4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS

This Draft EIR provides an analysis of cumulative impacts of the proposed project, as required by Section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The goal of such an exercise is twofold: first, to determine whether the overall long-term impacts of all such projects would be cumulatively significant, and second, to determine whether the incremental contribution to any such cumulatively significant impacts of the project would be "cumulatively considerable" (and thus significant). (See State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15130(a)–(b), Section 15355(b), Section 15064(h), and Section 15065(c); and *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 98, 120.) In other words, the required analysis intends first to create a broad context in which to assess cumulative impacts, viewed on a geographic scale beyond the project site itself, and then to determine whether the project's incremental contribution to any significant cumulative impacts from all projects is itself significant (i.e., "cumulatively considerable").

Cumulative impacts are defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355 as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." A cumulative impact occurs from "the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time" (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355(b)).

4.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, the discussion of cumulative impacts in this Draft EIR focuses on significant and potentially significant cumulative impacts. Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides, in part, that:

> The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact.

A proposed project would have a significant cumulative effect if:

- the cumulative effects of development without the project are not significant and the project's additional impact is substantial enough, when added to the cumulative effects, to result in a significant impact, or
- the cumulative effects of development without the project are already significant and the project contributes measurably to the effect.

The term "measurably" is subject to interpretation. The standards used herein to determine measurability are that the impact must be noticeable to a reasonable person or must exceed an established threshold of significance (defined throughout the resource sections in Chapter 3 of this Draft EIR). This cumulative analysis also assumes that all mitigation measures identified in Chapter 3 to mitigate project impacts are adopted and implemented that would minimize environmental effects are implemented.

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15130[b][1]) identify two basic methods for establishing the cumulative environment in which the project is to be considered: the use of a list of past, present, and probable future projects or the use of adopted projections from a general plan, other regional planning document, or a certified EIR for such a planning document. This analysis uses a combination of the list and planning document approach, as described further below.

4.2.1 Geographic Scope

The geographic area that could be affected by the project and is appropriate for a cumulative impact analysis varies depending on the environmental resource topic, as presented in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1 Geographic Scope of Cumulative Impacts

Resource Topic	Geographic Area
Aesthetics	Project site and surrounding public viewshed
Air Quality	Region (pollutant emissions that affect the Mountain Counties Air Basin) and immediate project vicinity (pollutant emissions that are highly localized)
Archaeological and Historical Cultural Resources	Region
Biological Resources	Project site and region
Energy	Pacific Gas and Electric Company service area and state
Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources	Project site and region
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change	Global/statewide
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Project site and immediate project vicinity
Hydrology and Water Quality	Green Spring Creek Watershed that is contained within the Lower South Fork American River watershed and Folsom Reservoir–South Fork American River subwatershed
Land Use, Planning, and Agriculture and Forestry Resources	Project site and surrounding area
Noise and Vibration	Project site and immediate project vicinity
Population and Housing	El Dorado County
Public Services and Recreation	El Dorado County
Transportation	Project site and region
Utilities and Service Systems	Local service areas (e.g., El Dorado Irrigation District and El Dorado Hills Fire Department)
Tribal Cultural Resources	Region
Wildfire and Evacuation	Project site and region

Source: Compiled by Ascent in 2024.

4.3 CUMULATIVE SETTING

4.3.1 Regional Planning Environment

El Dorado County General Plan

The El Dorado County General Plan was adopted in 2004 and has been subsequently amended through 2022 (including the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update, adopted in 2015). It provides a broad framework for planning the future of the unincorporated area of the County. It is the official policy statement of the County and is used to guide the private and public development in the unincorporated area.

As discussed in El Dorado County's 2021–2029 Housing Element Update, El Dorado County's population could grow by an additional 16,846 persons by 2030 from 2020. It is expected that the El Dorado County population will increase by 8.8 percent between 2020 and 2030, with an average annual growth rate of 0.9 percent per year. It is projected that the County will grow to approximately 225,419 residents by 2040, an increase of approximately 36,413 new residents compared to the current population of 189,006 residents (El Dorado County 2022).

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) provides regional housing, land use planning, and transportation planning for its six-county region, which encompasses El Dorado County, as well as Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties. In developing the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), SACOG prepared a land use forecast required to accommodate the regional growth forecast of population, employment, and housing demand. The 2020 MTP/SCS includes a forecast of the amount of growth that will occur in SACOG's plan area over a 20-year planning period (2020–2040). The regional growth forecast is based on economic and demographic projections through 2040, adopted and pending land use plans and policies, market and economic considerations, and other state and federal policies and regulations that can affect the locations and pace of growth. The number of new residents in the SACOG area is estimated to increase by approximately 620,000 between 2016 and 2040 (SACOG 2019).

4.3.2 Related Projects

A list of probable future projects is provided below. Probable future projects are those in the project vicinity that have the possibility of interacting with the project to generate a cumulative impact (based on proximity and construction schedule). These projects:

- are partially occupied or under construction,
- have received final discretionary approvals,
- have applications accepted as complete by local agencies and are undergoing environmental review, or
- are proposed projects that have been discussed publicly by an applicant or that otherwise have become known to a local agency and for which information is sufficient to allow at least a general analysis of environmental impacts.

Past and present projects in the vicinity are also considered as part of the cumulative analysis because they contribute to the existing conditions upon which the project's and probable future projects' environmental effects are considered.

Table 4-2 briefly summarizes reasonably foreseeable large-scale projects in the project area.

Table 4-2 Cumulative Projects List

Project Name	Location	Project Summary	Project Status
Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan	3 miles east of the Sacramento/El Dorado County line, adjacent to the west end of Cameron Park, and north of US 50	Development framework for 1,196 acres. Provides for development of residences in a range of densities, from one dwelling unit per 5 acres to four dwelling units per acre (approximately 1,458 dwelling units).	Approved; under development
Carson Creek Specific Plan	East of the Sacramento/El Dorado County line, south of White Rock Road	Framework for mixed-use development on 710 acres for a total of 1,925 dwelling units.	Specific plan adopted; under development
Promontory Specific Plan	East of the Sacramento/El Dorado County line and north of US 50	Framework for mixed-use development on 1,000 acres. Includes eight residential villages, a village center, a community park, and open space. 1,100 residential units entitled.	Specific plan adopted; under development
Valley View Specific Plan (Blackstone)	South of US 50 and east of Latrobe Road	Framework for mixed-use development on 2,037 acres that allows up to 2,840 residential units.	Specific plan adopted; under development
The Village of Marble Valley Specific Plan	East of Marble Valley Road, south of US 50	Framework for mixed-use development on 2,341 acres. Includes a variety of residential housing types, commercial and public facilities uses (475,000 square feet of nonresident uses), and parks and natural open spaces. Would allow up to 3,236 dwelling units.	Under review

Project Name	Location	Project Summary	Project Status
Lime Rock Valley Specific Plan	West of Shingle Lime Mine Road, south of Cameron Estates, and east of the Marble Valley Specific Plan area	Framework for mixed-use development on 740 acres. Would allow up to 800 dwelling units.	Under review
El Dorado Hills 52 Retail Shopping Center	North of the Silva Valley Parkway/US 50 interchange	Commercial development project on approximately 34 acres consisting of up to approximately 179,000 square feet of commercial uses and 304 multifamily dwelling units.	Under review
Saratoga Estates	Within the El Dorado Hills Community north of US 50 adjacent to the western El Dorado County boundary with the City of Folsom	Residential development project on 121 acres consisting of the development of 317 dwelling units.	Approved and under development
Ridgeview Village	East of El Dorado Hills Boulevard	444 acres with 527 large and small residential lots, three parks, and open space.	Approved and under development
Cameron Meadows	In the Cameron Park Community east of the Cameron Park Airport between the Cameron Woods and Cameron Valley subdivisions	Residential development project consisting of 161 residential lots and 16 accessory dwelling units.	Under review
Dorado Oaks	Located on the west side of Faith Lane, approximately 500 feet south of the intersection with Pleasant Valley Road/State Route 49 in the El Dorado and Diamond Springs Community Region	Residential development project located on 142.3 acres. Project proposes 156 single family lots ranging in size from 6,000 square feet to approximately 24,000 square feet, 225 multi-family lots ranging in size from approximately 2,000 square feet to 7,170 square feet; one single-family lot of approximately 6.4 acres; seven roadway lots; and 18 open space/landscape lots open space/landscape lots.	Under review
The Town & Country Village El Dorado	North of US 50, east of Bass Lake Road in the El Dorado Hills Community	Mixed-use development project on 60.5 acres consisting of 814 residential units; 300 hotel rooms; and 271,000 sf of commercial uses.	Under review
Creekside Village Specific Plan	South of US 50, west of Latrobe Road and south of Investment Boulevard in the El Dorado Hills community	208-acre site for the proposed development of a new 918-unit residential community.	Under review
City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Amendments for Increased Residential Densities	City of Folsom	Amendments to the 2035 General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan to increase residential development potential in compliance with the City 2021–2029 Housing Element Update and allow for an additional 6,046 residential dwelling units in the city.	Under review

Note: The Serrano Specific Plan development is not included on this list because it is largely constructed and is, therefore, generally incorporated into the existing condition.

Source: Compiled by Ascent 2024.

4.4 ANALYSIS OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The following sections present a discussion of the cumulative effects anticipated from implementation of the project, as well as related projects and planned development in the region, for each of the environmental issue areas evaluated in this Draft EIR. The analysis conforms with Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which states, "The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact."

When considered in relation to other reasonably foreseeable projects, cumulative impacts on some resources would be significant and more severe than those caused by the proposed project alone.

For purposes of this EIR, the project would result in a significant cumulative effect if:

- the cumulative effects of related projects (past, current, and probable future projects) and planned growth under the El Dorado County General Plan are not significant, and the incremental impact of implementing the project is substantial enough, when added to the cumulative effects of related projects, to result in a new cumulatively significant impact, or
- the cumulative effects of related projects (past, current, and probable future projects) and planned growth under the El Dorado County General Plan are already significant, and implementation of the project makes a considerable contribution to the effect. The standards used herein to determine a considerable contribution are that the impact either must be substantial or must exceed an established threshold of significance.

The cumulative impact analysis below includes a summary of significant and unavoidable impact conclusions that were identified in the certified EIRs for the El Dorado County General Plan and El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update as part of the cumulative impact setting.

This cumulative analysis assumes that all mitigation measures identified in Sections 3.1 through 3.17 to mitigate project impacts are adopted and implemented and that all elements of the design-build performance criteria that would minimize environmental effects are implemented. The analysis herein analyzes whether, after implementation of project-specific mitigation and performance criteria that minimize environmental effects, the residual impacts of the project would cause a cumulatively significant impact or would contribute considerably to existing/anticipated (without the project) cumulatively significant effects. Where the project would contribute to an effect, additional mitigation is recommended where feasible.

4.4.1 Aesthetics

Aesthetic and visual resource impacts are project specific and highly localized. The geographic extent for considering cumulative impacts on aesthetics encompasses the viewshed (i.e., area visible from the viewer's location) in which the project would be located. As described in Section 3.1, "Aesthetics," public viewsheds of the proposed project are limited to the Green Valley Road corridor for a distance of approximately 0.50 miles between Malcolm Dixon Road and the Green Valley Farms site and at Lima Way. There are no other proposed development projects within this viewshed of Green Valley Road or within 0.50 miles of the project site that could contribute to visual or light/glare impacts.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable visual character impacts associated with future development from implementation of the General Plan under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004). The El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR also identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic vistas, resources in a scenic highway, degradation of existing visual character, and lighting and glare under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2015).

IMPACT 4-1: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE VISUAL CHARACTER IMPACTS

As described in Section 3.1, "Aesthetics," the project site is not located along roadways that are identified by the County as providing public scenic viewpoints. In addition, there are no designated or eligible state scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site, and the site is not visible from any officially designated or eligible state scenic highway. Thus, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on scenic vistas or scenic highways.

The visual character of the site would change from an open, rural landscape to suburban development, which would continue the expansion of the single-family residential developments that surround the project site. However, the site is located within the boundaries of the General Plan's Community Region, indicating that it is appropriate for transition to an urbanized area. As shown in Figure 3.1-2 and 3.1-3 and the line of sight analysis provided in Figure 3.1-6, views deep into the project site are limited due to on-site oak woodland that would be retained in proposed open space and RE-5 zoned residential lots and topography conditions (hillsides facing Green Valley Road). Open

views of project features would be limited to the proposed RE-5 zoned residential lots 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 that would be 5 acres or greater in size as well as the proposed park site and open space Lot C (see Figure 2-6). These lot sizes and associated residential development would be similar in character to existing rural residential development to the north, east, and south of the project site as well as along the Green Valley Road corridor in the project area. As shown in Figure 3.1-6, the existing oak woodland and topographic conditions viewed from Green Valley Road would obscure public views of the denser residential development proposed in the central portion of the site that would be located over 0.25 miles from Green Valley Road. In addition, this viewshed is approximately 0.50 miles and only provides for a 32 second duration of views of the project site (assuming a vehicle is traveling the posted speed limit of 55 miles per hour). Given the distance of potential views of proposed dense residential development, oak woodland and topographic conditions that would obscure views of site development, and the limited duration that views into the project site are available, the project would not result in a substantial alteration of the visual character of the Green Valley Road corridor as compared to existing conditions. Public views from Lima Way would be altered with the extension of Lima Way as one of the three proposed emergency vehicle roads, proposed tree removal, grading, and site development. This alteration could allow for public views of future residential development of the site. However, these potential public views of residential development on the project site would be limited to the two residences adjacent to Lima Way and pedestrians passing Lima Way. Ultimately, the proposed residential uses would be generally similar in character to the existing subdivision where Lima Way is located. Construction related to the off-site improvements would be temporary and would not result in permanent scenic changes, because the scenic character and quality of the roadways and surroundings would return to their previous visual condition.

Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial changes to visual character impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-2: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE LIGHTING AND GLARE IMPACTS

As discussed for Impact 3.1-2, implementation of the project would result in the development of static features, such as residential units and windows, and mobile features, such as cars, which would introduce new sources of light and daytime glare. Implementing the project would result in outdoor lighting at intersections and potentially along roadways and pathways, as well as indoor and outdoor lighting associated with residential units, recreational facilities, and parks. These project features would contribute to cumulative lighting and glare conditions in the project area. However, all lighting would be required to comply with Section 130.34.020 of the County Zoning Ordinance, which requires development to shield and direct outdoor lighting to ensure that direct light does not fall outside the property line or into the public right-of-way. Additionally, Sections 3.5(B) and 3.5(C) of the Outdoor Lighting Community Design Standards require lighting to be installed close to residences or activity areas, security lighting to be activated by motion sensor, and a lighting plan to be prepared and submitted with the proposed lighting installation. The El Dorado Hills Community Services District would design the park features after project approval and acquisition of the park and would determine whether lighted sports fields or courts would be included in the future park design and identify light pollution controls under a separate project by the CSD. Features to reduce excess nighttime light and glare, such as the use of directional shielding and automatic shutoff or motion sensors, would be incorporated into the project design in compliance with these standards and would offset the project's contribution to this cumulative impact. Additionally, the proposed RE-5 zoned residential lots and open space lots around the perimeter of the project would serve as a buffer for new lighting and glare sources introduced by the denser residential development proposed by the project by adding more distance and topographic and vegetative (oak woodlands) barriers between the project site and public viewpoints along Green Valley Road. Other reasonably foreseeable cumulative development would be required to comply with the same lighting standards.

Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial changes to lighting and glare impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.2 Air Quality

The cumulative setting for air quality is the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB). El Dorado County and the MCAB are within the jurisdiction of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDCAQMD). El Dorado County is currently designated as nonattainment with respect to the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) for ozone and with respect to the NAAQS for respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM_{10}) and fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less ($PM_{2.5}$). Emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors from industrial sources, area sources, and mobile sources in the basin have contributed to exceedances of the NAAQS for ozone and fine particulate matter and the CAAQS for ozone, respirable particulate matter, and fine particulate matter. Projects identified in Table 4-2 would increase emissions of these criteria air pollutants. Odor and toxic air contaminants (TACs) exposure are localized impacts, and the cumulative context is considered to be within 1,000 feet from the project site and associated off-site roadway and infrastructure improvements during construction.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable air quality impacts related to construction-related emissions, long-term operational emissions, odors, and TAC emissions associated with future development from implementation of the General Plan under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004). The El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR also identified significant and unavoidable air quality impacts related to construction-related emissions, long-term operational emissions, odors, and TAC emissions under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2015).

IMPACT 4-3: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE CONFLICTS WITH OR OBSTRUCTION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF AN APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY PLAN

As described for Impact 3.2-1, the project would conflict with EDCAQMD's Guide to Air Quality Assessment: Determining Significance of Air Quality Impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (EDCAQMD CEQA Guide) regarding consistency with the 2023 Ozone Plan, which may contribute to cumulative impacts associated with regional efforts to address ozone air pollution. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.2-1a, 3.2-1b, 3.2-1c, 3.7-1a, and 3.14-2 would mitigate and offset the project's conflicts with the 2030 Ozone Plan through air pollutant reduction measures.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative conflicts with the 2030 Ozone Plan **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-4: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE CONSTRUCTION AIR QUALITY IMPACTS

Construction activities in the region would emit additional particulate matter and ozone precursors that may conflict with attainment efforts in the County. Because the region is in nonattainment, the existing cumulative condition is adverse, and any additional emissions would exacerbate that condition. However, EDCAQMD has established construction emission thresholds for individual construction projects that determine whether that particular project's emissions would be cumulatively considerable. As addressed in the discussion of Impact 3.2-2, application of Mitigation Measure 3.2-1a would be effective in reducing construction-related emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) below EDCAQMD's numerical threshold for NO_x by requiring that off-road equipment use Tier 4 engines. In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-1b would require that the dust reduction measures of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 403, identified as mitigation in Section C.6 of the EDCAQMD CEQA Guide, be

implemented. The incorporation of these dust reduction measures would address and offset the project's contribution to this impact.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative construction air quality impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-5: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE OPERATIONAL AIR QUALITY IMPACTS

As discussed for Impact 3.2-3, the project would not result in emissions that would exceed EDCAQMD thresholds and would not conflict with air quality planning efforts in the region and may result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in ozone, for which the region has been designated as nonattainment with respect to the NAAQS and CAAQS. Because the NAAQS and CAAQS were established to be protective of public health, adverse health impacts to receptors are not likely occur.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative operational air quality impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-6: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE EXPOSURE TO TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS, NATURALLY OCCURRING ASBESTOS, CARBON MONOXIDE, AND ODOR

Emission of TACs, naturally occurring asbestos (NOA), carbon monoxide, and odor is a localized impact. There are no existing or planned land uses adjacent to the project that would be large stationary sources of local TACs or odors. As identified in the discussion of Impact 3.2-4, the project's potential for TAC and NOA impacts is associated with project construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.2-1a and 3.2-1c would offset the project's impact through use of Tier 4 engines and implementation of NOA dust control measures. The discussion of Impact 3.2-5 concludes that the project's contribution to carbon monoxide hotspots through increases in traffic volumes in the project area would not exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS that address public health.

As discussed for Impact 3.2-6, construction and operation of land uses under the project would not result in the development of new odor sources atypical of developed urban areas, and odor-generating construction activity would be temporary. Any new odor sources would be subject to future environmental review and to EDCAQMD Rule 205, Nuisance.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative exposure to TACs, NOA, carbon monoxide, and odor impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.3 Archaeological and Historical Cultural Resources

The cumulative context for the cultural resources analysis considers a broad regional system that includes the resources. The Gold Rush of the 1850s, the economic and agricultural development of El Dorado County, and commerce and trade in the historic communities associated with Green Valley have affected these lands. In addition, both the Sacramento-Coloma Road and the Sacramento and Placerville Wagon Road, developed from a circuitous trail used by emigrants and miners between 1848 and 1850, affected Nisenan lands. These activities have resulted in an existing significant adverse effect on cultural resources. Cumulative development, including projects described in Table 4-2, continues to contribute to the disturbance of cultural resources.

Because all significant cultural resources are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes (meaning there are a limited number of significant cultural resources), all adverse effects erode a dwindling resource base. The loss of any one archaeological site could affect the scientific value of others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. The cultural system is represented archaeologically by the total inventory of all sites and other cultural remains in the region. As a result, a meaningful approach to preserving and managing cultural resources must focus on the likely distribution of cultural resources, rather than on a single project or parcel boundary.

Although the El Dorado County General Plan EIR did not identify any significant and unavoidable cultural resource impacts, the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts on historic and archaeological resources under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2015).

IMPACT 4-7: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ON HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES AND HUMAN REMAINS

As identified in Section 3.3, "Archaeological and Historical Cultural Resources," no known historical resources (built-environment resources) are located within the boundaries of the project site. However, implementing the project, in combination with other development in the region, could contribute to ongoing substantial adverse changes in the significance of unique archaeological resources resulting from urban development and conversion of natural lands. Cumulative development could result in potentially significant archaeological resource impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a through 3.3-1c would offset the project's contribution to cumulatively significant archaeological resource impacts by providing training to construction personnel; requiring the performance of professionally accepted and legally compliant procedures in the event of a discovery, as well as the protection of any previously undocumented significant archaeological resources; and establishing protective orange fencing around significant resources during construction. Further, cumulative development would be required to implement similar mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts on cultural resources. Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resource Code Section 5097 would ensure that treatment and disposition of the remains occurs in a manner consistent with state guidelines and California Native American Heritage Commission guidance.

Therefore, the project's contribution to any significant cumulative impact related to cultural resources (archaeological resources) or human remains would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.4 Biological Resources

The effects of the project and potential cumulative impacts of related projects are limited to the greater project area vicinity, including adjacent migration and movement corridors in western El Dorado County. The project site is surrounded by residential development, roads, and open space. Past development in the region, including conversion of natural land to suburban uses, has resulted in a substantial loss of native habitat. The overall effect of this land conversion on native plants, animals, and habitat has been decidedly negative. Therefore, the cumulative condition for special-status species and sensitive habitats in the vicinity of the project site is already adverse.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable biological resource impacts associated with loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat and significant and unavoidable impacts on special-status species, wildlife movement, and sensitive habitats under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004). The El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR also identified significant and unavoidable biological resource impacts associated with loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat and significant and unavoidable impacts on special-status species, wildlife movement, and sensitive habitats under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2015). The approved and proposed development in the project area

identified in Table 4-2 would further contribute to identified cumulative biological resource impacts anticipated under the General Plan and Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update.

As described in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources," the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors certified the Final EIR and adopted the Biological Resources Policy Update and the Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP) in October 2017. The Biological Resources Policy Update included revisions to the General Plan objectives, policies, and implementation measures to establish a comprehensive Biological Resource Mitigation Program. The objective of this program is to conserve special-status species habitat, aquatic habitat, wetland and riparian habitat, habitat for migratory deer herds, and large expanses of native vegetation. The ORMP updated and revised the existing Oak Woodland Management Plan and defines mitigation requirements for impacts on oak woodlands, individual native oak trees, and heritage trees. The Final EIR determined that the implementation of the Biological Resources Policy Update and ORMP would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the loss of sensitive habitats associated with the loss of valley oak trees and valley oak woodlands (El Dorado County 2017).

IMPACT 4-8: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ON BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As described in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources," project implementation could result in significant impacts on special-status plants (some protected under El Dorado County Code), California red-legged frog, coast horned lizard, foothill yellow-legged frog, western pond turtle, burrowing owl, bald eagle, California black rail, golden eagle, grasshopper sparrow, loggerhead shrike, northern harrier, tricolored blackbird, white-tailed kite, yellow-breasted chat, and yellow warbler, native nesting birds protected under Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code and Migratory Bird Treaty Act, crotch bumble bee, monarch, American badger, pallid bat, Townsend's big-eared bat, western red bat, riparian habitat, state and federally protected wetlands, and oak trees protected under the El Dorado County Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP). Implementing the mitigation measures identified for these resources (Mitigation Measures 3.4-1, 3.4-2a, 3.4-2b, 3.4-2c, 3.4-2d, 3.4-2e, 3.4-2f, 3.4-2g, 3.4-2h, 3.4-2i, 3.4-3a, 3.4-3b, 3.4-4, 3.4-6a, and 3.4-6b) would offset the project's contribution to cumulative biological resource impacts by avoiding impacts on these species and habitats or compensating for habitat and species impacts.

Therefore, the project's potential contribution to impacts on special-status species, riparian habitat, and state and federally protected wetlands would not be cumulatively considerable. However, the project would contribute to the cumulative loss of oak woodland habitat due to the anticipated removal of approximately 56 acres of oak woodland habitat. Thus, the project's contribution to cumulative oak woodland loss identified in the Biological Resources Policy Update and ORMP Final EIR would be **cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.5 Energy

The cumulative context for energy is existing and projected energy use in the Pacific Gas and Electric Company service area and in the state. Cumulative development in the County would increase regional energy demand. This would include approved and proposed projects identified in Table 4-2.

No significant and unavoidable energy use impacts were identified in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR or the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR.

IMPACT 4-9: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE ENERGY IMPACTS

As discussed for Impact 3.5-1, implementing the project would increase energy demand during temporary construction activities for new buildings and facilities; however, construction activities would not increase long-term, ongoing demand for energy or fuel, because project construction would be temporary, lasting approximately 60 months. Regarding operation, the project-level analysis (Impacts 3.5-1 and 3.5-2) concluded that because the project

would include natural gas utilities and would result in an exceedance of the County's vehicle miles traveled (VMT) threshold, thus increasing use of fossil fuels, energy use associated with operation of the project would be inefficient. Additionally, as discussed for Impact 3.5-2, the project would conflict with the priority areas identified in Appendix D of the 2022 Scoping Plan because natural gas infrastructure is included in the project design and the County's VMT threshold would be exceeded. In addition, the project does not include any features that would reduce energy consumption or increase the use of renewable energy sources above what would be required by the California Building Code. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.7-1a, 3.7-1b, and 3.14-2 would require that energy efficiency measures be included in the project design. Collectively, these measures would reduce fossil fuel consumption and increase the use of renewable energy sources, consistent with the requirements of Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines to conserve energy. Implementation of these mitigation measures would offset the project's contribution to a cumulative energy impact. Other reasonably foreseeable cumulative development would be required to comply with the same requirements as the project.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative energy impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.6 Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources

Impacts related to geology and soils are not cumulative in nature. For example, impacts related to seismic shaking, erosion and loss of topsoil, geologic stability, expansive soils, and on-site wastewater disposal system operation relate only to project structures or the individual project site. However, paleontological resources can be thought of as areawide resources, and their loss at multiple sites may result in a cumulative impact.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable mineral resource impacts under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004). No significant and unavoidable geology, soil, or paleontological impacts were identified in the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR. The approved and proposed development in the project area identified in Table 4-2 would further contribute to identified cumulative impacts anticipated under the General Plan.

IMPACT 4-10: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ON PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As described in the discussion of Impact 3.6-5, El Dorado County's geologic formations are predominantly igneous in nature, and the types of sedimentary deposits where paleontological resources occur are virtually nonexistent in the County. Nevertheless, no comprehensive paleontological studies have been conducted in the County, and as a result, no information regarding the sensitivity of certain areas is available. Therefore, although it is unlikely that paleontological resources exist in the County, inadvertent discovery could still occur. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-5a would require that construction workers receive training provided by a qualified paleontologist to ensure that personnel can correctly identify fossilized remains in the event of inadvertent discovery, and Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-5b would require, if any paleontological resources are encountered, that proper measures are in place to halt construction work until a qualified paleontologist evaluates the find. Mitigation Measure 3.6-5b also identifies recommendations regarding treatment. Because the presence or absence of paleontological resources is highly localized to a project site, the other projects considered in this cumulative analysis would be assessed on a project-specific, case-by-case basis and would be required to implement mitigation measures, as applicable. Implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that the project's contribution to a cumulative geology and soils impact regarding paleontological resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on paleontological resources **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Prominent greenhouses gases (GHGs) contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are found to be responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and leading to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth's climate, known as global climate change or global warming. Climate change is a global problem caused by global pollutants and is inherently cumulative. Therefore, the cumulative setting for climate change is global, and the earth is experiencing an adverse cumulative condition. This includes consideration of planned development under the El Dorado County General Plan and pending development projects identified in Table 4-2.

No significant and unavoidable GHG and climate change impacts were identified in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR or the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR.

IMPACT 4-11: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE GREENHOUSE GAS IMPACTS

As stated above, the issue of global climate change is inherently cumulative because the GHG emissions of individual projects cannot be shown to have any material effect on global climate. Therefore, the project's impact on climate change is addressed only as a cumulative impact. The discussion of Impact 3.7-1 states that implementing the project would result in significant and unavoidable GHG emission impacts that would conflict with state efforts to reduce GHG emissions and decarbonization (e.g., the California Air Resources Board's 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality) even with application of Mitigation Measures 3.7-1a and 3.7-1b, which would reduce project-related GHG emissions. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative GHG and climate change impacts **would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable**.

Mitigation Measures

No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to address this cumulative impact.

4.4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The cumulative context for hazards and hazardous materials is considered to be project-specific and limited to within approximately 1,000 feet of the project site. Although some hazardous material releases can cover a large area and interact with other releases (e.g., atmospheric contamination, contamination of groundwater aquifers), incidents of hazardous material contamination typically are isolated to a small area, such as leaking underground storage tank sites or the area affected by a release at individual businesses. For this reason, isolated areas of contamination typically do not interact in a cumulative manner with other sites of hazardous material contamination. However, if implementing the project would create a new site of contamination or contribute substantially to an existing hazardous condition in the vicinity of the project site, then it could contribute to a cumulative impact.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts associated with illegal disposal of household hazardous waste and accidental release of hazardous materials under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004). No significant and unavoidable hazard impacts were identified in the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR. The approved and proposed development in the project area identified in Table 4-2 would further contribute to identified cumulative impacts anticipated under the General Plan.

IMPACT 4-12: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE HAZARD AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL IMPACTS

As addressed in the discussion of Impact 3.8-3, project development is not expected to result in impacts on navigable airspace associated with Cameron Airpark Airport given the height of future residential structures in relation to local topography, the height of existing oak woodlands, and the presence of overhead powerline facilities in the project area.

Section 3.8, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," states that the project site Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and updated records searches on EnviroStor and GeoTracker did not identify the presence of, or the previous release of, hazardous materials on or in the vicinity of the project site under cumulative conditions. Construction activities that involve the use of hazardous materials on the project site would be required to comply with established safety regulations mandated by federal, state, and County laws and regulations governing the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.8-1a and 3.8-1b would address project-specific on-site hazards. Construction of cumulative projects and associated activities located in the vicinity of the project site would also be required to comply with these mandated federal, state, and County laws and safety regulations regarding the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.

Operation of the project site as a residential development would not involve the use of significant quantities of hazardous materials that would create a cumulatively considerable hazardous condition to the public or environment through routine transport, use, or disposal. Like the project, the operation of cumulative projects located in the vicinity of the project site would also be subject to the County's Household Hazardous Waste Program, and adherence to manufacturers' instructions on the use and disposal of these household materials would minimize any impact related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of day-to-day operational use of hazardous materials.

With continued regulatory compliance, the project, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative hazard and hazardous material impact associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative hazard and hazardous material impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

The project site and the off-site improvements are located in the Lower South Fork American River watershed and Folsom Reservoir–South Fork American River subwatershed. The western slope of El Dorado County does not contain groundwater basins. Groundwater conditions in the foothills are highly variable spatially and temporally based on geology and fractured bedrock conditions. Surface water and groundwater quality in the region is influenced by land use and development conditions in the area.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable hydrology and water quality impacts associated with increased groundwater demand and water quality impacts from wastewater treatment plant discharges under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004). The El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR also identified significant and unavoidable hydrology and water quality impacts associated with groundwater use under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2015). The approved and proposed development in the project area identified in Table 4-2 would further contribute to identified cumulative impacts anticipated under the General Plan and the Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update.

As identified in Section 3.9, "Hydrology and Water Quality," the project would have no project impacts and make no contribution to cumulative impacts related to inundation by floods, tsunamis, or seiches, because the project site is not located in an area vulnerable to floods, tsunamis, or seiches. In addition, the project would not conflict with a sustainable groundwater management plan, because it would not require the use of groundwater or substantially inhibit recharge. Thus, the project would not contribute to these cumulative impacts.

IMPACT 4-13: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE WATER QUALITY IMPACTS

A cumulative impact would occur if the project, together with the cumulative projects identified in Table 4-2, would result in a result in a regional impairment of water quality. As described in the discussion of Impact 3.9-1, project construction would be subject to coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit (Order WQ 2022-0057-DWQ), which requires that a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) be prepared and implemented. The SWPPP would include specific construction best management practices that include temporary erosion control measures (e.g., installation of straw wattle, silt fence, and erosion control blanket) to reduce sedimentation and turbidity of surface runoff from disturbed areas on the project site, as well as leak and spill protection for heavy equipment and hazardous material use. The project would also be required to comply with the County's Stormwater Management Plan and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ordinance No. 5022), which include requirements for construction water quality control. Construction of the cumulative projects identified in Table 4-2 would be required to comply with the same regulations and requirements related to water quality protection.

The project involves construction and operation of eight on-site detention/water quality basins (as shown in Figure 2-9a and 2-9b) that would capture and treat runoff consistent with water quality standards in accordance with the El Dorado County West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan Requirements. The project site design also includes disconnected pavement and open space, which are additional low-impact development (LID) measures to address water quality. The LID water quality treatment measures would be designed to control the quality of stormwater runoff from the site before discharge to the surrounding waters, as required by the El Dorado County West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan Requirements. Typical measures could include the use of biofiltration planters, biofiltration basins, infiltration areas, permeable paving, localized rainwater harvesting, where feasible, and other treatment measures as approved by the County. Similar to the project, cumulative projects (e.g., Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan) would be required to comply with the El Dorado County West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan Requirements to ensure that operation of the projects would not result in significant water quality impacts.

Compliance with existing regulations and provision of drainage facilities would ensure that the project, in combination with the cumulative projects, would not result in an incremental effect that would result in a significant cumulative impact related to water quality. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative water quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-14: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE DRAINAGE AND FLOODING IMPACTS

A cumulative impact would occur if the project, together with the cumulative projects identified in Table 4-2, would result in a regional impairment of water quality due to drainage change and flooding. As addressed in the discussion of Impact 3.9-3, a storm drainage evaluation was conducted based on the proposed storm drainage facilities, as required by the County's Drainage Manual. The evaluation concluded that the proposed detention basins would direct flows to existing channels at rates below those of pre-development stormwater peak flows and would therefore reduce the existing rate of surface water flow from the project site. Development of the proposed off-site improvements would not result in a net increase in impervious surface area that could alter drainage patterns and result in on-site or off-site flooding. Therefore, with compliance with existing regulations, implementation of the project would not result in altered drainage patterns that could result in on-site or off-site flooding or impeded or redirected flood flows. The project and the proposed off-site improvements are located in areas of minimal flood hazards and not within a 100-year flood zone. Implementation of the cumulative projects would be subject to the County's Drainage Manual and the existing regulations and policies identified in Section 3.9.1 of the Draft EIR to prevent flood hazards and maintain natural drainage features. Specifically, the County's Drainage Manual requires

preparation of hydrologic and hydraulic analysis of proposed drainage facilities to ensure appropriate runoff design and controls are in place. In addition, El Dorado County General Plan Policies 5.4.1.1 and 5.4.1.2 require prevention of increased flood hazards and protection of natural drainage patterns.

Compliance with existing regulations and provision of drainage facilities would ensure that the project, in combination with the cumulative projects, would not result in an incremental effect that would result in a significant cumulative impact related to water quality due to drainage change or flooding. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative drainage and flooding impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.10 Land Use, Planning, and Agriculture and Forestry Resources

The cumulative setting for these resource areas consists of planned land uses and development under the El Dorado County General Plan for the western slope of the County, as well as reasonably foreseeable projects identified in Table 4-2.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable land use and agricultural impacts associated with the loss of Important Farmland and Williamson Act contract lands and land use compatibility impacts on new and expanded solid waste, hazardous material, energy, and school facilities under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004). The El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR also identified significant and unavoidable land use and agricultural impacts associated with the loss of Important Farmland and Williamson Act contract lands and land use compatibility impacts project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2015).

IMPACT 4-15: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE LAND USE AND PLANNING IMPACTS

As identified in Section 3.10, "Land Use, Planning, and Agriculture and Forestry Resources," the project site and surrounding area consist of residential and rural residential uses, and the project would not conflict with existing agricultural or forest production uses. The project site is not designated as Important Farmland under CEQA or zoned for agricultural uses, and it does not contain forest conditions appropriate for timber production and is not zoned for timber production uses. Thus, the project would not contribute to these cumulative impacts.

The project would not physically divide an established community. The project site is adjacent to existing communities in the surrounding area. The project does not involve rerouting any roads or altering access to nearby neighborhoods.

Although the project would amend the General Plan Land Use Diagram, the proposed residential density and project design would be consistent with the General Plan's Plan Strategies and Plan Concepts, as well as Objective 2.1.1. and associated Policy 2.1.1.2, regarding the placement of urban-type development in the El Dorado Hills Community Region. In addition, the project design includes open space buffers and estate lot sizes that range from 5.0 to 5.7 acres to buffer and transition project residential densities with surrounding land uses (see Figures 2-4 and 2-5), consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.5.21 and Objective 2.5.1 and associated Policy 2.5.1.1. As identified in the discussion of Impact 3.10-1, either the project is consistent with General Plan policy provisions that address an environmental impact, or mitigation measures have been identified in Sections 3.1 through 3.17 to mitigate environmental impacts consistent with General Plan objectives and policies.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative land use and planning impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.11 Noise and Vibration

Noise and vibration impacts associated with future development under the project are analyzed in Section 3.11, "Noise and Vibration." Noise and vibration impacts arise from and reflect project-specific characteristics and conditions, including distance to noise sources, barriers between land uses and noise sources, and other factors. Noise impacts are typically site specific and combine with other noise impacts only when cumulative development occurs close by or when traffic-related noise from a project contributes to traffic volumes on roadways in the project area. For this reason, the geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis for noise and vibration is the project vicinity.

Both the El Dorado County General Plan EIR and Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR identified significant and unavoidable noise impacts associated with construction noise, traffic noise, exposure of sensitive noise receptors to stationary noise sources, and aircraft noise under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004, 2015). The approved and proposed development in the project area identified in Table 4-2 would further contribute to identified cumulative impacts anticipated under the General Plan and the Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update.

The project site is not located within 2 miles of an airport. The airport nearest to the project site is Cameron Park Airport, located approximately 2.8 miles southeast of the project site. The project site is outside the Cameron Park Airport's 55- to 60-decibel (dB) community noise equivalent level noise contour. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport noise levels. Thus, the project would not contribute to cumulative aircraft exposure impacts.

Implementing the project would not result in development of any major sources of ground vibration, such as a commercial railway or passenger rail transit line. No existing or planned land uses in the project area would be sources of substantial and permanent ground vibration. Therefore, development facilitated by the project would not result in long-term operational activities associated with permanent or substantial levels of ground vibration. Thus, the project would not contribute to or create cumulative operational vibration impacts.

IMPACT 4-16: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND VIBRATION IMPACTS

Construction-related noise and vibration are typically considered localized impacts that affect only receptors close to construction activities. Therefore, unless construction of cumulative projects, including construction associated with the project, occurs on sites close to one another (i.e., less than 500 feet apart) and at the same time, noise and vibration from individual construction projects have little chance of combining to create cumulative impacts. There are no reasonably foreseeable projects within 500 feet of the project site that would be an additional source of construction noise or vibration. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative construction noise and vibration impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-17: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACTS

With respect to mobile-source noise levels, the cumulative context includes local roadways likely to be affected by project-related vehicles. As discussed in Section 3.11, "Noise and Vibration," project-related traffic increases would not result in a substantial noise increase on affected roadways. Traffic noise was also modeled under the cumulative context. Table 4-3 shows an increase in traffic noise between the cumulative no project scenario and the cumulative with project scenario.

Table 4-3 Summary of Modeled Traffic Noise Levels under Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Roadway	Segment	Noise (dB L_{dn}/CNEL) at 50 feet from Roadway		Change
		Cumulative No Project	Cumulative Plus Project	
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	Francisco Drive to Green Valley Road	64.5	64.7	0.2
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	Harvard Way to Francisco Parkway	68.9	69.0	0.1
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	Wilson Boulevard to Harvard Way	70.5	70.5	0.0
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	Serrano Parkway to Wilson Boulevard	70.2	70.2	0.0
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	Saratoga Way to Serrano Parkway	71.1	71.2	0.0
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	South end of Saratoga Way/US 50 WB ramp to north end of Saratoga Way/Park Drive	71.1	71.2	0.0
Latrobe Road	US 50 EB ramp to US 50 WB ramp	72.6	72.7	0.0
Silva Valley Parkway	Tong Road to Serrano Parkway	69.5	69.6	0.1
Silva Valley Parkway	Serrano Parkway to Harvard Way	68.3	68.4	0.1
Silva Valley Parkway	Harvard Way to Appian Way	65.9	66.1	0.2
Silva Valley Parkway	Appian Way to Green Valley Road	65.4	65.6	0.2
Green Valley Road	Sophia Parkway to Francisco Drive	73.8	73.9	0.2
Green Valley Road	Francisco Drive to El Dorado Hills Boulevard	72.2	72.5	0.3
Green Valley Road	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Silva Valley Parkway	71.9	72.5	0.6
Green Valley Road	Silva Valley Parkway to Loch Way	70.5	71.1	0.6
Green Valley Road	Loch Way to Malcolm Dixon Cutoff	70.3	71.0	0.7
Green Valley Road	Malcolm Dixon Cutoff to Malcolm Dixon Road	70.3	70.9	0.7
Green Valley Road	Project Driveway 2 to Deer Valley Road	70.2	70.4	0.3
Green Valley Road	Deer Valley Road to Silver Springs Parkway	70.5	70.7	0.2
Green Valley Road	Silver Springs Parkway to Bass Lake Road	70.2	70.3	0.1
Green Valley Road	Bass Lake Road to Cambridge Road	70.7	70.8	0.1
Green Valley Road	Cambridge Road to Cameron Park Drive	69.8	70.1	0.3
Green Valley Road	Malcolm Dixon Road to Project Driveway 1	70.3	70.7	0.4
Green Valley Road	Project Driveway 1 to Project Driveway 2	70.2	70.8	0.6
Francisco Drive	Green Valley Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard	67.7	67.8	0.1
Harvard Way	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Silva Valley Parkway	64.0	64.1	0.1
Serrano Parkway	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Silva Valley Parkway	66.9	66.9	0.0

Notes: CNEL = community noise level equivalent; dB = weighted decibels; EB = east-bound; L_{dn} = day-night noise level; WB = west-bound.

Source: Modeled by Ascent in 2024; based on traffic data provided by Kimley-Horn in 2022.

As shown in Table 4-3, none of the studied roadway segments would have an increase of 1.5-dB day-night noise level (L_{dn}) or more; therefore, all would meet the County's most stringent standard related to incremental noise increases designed to protect sensitive land uses from excessive traffic noise levels (General Plan Policy 6.5.1.12). Additionally, as detailed in Section 3.11, "Noise and Vibration," a 3-dB increase, or doubling of noise, would be perceptible to the human ear based on guidance from the California Department of Transportation. Thus, because none of the studied roadway segments would have a 3-dB increase or more, project-generated traffic noise in the cumulative scenario would not result in an adverse effect on sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative traffic noise impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-18: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE OPERATIONAL NOISE IMPACTS

Similar to construction-related noise impacts, stationary source noise impacts are generally localized. As a result, the context for cumulative stationary noise sources is within 500 feet of the project site. The project would include new stationary heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment and surface parking lots. However, noise from these sources would be localized and would not combine with noise from other projects. As discussed for Impact 3.11-3, noise from these sources is a consideration only within the immediate vicinity of the project site, at distances less than 100 feet from the sources. Additionally, Mitigation Measure 3.11-3 would require an acoustical assessment to be prepared before HVAC equipment is purchased and installed to ensure that HVAC noise levels would comply with the stationary noise standard of 55-dB equivalent continuous sound level (L_{eq}) and 70-dB maximum sound level (L_{max}) at receiving sensitive receptor property lines. Therefore, operational noise sources on the project site would not combine with noise from other area sources to result in a substantial increase in ambient noise.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative operational noise impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.12 Population and Housing

For population and housing, the cumulative setting encompasses El Dorado County and the El Dorado Hills Community. Table 3.12-1 in Section 3.12, "Population and Housing," presents the regional growth forecast prepared by SACOG as part of the 2020 MTP/SCS. According to SACOG's calculations, approximately 93,742 new residents are expected in the six-county region by 2040.

The El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR identified a significant and unavoidable impact associated with the inducement of substantial population growth under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2015). The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified no significant and unavoidable population and housing impacts. The approved and proposed development in the project area identified in Table 4-2 would further contribute to identified cumulative impacts anticipated under the General Plan.

IMPACT 4-19: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE POPULATION AND HOUSING IMPACTS

As identified in Section 3.12, "Population and Housing," no residential units would be permanently removed by the project, nor does the project propose or involve any actions that would displace substantial numbers of people. Thus, the project would not contribute to or create cumulative displacement impacts.

As discussed in Section 3.12, "Population and Housing," the project has the potential to add a total of 379 residential lots to the existing housing stock in El Dorado County and between 854 to 1,077 residents. However, El Dorado County anticipates an annual growth rate of approximately 0.9 percent per year between 2020 and 2030, or approximately 1,724 new residents per year. By 2040, El Dorado County anticipates a total population of 225,419, an increase of 36,413 from its current population of 189,006. As a result of an anticipated population increase, the County also would anticipate an increase in available housing added to the housing stock. Buildout of the proposed project in conjunction with buildout of other projects in the area (see Table 4-2) would result in an increase of additional population and employment opportunities.

The project site is included in SACOG's 2020 MTP/SCS as an Established Community Type and has therefore been accounted for in the growth pattern estimation for the region (SACOG 2019). The 2020 MTP/SCS forecasts approximately 2,330 new housing units in El Dorado Hills and 4,070 new housing units in the Established Community Type in El Dorado County. The project would account for approximately up to 16 percent of the total new housing units in El Dorado Hills by 2040. The project site is located in the El Dorado Hills Community Region, which by definition anticipates residential growth under the General Plan. The extension of infrastructure onto the project site, including roadways and utilities that would serve the proposed development, would not contribute to or cause additional growth to occur outside the community region boundaries or elsewhere within the vicinity of the project site, because the project site is surrounded by residential development. The proposed project would not induce substantial unanticipated population growth in the County, and the population increase would fall within the projected increase identified in the County's Housing Element Update.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative population growth impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.13 Public Services and Recreation

The cumulative setting associated with fire protection, law enforcement, public schools, and park/recreation services consists of the El Dorado Hills Fire Department (EDHFD) service area, El Dorado County Sheriff's Office West Slope patrol service area, Rescue Union School District and El Dorado Union High School District service areas, and El Dorado Hills Community Services District service area, respectively. Increases for these public services that would occur under cumulative conditions would occur as growth planned under the El Dorado County General Plan, as well as foreseeable projects located within the service area boundaries of the projects identified in Table 4-2.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts associated with fire incidents and fire hazards under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004). No significant and unavoidable public service impacts were identified in the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR. The approved and proposed development in the project area identified in Table 4-2 would further contribute to identified cumulative impacts anticipated under the General Plan.

IMPACT 4-20: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE FIRE PROTECTION IMPACTS

As identified in the discussion of Impact 3.13-1, the project is not expected to affect the ability of the fire department to meet the minimum required response time. In addition, the project proposes to include three gated emergency access routes to the site, El Dorado Irrigation District has required that the project include off-site infrastructure improvements to obtain the mandated fire flow water pressure design, and additional wildfire and emergency protection standards are built into the project design to address its contribution to cumulative fire service needs. Further, EDHFD charges a development fee based on square footage that must be paid to EDHFD for any development within its jurisdiction (Standard #A-001). Fees are collected to support the fire department's capacity to serve the development. Other planned and proposed projects within the EDHFD service area would be required to comply with EDHFD standards and pay development fees to address their impact on fire protection services.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative fire protection services impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-21: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT IMPACTS

As identified in the discussion of Impact 3.13-2, the increased population and development on the project site associated with implementing the project would increase demand for police protection services. However, the increase in demand is expected to be incremental and would not contribute to the need for construction of a new station. The gated emergency access roads on the project site would be available for use by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office in the event of emergency evacuations or other security needs. Funding considerations associated with future increased police protection staffing would be addressed by the County Board of Supervisors.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative law enforcement services impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-22: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE PUBLIC SCHOOL IMPACTS

As noted above, the geographic setting for cumulative public school impacts is the Rescue Union School District and El Dorado Union High School District service areas, which include the communities of Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, Shingle Springs, Rescue, Diamond Springs, Cold Springs, Coloma, Camino, Pollock Pines, and the city of Placerville. As growth occurs in the two school service areas, demand on the school districts' services and facilities increases. The cumulative demand in the two school districts is expected to increase as a result of implementing the project, as well as other population growth in these school districts.

Overall trends indicate declining enrollment in the Rescue Union School District and El Dorado Union High School District service areas, and implementing the project would not result in a significant cumulative impact on the schools (RUSD 2023; SchoolWorks 2018). Development associated with the project, and other reasonably foreseeable projects proposed in the school districts' service areas (Table 4-2), would be required to pay school impact fees to assist the school districts with meeting the increased demand for school services. Government Code Section 65995(h) states that the payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed under Section 17620 of the Education Code is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impact for the planning, use, development, or provision of adequate school facilities. Additionally, the school districts conduct their own environmental analysis to address proposals for new facilities and address project-level adverse environmental impacts on a case-by-case basis. Other planned and proposed projects would be required to pay school impact fees to address their impact on fire public schools.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative public school service impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-23: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE PARK AND RECREATION IMPACTS

As identified in the discussion of Impact 3.13-4, the El Dorado Hills Community Services District (CSD) and the El Dorado County General Plan use a standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents to assess the adequacy of park access to residents. The project would offset the increase on park demand associated with its development through the proposed 4-acre park site and payment of parkland dedication fees under Chapter 120.12, Conditions and Requirement, for parks development to meet park dedication requirements consistent with General Plan Objective 9.1.1 and associated Policy 9.1.1.1 and Objective 9.2.2 and associated Policy 9.2.2.2. The project would also annex into the El Dorado Hills CSD and would provide funding for park and recreation services and be subject to service fees. Other planned and proposed projects within the El Dorado Hills CSD would be required to comply with park dedication requirements to address their demand on park facilities.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative public park and recreation impacts **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.14 Transportation

The geographic context for cumulative impacts related to transportation is the unincorporated area of the County. As described in Section 3.14, "Transportation," in 2018, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) published its Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (Technical Advisory), which provides guidance for VMT analysis. The Office of Administrative Law approved the updated State CEQA Guidelines and, as of July 1, 2020, implementation of CCR Section 15064.3 of the updated State CEQA Guidelines applies statewide.

While VMT had not yet been adopted as the metric by which to analyze traffic at the time of certification of the El Dorado County General Plan EIR and Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR, those EIRs generally evaluated VMT. The General Plan EIR concluded that, under all alternatives and scenarios analyzed, implementation of the General Plan would result in an increase in countywide VMT per capita from about 27 miles to approximately 32 miles in 2025(El Dorado County (El Dorado County 2003). The Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR identified that changes in regional travel demand that are projected to occur for each study scenario include an increase in daily vehicle trips, VMT, and vehicle hours (El Dorado County 2014).

IMPACT 4-24: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ON TRANSIT, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

As described in the discussion of Impact 3.14-1, the project would include the construction of pedestrian facilities, thus enhancing active transportation mobility in the vicinity of the project site. Additionally, the project would not adversely affect any existing or planned transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of the project site. Other planned development and reasonably foreseeable projects (Table 4-2) in the region would be subject to individual environmental analysis and mitigation as applicable and would be required to comply with federal, state, and local requirements related to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-25: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ON VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

Because the project is not captured in the County's future land use projections, its cumulative impacts are analyzed in a manner consistent with 2018 conditions. OPR recommends that VMT thresholds not be recalculated for cumulative conditions; thus, the County threshold for cumulative conditions is consistent with the threshold shown in Table 3.14-2 (i.e., 19.1 VMT per capita). To determine the cumulative residential VMT per capita produced by the project, the home-based VMT for the project Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) (TAZ 630) for cumulative (2040) conditions was totaled and divided by the total residential population for the project (see Appendix D).

As shown in Table 4-4, the project's cumulative VMT per capita is 19.7, which is above the County threshold of significance of 19.1 VMT per capita. Therefore, the cumulative VMT impact from the project would be cumulatively considerable. Although implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.14-2 could assist in reducing the project's cumulative VMT impact, the effectiveness of VMT reduction strategies and the extent to which VMT would be reduced are not certain.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative VMT impacts **would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable**.

Table 4-4 Cumulative Vehicle Miles Traveled

Scenario	VMT per Capita
County Average (2018)	22.5
Threshold (15% below 2018 County Average VMT per Capita)	19.1
2040 Plus Project	19.7
VMT per Capita as a % of threshold	**103%**

Notes: % = percent; VMT = vehicle miles traveled.

Source: Kimley-Horn 2023 (Appendix I of this Draft EIR).

Mitigation Measures

No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to address this cumulative impact.

IMPACT 4-26: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE GEOMETRIC DESIGN HAZARD IMPACTS

In general, transportation hazards are site specific and not cumulative in nature. However, cumulative impacts on transportation hazards from project-generated construction effects could result if other future planned construction activities were to take place close to the project site and cumulatively combine to exacerbate the construction-related impacts of the project. As described for Impact 3.14-3, although the project would be subject to and designed in accordance with standards listed in the County Design and Improvement Standards Manual and would be reviewed by the County before implementation to address potential project safety hazards, construction activities could increase transportation-related hazards. Thus, implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.14-3 would require the project contractor to develop and submit a traffic control plan to demonstrate appropriate handling of construction vehicles and materials throughout the project area, as well as the safe navigation of vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians affected by construction. Other projects in the vicinity of the project site would also be required to comply with County standards and demonstrate to County staff that they would not contribute to construction-related transportation hazard impacts, thus minimizing the potential for cumulative transportation-related hazards.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on design hazards **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-27: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE EMERGENCY ACCESS IMPACTS

Cumulative impacts associated with emergency access or road design are primarily localized effects. For this reason, the cumulative projects with the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact associated with construction-phase emergency access and road design features are the projects located in the vicinity of the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.14-3 would require the project contractor to develop and submit a traffic control plan to demonstrate appropriate handling of construction vehicles and materials throughout the project area. As described in Chapter 2, "Project Description," the project would include an emergency access/egress EAE at Lima Way to serve as a secondary means of emergency access and evacuation that would be gated but designed to be accessible by project residents during an evacuation order. There would also be two emergency vehicle access (EVA) road connections at Marden Drive and at East Green Springs Road (to the south) that would be stubbed to the property line for emergency vehicle use. These accesses would meet the design standards for gated developments as described in Section 130.30.090(D) of the El Dorado County Code of Ordinances and the El Dorado Hills Fire Department Ordinance 2022-01. Other planned and proposed projects would be required to comply with State, County, and EDHFD standards for the provision of adequate emergency access.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on emergency access **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.15 Utilities and Service Systems

The cumulative setting for utility and service impacts consists of the El Dorado Irrigation District's (EID's) service area for water and wastewater service and the County for solid waste management. Environmental impacts associated with infrastructure improvements are project- and site-specific impacts that are addressed as part of the project's impacts addressed in this chapter, as well as in Sections 3.1 through 3.17.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts associated with water supply and wastewater flows and related infrastructure under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2004). The El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR also identified significant and unavoidable water supply impacts under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2015).

IMPACT 4-28: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE WATER SUPPLY IMPACTS

As discussed for Impact 3.15-2, EID states that 387 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) (approximately 271 acre-feet) of water supply would be required annually to accommodate the proposed residential uses, clubhouse, park site, and project site landscaping. The 2022 Water Supply and Demand Report provides updated calculations and reports that in 2022, approximately 16,910 EDUs of water supply were available in the El Dorado Hills water supply region (EID 2022). Tables 3.15-2 through 3.15-4 in Section 3.14, "Utilities and Service Systems," provide a comparison of current and secured water supply from 2025 to 2045. Central Valley Project Fazio Water of 7,500 acre-feet per year (afy) would be available starting in 2035. Future water demands identified in these tables include the development of 7,050 new residential units between 2020 and 2045 in the El Dorado Hills water supply region based on the EID 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (2020 UWMP). As identified in these tables, additional water supply above existing and anticipated water demands would be available to accommodate the project and additional growth in EID's service area through the 2045, summarized as follows:

- normal year: 31,030–34,980 afy,
- single dry year: 21,610–24,130 afy, and
- multiple dry years: 11,110–22,470 afy.

The 2020 UWMP estimates that EID will have a total of 53,073 water connections by 2045 and that the population of the El Dorado Hills region of the EID's service area is anticipated to grow by 5,769 residential units between 2025 and 2045 (EID 2021). Table 2-5 of the 2020 UWMP shows that several reasonably foreseeable projects identified in Table 4-2 (Creekside Village Specific Plan, Lime Rock Valley Specific Plan, and Village of Marble Valley Specific Plan), along with the proposed project, were factored into the water service reliability portion of the UWMP.

Based on the water availability identified in the 2020 UWMP under multiple-dry-year conditions, EID has additional water capacity to support 25,250 single-family residential units (using EID's 0.44-afy water demand factor for new single-family customers in the El Dorado Hills region of EID's service area) (EID 2021).

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on water supply **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-29: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE WASTEWATER SERVICE IMPACTS

The discussion of Impact 3.15-3 states that the project's anticipated wastewater generation of 86,640 gallons per day, combined with a current average dry weather flow (ADWF) of 2.6 million gallons per day (mgd), would be within EID's

El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant's (EDHWWTP's) permitted capacity of 4.0 mgd. As further discussed in Section 3.15, "Utilities and Service Systems," EID's Integrated Water Resources Master Plan predicts total wastewater flows of 5.45 mgd for the El Dorado Hills system after full buildout is complete in the service area (EID 2013). The future wastewater flows would be beyond the EDHWWTP's capacity. However, EID has planned expansion projects for the system. In 2013, the EDHWWTP was expanded to manage an ADWF of 4.0 mgd, and a subsequent expansion is planned to manage the predicted future flows (EID 2013: 151). EID's Capital Improvement Plan identifies project proposals to continue to expand EDHWWTP's capacity to treat future wastewater flows (EID 2023). The project and other future development in the EID service area would be required to pay connection and service fees that would fund their fair share of future conveyance and wastewater treatment facility improvements to meet future service demands.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on wastewater service **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

IMPACT 4-30: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE SOLID WASTE IMPACTS

The project is estimated to generate approximately 3.3 tons per day upon buildout. This waste would be collected by El Dorado Disposal, transferred through the Diamond Springs Materials Recovery Facility (MFR), and then delivered to the Potrero Hills Landfill. The Diamond Springs MFR, which is used to transfer landfill and recycled materials to larger facilities, uses less than one-quarter of its processing capacity per day and would be able to accommodate the construction and daily waste generated by the project, as well as accommodate anticipated growth in the County. The Potrero Hills Landfill's daily permitted capacity is 4,330 tons per day, and the current average daily disposal rate is 2,700 tons per day (CalRecycle 2023). The estimated closure date for the Potrero Hills Landfill is 2062 (ICF 2022). The project would produce less than one-half of 1 percent of the 4,330-ton permitted daily throughput for the facility. This small increase in solid waste would not consume a substantial proportion of the available permitted capacity and would not trigger the need to expand the Potrero Hills Landfill under either project or cumulative conditions. These facilities would be expanded should future growth require expansion.

In addition, El Dorado Disposal now offers biweekly organic waste collection services to residents as part of implementation of Senate Bill 1383. As the program gains popularity and as residents become more familiar with it, more waste will be diverted from the landfill per capita. The project and cumulative development would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste and solid waste reduction plans identified in Section 3.15, "Utilities and Service Systems."

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on solid waste service **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.16 Tribal Cultural Resources

The geographic scope for the analysis of cumulative impacts to archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains is the historic lands of the Nisenan or Southern Maidu people. The Nisenan territory extended to the Bear River and south of the South or Middle Fork of the Cosumnes River. The historic lands of the Nisenan people have been affected by development since the arrival of the first Spanish settlers in the late 1770s. The Gold Rush of the 1850s, the economic and agricultural development of El Dorado County, and commerce and trade within the historic communities associated with Green Valley has also impacted these lands. In addition, both the Sacramento-Coloma Road and the Sacramento and Placerville Wagon Road developed from a circuitous trail used by emigrants and miners between 1848 and 1850 impacted Nisenan lands. These activities have resulted in an existing significant adverse effect on tribal cultural resources.

Assembly Bill 52 was not in effect at the time of the preparation of the El Dorado County General Plan EIR and Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR. However, both EIRs did evaluate potential impacts to archaeological resources that could include tribal cultural resources. Although the El Dorado County General Plan EIR did not identify any significant and unavoidable archeological resource impacts, the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts on archaeological resources under project and cumulative conditions (El Dorado County 2015).

The approved and proposed development in the project area identified in Table 4-2 would further contribute to identified cumulative impacts to archaeological resources (as well as tribal cultural resources) anticipated under the General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update.

IMPACT 4-31: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS

As identified in Section 3.16, "Tribal Cultural Resources," no known tribal cultural resources have been identified within the boundaries of the proposed project site. However, project-related earth-disturbing activities could damage undiscovered tribal cultural resources. The project, in combination with other developments in the region (Table 4-2), could contribute to ongoing substantial adverse changes in the significance of tribal cultural resources resulting from urban development and conversion of natural lands. Cumulative development could result in potentially significant tribal cultural resource impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.16-1a and 3.16-1b would ensure that the proposed project's contribution to cumulatively significant tribal cultural resources impacts would not be considerable by level by requiring the performance of professionally accepted and legally compliant procedures in the event of a discovery, as well as the protection of any previously undocumented significant archaeological resources and establishing protective fencing around P-55-5445's rock outcrop. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.16-1a and 3.16-1b, the project's contribution to these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Further, cumulative development would be required to implement similar mitigation to avoid/reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

4.4.17 Wildfire and Evacuation

As identified in Section 3.17, Wildfire and Evacuation," wildland fires affect grass, forest, and brush lands, as well as any structures located within them. Where there is human access to wildland areas, such as the Sierra Nevada and foothills areas, the risk of fire increases due to a greater chance for human carelessness and historical fire management practices. Within El Dorado County, the area starting in the foothills just east of El Dorado Hills and extending east, as well as north and south to the County lines is most vulnerable and prone to wildfire due to the climate, topography, and vegetation. Wildfires may occur in areas of El Dorado County, including the most populated areas of El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park/Shingle Springs, Placerville, Camino/Pollock Pines and South Lake Tahoe.

As identified in the El Dorado County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, El Dorado County and the incorporated cities have a variety of systems and procedures for warnings and evacuation activities. Specific warning and evacuation systems and procedures include Code Red alter system, dam protocols, evacuation recommendations, and shelter in place.

IMPACT 4-32: CONTRIBUTE TO CUMULATIVE WILDFIRE AND EVACUATION IMPACTS

As identified in Impact 3.17-2 through 3.17-4, fire protection and prevention measures for project construction, operation, and maintenance of open space areas are addressed in the Generations at Green Valley Wildland Urban Interface Fire Protection Plan (Fire Safe Plan or FSP) provided in Appendix J. The FSP addresses potential impacts resulting from wildland fire hazards and identifies measures necessary to mitigate these hazards in conformance with CCR Title 14, Sections 1270 through 1276 (Fire Safe Regulations), CCR Title 24, Part 9, Section 4903 (Plans), El Dorado County Fire Protection Standard W-002 (Wildland Interface Fire Protection Plans), and El Dorado County General Plan Policy 6.2.2.2. This plan identifies fuel modification/management zones and recommends the types and methods of treatment that protect this project and its essential infrastructure. In addition, this FSP recommends enhanced fire protection measures that the project homeowner's association, and individual property owners take to reduce the probability of structural ignition during the occupancy phase of the project. The provision of defensible space and the associated reduction of vegetative fuels have specifically been found to be effective at reducing fire frequency, fire severity, and annual area burned over an extended period of time. Where treatments have occurred, the pattern of wildfire progression may be limited to low-intensity underbrush and surface burning, which can create safe conditions for firefighters to successfully suppress fires in areas near structures, or around areas of high resource value (Kim et al. 2013; Martinson and Omi 2013; Tubbesing et al. 2019). Implementation of the FSP would offset the potential for the project to increase wildfire hazards under cumulative conditions.

In addition to wildfire protection and prevention, the FSP addresses the project's proposed emergency access roads and whether the project could adversely impact or delay evacuation efforts in the project area. As identified in the FSP and Impact 3.17-1, the inclusion of the project traffic in addition to existing residential land uses in the project would not result in an adverse impact on evacuation efforts or timing. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.17-1 would ensure improved evacuation traffic flow along Green Valley Road by controlling traffic signals at Green Valley Road at A-Drive, Silva Valley Parkway, El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Francisco Drive, at Pleasant Grove Middle School, and Silver Springs Parkway intersections during evacuations.

The approved and proposed development in the project area identified in Table 4-2 would also be require to prepare fire safe plans to address their impact to wildfire hazards in conformance with the fire regulations identified above.

Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on wildfire hazards and evacuation would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.