

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

550 Main Street Suite E • Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 295-2707 • lafco@edlafco.us • www.edlafco.us

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title: Shingle Springs Montessori School Annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District; LAFCO Project No. 2014-02

Lead Agency: El Dorado LAFCO
550 Main Street, Suite E
Placerville, CA 95667

Contact Person: José C. Henríquez
(530) 295-2707

Project Applicant/Landowner: California Montessori Project
5330A Gibbons Drive
Carmichael, CA 95608

Project Agent: Anthony Tassano, Project Engineer
Warren Consulting Engineers, Inc.
1117 Windfield Way, Suite 110
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 319-220-57

Description of the Project: Annexation of APN 319-220-57 (10 acres) into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), in order to obtain water and wastewater services to support a new K-8 charter school campus for the California Montessori Project. The new Shingle Springs Campus is a planned upgraded facility for the approximately 350 students who currently attend the existing Shingle Springs Campus, adjacent to the project site.

APN 319-220-57 (10 acres) was split from APN 090-220-26 and merged through a record of survey with APN 319-220-49 (site of the existing Shingle Springs Montessori School campus, 5.22 acres); the two merged parcels have retained separate administrative APNs.

Project Location: The project site is located at 4741 Buckeye Road in Shingle Springs, on the north side of Buckeye Road, approximately 800 feet east of its intersection with Shingle Springs Road.

General Plan designation: The project site is designated Low Density Residential (LDR), by the County general plan.

Zoning: The project site is zoned Estate Residential, Five-Acre (RE-5).

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The project site is currently undeveloped, vacant land. Vegetation is comprised of Annual Grassland and Blue Oak Woodland habitat with a few notable oak trees on the site. The site also contains an ephemeral creek and a seasonal wetland swale. Topography on-site is relatively flat.

The area surrounding the project site consists of low density residential development, existing school facilities and vacant land. The existing Shingle Springs Montessori School Campus is located immediately to the west (merged with the subject parcel through a record of survey), Buckeye Road is located on the south, and low density residential development exists on all sides.

Surrounding Area	Zoning	General Plan Land Use	Current Land Use
Project Site: 319-220-57	RE-5	LDR	Vacant: Split from APN 090-220-26, merged with APN 319-220-49

North:	RE-5	LDR	Residential: 5-acre parcels
West:	RE-5	LDR	Residential: 5-acre parcel Schools: Existing Shingle Springs Montessori School Campus (APN 319-220-49) Buckeye Elementary School Shingle Springs Drive
East:	RE-5	LDR	Residential: 13.35-acre parcel, split from APN 090-220-26 Residential: 5-acre parcels
South:	RE-5	LDR	Residential: 0.5 to 2.26-acre parcels Buckeye Road

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. The environmental factors checked below contain mitigation measures which reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

x I find that all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been analyzed adequately in an earlier MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and that nothing further is required.

José C. Henríquez
LAFCO Executive Officer

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence 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 analysis 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(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 Measures 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 significance.

This Addendum to the California Montessori Project Charter School Shingle Springs Campus Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted by the lead agency California Montessori Project on November 6, 2012, has been prepared to provide supplemental information regarding the Shingle Springs Montessori School Annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District, LAFCO Project No. 2014-02. The annexation involves one parcel totaling 10 acres, APN 319-220-57, which will be annexed into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Annexation to EID is necessary in order to obtain water and wastewater services to support a 350-student, K-8 Charter School Facility for the California Montessori Project.

In its capacity as a responsible agency, the El Dorado LAFCO has determined that the annexation is within the scope of the project analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The State CEQA Guidelines provide that an "addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred." (State CEQA Guidelines, §15164(b).) Section 15162 provides:

- (a) *When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:*
 - (1) *Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*
 - (2) *Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or*
 - (3) *New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:*
 - (A) *The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;*
 - (B) *Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;*
 - (C) *Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or*
 - (D) *Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant*

effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Though it concurs with the conclusions contained in the lead agency's Mitigated Negative Declaration, LAFCO has prepared supplemental information regarding utilities and service systems and recreation (see below) to confirm that the annexation will result in no additional environmental impacts beyond those addressed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. As documented below, no new impacts would result. Therefore, preparation of this Addendum is appropriate.

This Addendum need not be circulated for public review. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15164(c).) The Commission will consider this Addendum with the Mitigated Negative Declaration prior to making a decision on the annexation of the subject parcel into EID.

Utilities and Service Systems <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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 expansions 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	

Utilities and Service Systems (continued) <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Upon annexation into the District, wastewater treatment would be provided for the site by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). The project site would be served by the Deer Creek Wastewater Collection System – Western Service Area. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board sets treatment requirements for the collection, processing, and disposal of waste, which must be complied with by EID. Specifically, EID operates under Waste Discharge Requirement Order No. RS-2002-0210 regarding treatment processes and water quality standards that are specific to the Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. EID has indicated that it would be willing and able serve the proposed project, consistent with the requirements of the RWQCB. The impacts are less than significant.

b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or

expansions of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

According to EID's *Facility Improvement Letter FIL1012-020* to the applicant, dated October 31, 2012, an 8-inch water line exists in Buckeye Road and a 24-inch water line is located in Mother Lode Drive. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District has determined that the minimum fire flow for this project ranges from 875 to 1,250 gallons per minute for a two-hour duration while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. According to EID's hydraulic model, the existing system can deliver the required fire flow. In order to receive service, a looped water line extension connecting to both the existing 8-inch and 24-inch water lines must be constructed. Facilities required include approximately 55 linear feet of 6-inch water line and 1,050 linear feet of 10-inch water line. The hydraulic grade line for the existing water distribution facilities is 1,670 feet above mean sea level at static conditions and 1,650 feet above mean sea level during fire flow and maximum day demands.

There is an existing 12-inch sewer force main abutting the southern property line in Buckeye Road. In order to receive service from the Mother Lode Force Main, a 4-inch force main connection and a new private full sewage lift station must be constructed. Facilities required include approximately 25 linear feet of 4-inch force main sewer line. According to EID's *2013 Wastewater Facilities Master Plan* and *FIL1012-020*, the existing 12-inch Mother Lode Force Main has adequate capacity at this time to service this project. EID plans to replace the portion of the Mother Lode Force Main along Buckeye Road with an upgraded 20-inch line in Phase 6 of its Wastewater Pipeline Replacement Program, to be completed between 2013 and 2017.

Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Storm drainage facilities required by the project are limited to on-site storm drains, drainage ditches and culverts. Potential environmental effects of constructing these drainage facilities are considered throughout this document as part of the project. No off site drainage improvements are proposed as a part of the project. Any potential impacts would be avoided through the implementation of the County Grading Ordinance and thus this potential impact would be considered less than significant.

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

According to EID's *Facility Improvement Letter FIL 1012-020*, an estimated total of 10 Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) will be required to serve the water and sewer needs of the project. An EDU is the annual water requirement for a single-family residential dwelling served by a $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch water meter; larger water meters require additional EDUs. The subject parcel is within the Shingle Springs Service Zone (Zone #5) of EID's Western/Eastern Water Supply Area, which receives gravity water supply from FERC Project 184 and Jenkinson Lake. Per EID's *2013 Water Resources and Service Reliability Report*, water meter availability in the Western/Eastern Supply Area is 1,935 EDU's, based on the following calculations:

The 2013 supply-based firm yield for the Western/Eastern Supply Area is 36,000 acre-feet (AF); 15,080 AF from Project 184 and 20,920 AF from Jenkinson Lake. During a critical dry year, the annual supply from Jenkinson Lake would be reduced pursuant to EID Board Policy 5010. The

total potential demand as of December 31, 2012 included 28,090 AF of active demand, 140 AF of latent demand, and 6,725 AF of other system demand, for a total of 34,955 AF. The resulting unallocated water supply is therefore 1,045 AF.

In order to convert available water supply to meter availability (AF to EDUs), EID calculates an average unit demand, based on a 10-year historical trend (2001-2010). Unit demands are estimated by excluding the historical maximum and minimum values and averaging the remaining values, resulting in 0.54 AF per EDU in the Western/Eastern Supply Area. Water meter availability is calculated by taking the unallocated water supply (1,045 AF) and dividing it by the average unit demand (0.54), resulting in 1,935 EDUs of water supply available for the Western/Eastern Supply Area. 283 EDUs have been previously committed through contractual commitments, leaving a total of 1,652 EDUs available for purchase. According to *FIL 1012-020*, the project as proposed would require 10 EDUs of water supply to serve the water and wastewater needs of the project.

The County General Plan requires the applicant demonstrate a guaranteed supply of water is available at the time final subdivision and parcel maps are approved before building permits are issued. In addition, EID service to the proposed project would be contingent upon the future availability of water supply, approval of the Facility Plan Report, construction of all water facilities, and acceptance of the facilities by EID. These procedures would provide assurances that expansion of water supply to the project site is sufficient and reliable.

EID has sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Upon annexation, the subject parcel would be served by EID's Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (DCWWTP), which is located approximately two miles south of U.S. Highway 50 in Cameron Park area and receives flows from a 24 square mile area that includes Diamond Springs, El Dorado, Shingle Springs, and Cameron Park. DCWWTP discharges treated wastewater to Deer Creek, a tributary to the Cosumnes River, with a portion of the flow recycled for irrigation and dust control under Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. EID's discharge permit requires that a minimum of one million gallons per day be discharged to Deer Creek year round.

The proposed project would require an extension of EID's wastewater collection system and increase the demand on EID's wastewater treatment facilities. According to EID's *2013 Wastewater Facilities Master Plan*, the DCWWTP has a permitted capacity of 3.6 million gallons per day (mgd) average dry weather flow; the current average dry weather flow is 2.64 mgd. The DCWWTP has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The impacts would be less than significant.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Solid waste collection for the Charter School will be provided by El Dorado Disposal. Solid waste disposal at the site would be limited to construction debris and typical school-related materials (e.g., papers, school supplies and food waste), in addition to small amounts of

residentially-generated waste materials, which are not expected to have a significant impact on local landfills. Solid waste disposal will occur at permitted landfills in accordance with federal, state and local regulations.

In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility/Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g. concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.

After July of 2006, El Dorado Disposal began distributing 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting and loading of solid waste and recyclables. Adequate space would be available on-site. On-site solid waste collection would be collected by El Dorado Disposal. Solid waste disposal will occur at permitted landfills in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. Impacts would be less significant.

FINDING: No significant impacts will result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the "Utilities and Service Systems" section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects will result from the project.

REFERENCES

- 2013 – 2017 Five Year Capital Improvement Plan*, El Dorado Irrigation District, approved October 9, 2012
- 2013 Water Resources and Service Reliability Report*, El Dorado Irrigation District, adopted August 12, 2013
- 2013 Wastewater Facilities Master Plan*, El Dorado Irrigation District, adopted July 31, 2013
- Agreement for Service at Outside District Rates*: El Dorado Irrigation District and California Montessori Project, June 6, 2014
- California Montessori Project Shingle Springs Campus Mitigated Negative Declaration*, prepared and adopted by California Montessori Project, November 6, 2012
- Facility Improvement Letter FIL1012-020*, El Dorado Irrigation District, October 31, 2012
- Plan of Service for the Shingle Springs Montessori School Annexation to the El Dorado Irrigation District; LAFCO Project No. 2014-02*, prepared by Warren Consulting Engineers, May 19, 2014