requirements. As shown in the project site plan, the turn radius for a firetruck is depicted circulating through the proposed project. As such, the proposed project is considered to allow for adequate access and on-site circulation for emergency vehicles. The fire department review of plans associated with building permit would ensure compliance with these standards. There would be no impact.

f. **Alternative Transportation.** El Dorado Transit currently operates a "Sacramento Commuter" bus route that operates Monday through Friday only. This route has multiple stops within the Town Center development located south of US-50 along Latrobe Road. No other public transit services are known to operate in the project area. Nevertheless, the proposed project promotes safe and efficient access to the existing transit system by providing pedestrian connectivity to and through the project site. Additionally, the project will install 13 bicycle racks to promote an alternative transportation option. The proposed project will have no impact on adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

FINDING: The project as mitigated 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: There are no known TCRs located on or immediately adjacent to the project site. El Dorado County, as the CEQA Lead Agency, notified the United Auburn Indian Community and several other tribes on June 5, 2018 about the project and requested their input on any TCRs within the project site and the potential for the project to cause a substantial adverse change to them. El Dorado County received a response from the UAIC requesting additional consultation on the proposed project. The UAIC's tribal archaeologist preformed a pedestrian survey of the site and found no indications of cultural resources or TCR's. After a review of the totality of information submitted by the tribe (as described above), the thresholds under PRC Section 21074(a)(i)(ii) have not been met and the project would not cause a significant adverse change in significance of a TCR. Therefore, there will be **no impact** to TCRs and no mitigation is necessary.

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 there would be no impact.

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 utilize approximately 6.0 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of wastewater treatment. The proposed project would require less than 12 EDUs of sewer service. There is a 21-inch gravity sewer line abutting the southern property line. This sewer line has adequate capacity at this time. To receive service from this line, an extension of facilities of adequate size must be constructed. 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:** A 10-inch water line is located on the parcel(s) to be developed. The El Dorado Hills Fire Department has determined that the minimum fire flow for this project is 1,500 GPM for a 2-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 connect to the 10-inch water line. Based on preliminary project plans it appears that the part of the existing 10-inch water line and associated dedicated easement are in conflict with a proposed building. It also appears that a retaining wall is proposed adjacent to the 10-inch water line currently serving a previous phase of this project. The proposed abandonment of a portion of the existing 10-inch water line and associated easements must be coordinated with the District and completed as necessary before any grading activity occurs on site. The improvement plans shall include details on the proposed retaining wall, including calculations, to verify that the proposed structure will not negatively impact the existing District facilities in this area. The hydraulic grade line for the existing water distribution facilities is 960 feet above mean sea level at static conditions and 890 feet above mean sea level during fire flow and maximum day demands. 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:** The proposed project would not require construction of new or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities offsite. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, the project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County's Design and Improvement Standards Manual related to storm drainage. Compliance with these provisions would ensure existing drainage facilities can accommodate the additional runoff. The project will construct an onsite stormwater drainage facilities which will tie into the existing stormwater drainage system adjacent to the site. The impacts are less than significant.

d. **Sufficient Water Supply:** As of January 1, 2016, there were approximately 20,417 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of water supply available in the El Dorado Hills Water Supply Region. The proposed project would require less than 12 EDUs of water supply. There would be less than significant impacts to water supply, as the EID has already accounted for provision of water service to this project.

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 DR-R18-0001or 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) Figures; (2) Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis and Project Lifecycle Management Analysis; (3) Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment; (4) letter of correspondence from US Army Corps of Engineers; (5) Geotechnical Engineering Report; (6) Greenhouse Gas Emissions (7) Noise Analysis; and (8) Traffic Analysis Report and Supplement.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

Beals, R.L. (1933). *Ethnology of the Nisenan. Published in American Archaeology and Ethnology 31*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

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.

Cook, Sherburne F. (1976). *The Population of the California Indians 1769-1970.* University of California Press. Berkeley, California.

ECORP Consulting, Inc (2006). *Special Status Plant Survey*. Rocklin, CA.

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.

EMSL Analytical, Inc. (2010). *Test Report: PLM Analysis of Bulk Samples of Asbestos via EPA 600/R-93/116 Method with CARB 435 Prep (Milling) Level A for 0.25% Target Analytical Sensitivity*.

Environmental Solutions (2017). *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.* Glendale, CA.

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.

HELIX Environmental Planning Inc (2017). *The Habit Burger Restaurant Project Noise Assessment.* Folsom, CA.
.

HELIX Environmental Planning Inc (2017). *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis.* Folsom, CA

Johnson, Patti, J., (1978). *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8: California.* Washington, DC. Smithsonian Institution.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (May 2017). *Saratoga Retail Phase 2: Transportation Impact Study, El Dorado Hills, California.*

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (May 2018). *Supplement to Saratoga Retail Phase 2: Transportation Impact Study, El Dorado Hills, California.*

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. (March 2007). *Record search Results for El Dorado Hills Shopping Center.* 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 2008). *CEQA Evaluation of Potential Air Quality Impacts fo "The Shops" Mixed-Use Shopping Center, El Dorado County, CA.*

TSD Engineering, Inc. 2018. *Saratoga Retail Parking Memo*. El Dorado County, CA.

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

Wallace Kuhl & Associates Inc (2008). *Geotechnical Engineering Report Update.* West Sacramento, CA.

Wilson, Norman L. and Arlean H. Towne. (1978). "Nisenan" in *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol.8: California, edited by R.F. Heizer, 387-397. Washington, DC. Smithsonian Institution.