

EL DORADO LAFCO

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

550 Main Street Suite E • Placerville, CA 95667
 Phone: (530) 295-2707 • Fax: (530) 295-1208
 lafco@co.el-dorado.ca.us
 www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/lafco

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title: Summer Brook Annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District;
 LAFCO Project No. 2008-03

Lead Agency: El Dorado LAFCO 550 Main Street, Suite E Placerville, CA 95667	Contact Person: José C. Henríquez (530) 295-2707
--	--

Project Applicant/Landowner: Amar Ghorí and Imran Aziz
 657 Lakecrest Drive
 El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Project Agent: Olga Sciorelli, Project Engineer
 Cooper Thorne & Associates
 3233 Monier Circle
 Rancho Cordova, CA 95742

Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs): 102-210-12 and 102-220-13

Description of the Project: Annexation of two parcels totaling 90 acres, APN 102-210-12 (80 acres) and APN 102-220-13 (10 acres), into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Annexation to EID is necessary in order to obtain municipal water service for a planned 29-lot residential subdivision with parcels ranging in size from 1.4 to 2 acres, including 35 acres of open space.

Project Location: The property is located in the Rescue area, on the north side of Green Valley Road, approximately half a mile west of its intersection with Bass Lake Road.

General Plan designation: LDR (Low Density Residential), general plan amendment from RR (Rural Residential), approved by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on March 11, 2008.

Zoning: RE5-PD (Estate Residential Five-Acre – Planned Development), rezoned from AE (Exclusive Agriculture) and RE-5 (Estate Residential Five-Acre), approved by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on March 11, 2008.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The site is currently undeveloped and is utilized as grazing lands for cattle and horses. Topography on-site is relatively flat. Slopes exceeding 30% are limited to drainages and streams on-site. Vegetation is comprised of native grasslands and oak woodland habitat. Approximately 1.60-acres wetlands, seeps, and drainage channels are located on-site. The subject parcel is bordered on the north, west and east by residential development (RR/MDR), and on the south by Pleasant Grove Middle School, across from Green Valley Road.

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use
Site:	RE-5 PD	LDR	Undeveloped grazing land
North:	RE-10	RR	Existing residential development
West:	RE-10/RE-5	RR	Existing residential development
East:	R2A/RE-10/AE	MDR/RR	Existing residential development
South:	RE-5/AE	RR/LDR/PF	Existing residential development/ Green Valley Road / Pleasant Grove Middle School

Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 2 of 11

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	X	Agricultural Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality	X	Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	X	Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation	X	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.
- 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

Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 3 of 11

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.

*Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 4 of 11*

- 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 Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted by the lead agency County of El Dorado on March 11, 2008, has been prepared to provide supplemental information regarding the Summer Brook Annexation into the El Dorado Irrigation District, LAFCO Project No. 2008-03. The annexation involves two parcels totaling 90 acres, APN 102-210-12 and APN 102-220-13, which will be annexed into the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). Annexation to EID is necessary in order to obtain municipal water service for a planned 29-lot residential subdivision, with parcels ranging in size from 1.4 to 2 acres.

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*

Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 5 of 11

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	

Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 6 of 11

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?

The project would be served by private on-site septic systems for wastewater services. There would be no impact to the existing public wastewater services.

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?

Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 7 of 11

Existing Infrastructure and Improvements

Water

According to EID's *Facility Improvement Letter FIL0609-024* (FIL) to the applicant, dated June 4, 2009, a 12-inch water line exits in Green Valley Road approximately 900 feet southeast of the subject properties. The Rescue Fire Protection District has determined that the minimum fire flow for this project is 2,000 gallons per minute for a two-hour duration while maintaining a 20-psi residual pressure. In order to provide this fire flow and receive service, a water line extension connecting to the existing 12-inch water line in Green Valley Road must be constructed. The hydraulic grade line for the existing water distribution facilities is 1,488 feet above mean sea level at static conditions and 1,451 feet above mean sea level during fire flow and maximum day demands.

Wastewater

The project will utilize private septic systems; there will be no impact to public sewer. Impacts related to the private wastewater systems are expected to be less than significant.

Each individual property owner will be required to develop an on-site sewage disposal system meeting the current requirements of the Environmental Health Division of the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department. All lots were tested and percolation tests were completed by Youngdahl Consulting Group. The proposed parcels were found to have adequate leaching capacity to support the proposed individual on-site sewage disposal systems.

The approved Tentative Map and associated Land Capability Report identify areas where the percolation tests were conducted and leach fields are proposed to be located. The available area for the on-site sewage disposal ranges from 12,000 to 28,000 square feet on the 1.4 to 2 acre lots. The El Dorado County Environmental Health Division has reviewed and approved the proposed sewage disposal areas.

Septic tank waste is historically hauled by private commercial vendors for disposal and treatment. The Union Mine Septage Treatment Facility opened in 1996, which also treats "leachate," a bi-product of rainfall leaching through refuse.

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?

According to the original Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for this project by the County and incorporated by reference (County MND), the project would not require the construction of new stormwater facilities. The project would be required to comply with the stormwater requirements of the *Design and Improvement Standards Manual*. Impacts would be 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?

Service Capacity and Project Requirements

Water

The subject parcel is within the Cameron Park Service Zone (Zone #4) of EID's Western Region Supply Area. The Western/Eastern Water Supply Region receives gravity water supply from

Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 8 of 11

FERC Project 184 and Jenkinson Lake. According to EID's 2007 *Water Resources and Service Reliability Report*, there are 2,426 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) of water available in this region, based primarily on the following calculations:

The 2007 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. The total potential demand as of December 31, 2006 included 27,899 AF of active demand, 667 AF of latent demand, and 6,027 AF of other system demand, for a total of 34,593 AF. The resulting unallocated water supply for the year 2007 is therefore 1,407 AF.

To convert the available water supply to meter availability, EID projected demand out for three years. This per EDU demand was based on a 10-year historical trend (1996-2005) in the Western/Eastern Supply Area. The trend was extended out to 2009, resulting in 0.58 AF per EDU. The water meter availability for the Western/Eastern Supply Area is thus a total of 2,426 EDUs for 2007.

It should be noted, however, that this number does not take into account the existing EID contractual commitments in the region, nor does it reflect recent annexations approved by LAFCO that have not yet purchased water meters.

EID has several contractual commitments within the Western/Eastern Supply Area for existing water supplies. These commitments total 907 EDUs, including 152 EDUs for the Apple Mountain Water Service Agreement, 113 EDUs for the Bell Ranch Settlement Agreement, 563 EDUs for the Weber Dam Advanced Funding Agreement, and 79 EDUs for the City of Placerville. Contractual commitments refer to agreements between EID and various local development projects to provide services only after specific requirements are met by the developer and as water and infrastructure capacity are available. Although these commitments are intended to ensure that the construction of required infrastructure is completed prior to the purchase of meters, it is not intended in any way to guarantee water availability to these projects. However, because these contractual commitments are expected to be realized in the coming years, it is important to take into account when discussing water availability.

Similarly, it is also necessary to consider annexations already approved by LAFCO. Since January 2006, they account for an additional 511-518 EDU commitments [Marble Valley 05-08 (443-450 EDUs), Preacher 05-15 (3 EDUs), La Caille Estates 2006-07 (25 EDUs), Garrett 2007-02 (5 EDUs), and Bass Lake Estates 2008-01 (36 EDUs)], all of which have yet to be realized; however it is likely that the Garrett and La Caille Estates EDUs will be purchased and utilized within the next two years. It must also be noted that there are more annexation projects into this water region prior to January 2006 which have not yet purchased water meters and have not been accounted for in either the EID or LAFCO EDU estimates.

After taking into account both of these additional factors, it is reasonable to assume that EID's Western/Eastern Water Supply Region has approximately 1,001-1,008 EDUs that are available for purchase and not yet implicitly committed to other prospective customers. According to EID's FIL to the applicant, the project as proposed would require 34 EDUs of water supply. The current available supply is sufficient to accommodate the estimated 34 EDUs of service that will be required for the Summer Brook 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

Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 9 of 11

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?

Wastewater

The project site will be served by private septic systems. There would be no impact.

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

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. 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. On-site solid waste collection would be handled through the local waste management contractor. Adequate space would be available on-site. 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.

Recreation <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. 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. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

*Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 10 of 11*

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.

a. 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?

The Summer Brook subdivision is not expected to have a significant impact to recreation and open space resources either directly or indirectly. The proposed project would not increase population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities.

The project site currently receives, and will continue to receive, park and recreation services through the El Dorado County Parks and Recreation Department, which is responsible for providing recreation areas and parks within the unincorporated areas of the county not in Community Service Districts. Specifically, the project site is within County Service Area 9, Zone 17 – Ponderosa Recreation Zone.

The County's adopted MND for this project incorrectly states that, "Payment of in-lieu fees to the Cameron Park Community Services District (CPCSD) would be sufficient to ensure the impacts from the new development would be mitigated." Actually, the project site is within the CPCSD sphere of influence, but there are no plans to annex the project site into the CPCSD at this time; annexation into the CSD was not requested as a part of this proposal. It should be noted that although the subdivision is not within the service boundaries of the CPCSD and no property tax increment would be allotted to the District, future residents would likely use the District's parks and recreation facilities, creating a "free-rider" situation. This could be partially mitigated by the District's charges of out of district rates for certain park and recreation services.

b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The project would not include additional recreation facilities or sites as part of the project. Upon completion of the Summer Brook subdivision development there will be 29 new residential units, resulting in approximately 87 new residents (accounting for an average of three persons per home), which will not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities.

The increased demand for any services would be mitigated by the payment of the in-lieu fees. The unit of service for parks, recreation and open space is population. The Quimby Act allows, and the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan requires, three acres of parkland per one thousand persons. The parks and Recreation Department administers and manages three parks. The property owner will be required to pay park-in-lieu fees based on values supplied by the Assessor's Office and calculated in accordance with the provisions of Section 16.12.090 of the County Code.

*Addendum to the Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO Project No. 2008-03
September, 2009
Page 11 of 11*

FINDING: No significant impacts will result to park and recreation services or facilities from development of the project. For the "Recreation" section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects will result from the project.

REFERENCES

2007 Water Resources and Service Reliability Report, El Dorado Irrigation District, adopted June 25, 2007

Facility Improvement Letter FIL0609-024, El Dorado Irrigation District, June 4, 2009

Plan of Service for the Summer Brook Subdivision Annexation to the El Dorado Irrigation District; LAFCO Project No. 2008-03, prepared by Cooper Thorne & Associates, October 17, 2008

Summer Brook Mitigated Negative Declaration (A 07-0005 / Z 07-0012 / PD 07-0007 / TM 07-1440), prepared and adopted by El Dorado County, March 11, 2008

Water, Wastewater and Power Municipal Services Review, prepared by Dudek, adopted by El Dorado County Local Agency Formation Commission, January 2008