



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: S09-0022/AT&T Communications Tower – Placerville

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

Contact Person: Tom Dougherty

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Project Applicant's Name and Address: AT&T, 4430 Rosewood Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588

Project Agent's Name and Address: Jacob Reeves, The Lyle Company, 156 Gilded Rock Circle, Folsom, CA 95630

Project Engineer's Name and Address: PDC Corporation, 1062 Concannon Blvd., Livermore, CA 94550

Project Location: Southeast corner of the intersection of Kelli Drive and Cold Springs Road in the Placerville area.

Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 323-250-32 and 33

Acres: 3.55

Zoning: One-Acre Residential (R1A)

Section: 12 **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Description of Project: Construction and operation of a new wireless communications facility to support cellular transmission consisting of a 68-foot tall monopine tower. The branches would begin at the 15-foot level. Up to 12 antennas would be installed at the 60-foot centerline, and two microwave dishes at the 50-foot centerline. The tower is proposed to be located within a 30-foot by 30-foot area, enclosed by a six-foot tall, redwood fence and a ten-foot wide double swing redwood gate, and include one 16-foot by 8-foot concrete stoop just outside the gates. The antennas will have stealth sock covers to match the existing tree foliage and the mounts will be painted to match the color of the proposed monopine. Up to nine equipment cabinets are proposed to be mounted within the fenced enclosure. The fenced in area for the tower is proposed have a concrete pad to also allow for future development to accommodate up to two future co-locater's ground support equipment, depending on their technology and equipment requirements. The monopine is proposed to accommodate up to three total antenna arrays. The number of carriers that allows depends on the size of the array antennas, but potentially three total including the current applicants. Telco and electric would be undergrounded within a three-foot wide easement approximately 101 feet from an existing power pole located at the northwest parcel corner to the lease area. No permanent generator or exterior air conditioners are proposed. One service light is proposed to allow for potential emergency night services.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

| | <u>Zoning</u> | <u>General Plan</u> | <u>Land Use (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park)</u> |
|--------|---------------|---------------------|---|
| Site: | R1A | MDR | Residential/Vacant except for an asphalted turnaround driveway. |
| North: | RA-20 | MDR | Residential/Single-family residence across Cold Springs Road. |
| East: | R1A | MDR | Open space/Vacant. California Department of Parks and Recreation owned. |
| South: | R1A | MDR | Residential/Single-family residence. |
| West: | R1A0 | MDR | Residential/Single-family residence. |

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The site is located on two parcels totaling 3.55-acres. They are located at the 1,760-foot elevation above sea level. The two parcels contain primary and secondary dwellings and a carport, each sharing an asphalted turnaround driveway. The parcel is surrounded on two sides by roads. The vegetation surrounding the proposed tower site includes a few native oak trees in the northwest corner and an existing eight-foot tall redwood fence covered with vines partially buffering the north and west boundaries. The majority of the site contains annual grassland.

| |
|--|
| Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement) |
| 1. Building Services |
| 2. Department of Transportation |
| 3. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District |
| 4. El Dorado County Resource Conservation District |
| 5. El Dorado County Fire Protection District |

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED


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


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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by Mitigation Measures based on the earlier analysis as described in attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, pursuant to applicable standards; and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or Mitigation Measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature:  Date: 4/6/10
 Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Project Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature:  Date: 4-6-10
 Printed Name: Pierre Rivas, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from a residential and commercial development.

Project Description

The project would allow the construction of a wireless communications facility to include a 100-foot tall monopine tower to support cellular transmission. The project would include a 68-foot tall monopine tower to support cellular transmission. The facility is proposed to include 12 antennas at the 60-foot level with ground support equipment to be located in a 30-foot by 30-foot fenced lease area.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within a Community Region. The surrounding parcels have residential uses or are designated for medium density residential uses by the General Plan. The closest residence to the project site is approximately 200 feet to the west.

Project Characteristics

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the project would be provided from an encroachment onto Cold Springs Road which is a County maintained roadway. DOT determined that because there would be a low volume of traffic generated by the project (approximately one trip per month after construction), a traffic study would not be required. The proposed access road and turnaround to the fenced lease area would travel approximately 160 feet from the Cold Springs Road easement. The encroachment access onto Cold Springs Road was found by DOT to be adequate as was the turnaround at the lease area by El Dorado County Fire Projection District.

Parking standards have been met for the project with the turnaround at the lease area for maintenance vehicles. No impacts to parking would occur as part of the project.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

There are existing phone and electrical facilities which would be extended within the parcel to the tower facilities.

3. Population

The project would not impact population.

4. Construction Considerations

Interior access driveway construction and grading would not be required for the project. The extension of existing utilities would require trenching. A building permit would be required for the communications facility components. A typical cellular communications tower site would take between three to six weeks to construct and that does not include every single day within that time frame.

The proposed project is not within the Asbestos Review Area. The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the project and concluded that a Dust Mitigation Plan would need to be adhered to during the construction process.

Project Schedule and Approvals

This Initial Study is being circulated for public and agency review for a 30-day period. Written comments on the Initial Study should be submitted to the project planner indicated in the Summary section, above.

Following the close of the written comment period, the Initial Study will be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency will also determine whether to approve the project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of Mitigation Measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the Mitigation Measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | X |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | X |
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character quality of the site and its surroundings? | | X | |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | X | |

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista.

- a. **Scenic Vista:** The project site is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (El Dorado County Planning Services, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). There would be no impact
- b. **Scenic Resources:** The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>)). There would be no impact.
- c. **Visual Character:** The project is designed and conditioned to resemble a pine tree in shape and color. The tower pole would be painted a dark-brown and the branches would begin 15 feet above ground level. The ground equipment would be buffered from up-close ground view by an eight-foot tall redwood board fence and native shrubs planted around the fenced lease area. The antennas would be painted with green, non-reflective paint to blend in with the “branches.” Zoning Ordinance Sections 17.14.210 F & G require screening in order to reduce the aesthetics impacts to a less than significant level. The project has been conditioned to add landscaping as shown in the Staff Report Exhibits using toyon shrubs. As conditioned, and with strict adherence to applicable County Code, impacts in this category would be reduced below a level of significance
- d. **Light and Glare:** One sconce-type light would be located on the equipment shelter building. The light would be controlled by motion sensor or timer. The applicant has shown the light would conform to Section 17.14.170, of the County Code requiring all the lights to be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America’s (IESNA) full cut-off designation. As designed and conditioned, impacts from outdoor lighting would be less than significant.

FINDING: As conditioned, and with strict adherence to County Code, for this “Aesthetics” category, impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | | | | X |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? | | | | X |
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | | | | X |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | X |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | X |

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
 - The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
 - Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.
- a. **Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program:** Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that the project site contains BhD (Boomer gravelly loam, with 15 to 30 percent slopes). This soil type is not classified as unique, soils of local importance or either prime farmland, statewide important farmland. There would be no impact.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract:** The property is not located within a Williamson Act Contract and would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract. There would be no impact.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

- c. **Non-Agricultural Use:** No conversion of agriculture land would occur as a result of the project. There would be no impact.
- d, e. **Loss of Forest land or Conversion of Forest land, Conversion of Prime Farmland or Forest Land:** Neither the General Plan nor the Zoning Ordinance designate the site as an important Timberland Preserve Zone. The serpentine rock-based soils do not promote timber growth due to the high magnesium content. As discussed above in Section a, there would be no loss or conversion of prime farmland as well. There would be no impact.

FINDING For this “Agriculture” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no impacts would result from the project.

| III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | X | |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | X | |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | X | |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | X |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | X |

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a. **Air Quality Plan:** El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). Any activities associated to the grading and construction of this project would pose a less than significant impact on air quality because the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) would require that the project implement a Dust Mitigation Plan during grading and construction

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

activities. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions below a level of significance.

- b, c. Air Quality Standards and Cumulative Impacts:** The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) reviewed the application materials for this project and determined that by implementing typical conditions that are included in the project permit, that the project would have a less than significant level of impact in this category. The conditions would be implemented as part of an Dust Mitigation Plan (DMP) and would be reviewed and approved by the AQMD prior to and concurrently with the grading, improvement, and/or building permit approvals. With full review with consistency with General Plan Policies, impacts would be less than significant.

The project would create air quality impacts which may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction. Construction activities associated with the project include grading and site improvements, for utilities, driveway, monopine pole installation, graveling, fence and landscape installation, and associated on-site activities. Construction related activities would generate PM10 dust emissions that would exceed either the state or federal ambient air quality standards for PM10. This is a temporary but potentially significant effect. A typical cellular communications tower site would take between three to six weeks to construct and that does not include every single day within that time frame. Standard Conditions of Approval would limit the hours of construction activities to 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am to 5:00pm on weekends and federally recognized holidays. Adherence to the limitations of construction and to the ADMP would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Operational air quality impacts would be minor, and would cause an insignificant contribution to existing or projected air quality violations. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

- d. Sensitive Receptors:** The CEQA Guide identifies sensitive receptors as facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others that are especially sensitive to the affects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools and convalescent hospitals are examples of sensitive receptors. No sensitive receptors were identified in the vicinity of the subject parcel. There would be no impacts.
- e. Objectionable Odors:** Table 3-1 of the *El Dorado County APCD CEQA Guide* (February, 2002) does not list the proposed cellular communications facility use as a use known to create objectionable odors. There would be no impact.

FINDING: The proposed project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The project would result in increased emissions due to construction and operation; however existing regulations would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Additional impacts to air quality would be less than significant. The proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts.

| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|----------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | X | |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or | | | | X |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | | X |
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | | X |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | X | |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | | | X |

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

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

a. Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities: Review of the County GIS soil data demonstrates the project site would not be located on lands shown to contain Serpentine Rock or Gabbro soils. Search of the California Natural Diversity database indicates there are none of the rare, threatened, or endangered species on the site. The project is located within County Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2 and would be subject to payment of a mitigation fee. The site has been developed for residential use since 1958. Impacts would be less than significant.

b, c. Riparian Habitat, Wetlands: The project is not located within a sensitive natural community of the County, state or federal agency, including but not limited to an Ecological Preserve or USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries.

Potentially Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.: The site does not support potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. There would be no impacts.

d. Migration Corridors: The project proposes to preserve all areas of the parcel that have existing trees and shrubs and are presently used by wildlife. Review of the Deer Herd map indicates the project is not located within a mapped deer herd area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e. Local Policies: Biological Resources: General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires protection of native oak tree canopy. The project does not propose to remove oak trees. There would be no impact.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

f. **Adopted Plans:** This project, as designed, does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. There would be no impact in this category.

FINDING: This site is not located within the County's adopted Ecological Preserve or within the USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries. No jurisdictional wetlands are present at the project site. With strict adherence to applicable County Codes, impacts on Biological Resources would be less than significant.

| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? | | | X |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? | | | X |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | X |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | | X |

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

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

a-c. **Historic or Archeological Resources:** The submitted North Central Information Center records research document, dated October 7, 2009 found there was a low possibility that the project would affect significant prehistoric and historic-period cultural resources sites, artifacts, historic buildings, structures or objects found. Based on the submitted report and the fact the entire parcel has been developed for residential uses since 1958, the presence of historical or archeological resources is remote. Standard Conditions of Approval would be required which require protective measures be implemented during project construction in the event of accidental discovery of historic or archeological resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. **Human Remains:** There is a small likelihood of human remain discovery on the project site. During all grading activities, standard Conditions of Approval would be required that address accidental discovery of human remains. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: Standard Conditions of Approval would be required with requirements for accidental discovery during project construction. This project would have a less than significant impact within the Cultural Resources category.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | | | X |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | X | |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | X |
| iv) Landslides? | | X | |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | X | |
| c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | | X | |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property? | | X | |
| e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | | | X |

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

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

a. Seismic Hazards:

i) According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, there are no Alquist-Priolo fault zones within El Dorado County. The nearest such faults are located in Alpine and Butte Counties. There would be no impact.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

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

iii) El Dorado County is considered an area with low potential for seismic activity. There are no potential areas for liquefaction on the project site as there are no wetland features or soil fill areas. There would be no impacts.

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

b. Soil Erosion: All grading activities exceeding 50 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* Adopted by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, 3-13-07 (Ordinance #4719). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. There would be the potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions with future development. These concerns would be addressed during the grading permit process. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. Geologic Hazards: The onsite soil types have a slow to medium runoff potential with medium to moderate erosion potentials. All grading activities would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. Expansive Soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the parcel is located on BhD, Boomer gravelly loam soil which has a low shrink-swell capacity. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. All grading activities would comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. Septic Capability: The project would not require a septic system use. There would be no impacts related to septic systems.

FINDING: A review of the soils and geologic conditions on the project site determined that the soil types are suitable for the proposed development. All grading activities would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would address potential impacts related to soil erosion, landslides and other geologic impacts. Future development would be required to comply with the Uniform Building Code which would address potential seismic related impacts. For this 'Geology and Soils' category impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | | | X |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | X |

a. Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions: The project could result in the generation of green house gasses, which could contribute to global climate change. However, the amount of greenhouse gases generated by the project would be negligible compared to global emissions or emissions in the County, so the project would not substantially contribute cumulatively to global climate change. These measures are included as standard grading permit requirements and would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

b. Conflict with Policy: The project would result in the generation of green house gasses, which could contribute to global climate change. However, the amount of greenhouse gases generated by the project would be negligible compared to global emissions or emissions in the county, so the project would not substantially contribute cumulatively to global climate change. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDING: The project would generate amounts of greenhouse gases would be negligible compared to global emissions or emissions in the County. For this ‘Greenhouse Gas Emissions’ category impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | X |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | | X |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | | X |
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | | | X |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | X |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | X |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | X |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | X |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect due to Hazards or Hazardous Materials would occur if implementation of the project would:

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

a, b. Hazardous Materials: The American National Standards Institute and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) have published a standard called ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992, which until recently set recommended maximum power density levels for radio frequency (RF) energy originating from communication sites and other sources. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has also produced its own guidelines, which are more stringent and supersede the ANSI standard. The FCC rules categorically exclude certain transmitting facilities from routine evaluations for compliance with the RF emission guidelines if it can be determined that it would be unlikely to cause workers or the general public to become exposed to emission that exceed the guidelines. The following table represents the FCC limits for both occupational and general population exposures to different radio frequencies:

| Frequency Range (F) (MHz) | Occupational Exposure (mW/cm ²) | General Public Exposure (mW/cm ²) |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| 0.3-1.34 | 100 | 100 |
| 1.34-3.0 | 100 | 180/F ² |
| 3.0—30 | 900/F ² | 180/F ² |
| 30-300 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| 300-1,500 | F/300 | F/1500 |
| 1,500-100,000 | 5.0 | 1.0 |

A radio frequency emissions analysis report of findings was prepared by AT&T Mobility dated September 17, 2009 for the project. Based on the submitted study, the maximum power density at ground level operations at the base of the tower would be 0.07 percent of the uncontrolled standard as set by the FCC. Therefore, the risk of release of hazardous materials or emissions to the public is remote.

The project would not introduce, transport, store, or dispose of hazardous materials in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

- c. **Hazardous Materials Near Schools:** The project would not directly allow any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There are no schools within one-quarter mile of the project. There would be no direct impact.
- d. **Hazardous Sites:** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List). No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the subject site are known to have occurred. There would be no direct impact with the approval of this project request.
- e. **Aircraft Hazards:** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrips:** There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impact.
- g. **Emergency Plan:** The proposed project would not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the project area. There would be no impact.
- h. **Wildfire Hazards:** The project site is in an area of very high hazard for wildland fire pursuant to Figure V.4-2 of the 1996 General Plan Draft EIR and Figure 5.8-4 of the 2004 General Plan Draft EIR. Compliance with the conditions required by the Garden Valley Fire Protection District and implementation of California Building Codes would reduce the impacts of wildland fire to a less than significant level.

FINDING: The proposed project would not expose the area to hazards relating to the use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. Any proposed use of hazardous materials would be subject to review and approval of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan issued by the Environmental Management. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District would require Conditions of Approval to reduce potential hazards relating to wild fires. For this 'Hazards and Hazardous Materials' category, impacts would be less than significant.

| XI. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | X |
| b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | X |
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site? | | | X |
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | X |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

| XI. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | X | |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | X | |
| g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | X |
| h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | X |
| i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | | | X |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | X |

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
 - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a. **Water Quality Standards.** Erosion control would be required of the future building/grading permit and strict adherence to County Code would not increase the level of sediments in stormwater discharges significantly more at the site than the current discharge levels. Operation of the proposed project would not involve any uses that would generate wastewater. Stormwater runoff from potential development would be directed to an engineered drainage system and would contain water quality protection features in accordance with a potential NPDES stormwater permit, as deemed applicable. The project would not violate water quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Groundwater Supplies.** The project would initially use groundwater from an existing water source supplied by a domestic water supply to support the landscaping required to buffer the fenced lease area. The proposed landscape plan includes plants native to the site vicinity. The dependence on supplemental water would be short-term until the plants are established at which time it would be unnecessary. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c-f. **Drainage Patterns.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit stormwater runoff and discharge from a site. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

not meeting those objectives would be required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. Compliance with an approved erosion control plan would reduce erosion and siltation on and off site. A grading permit through Development Services and encroachment permit through El Dorado County Department of Transportation would be required for any future development to address grading, erosion and sediment control. Project related construction activities would be required to adhere to the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would require Best Management Practices (BMP's) to minimize degradation of water quality during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

- g-j. Flood-related Hazards.** The project site is not located within any mapped 100-year flood areas and would not result in the construction of any structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. No dams are located in the project area which would result in potential hazards related to dam failures. The risk of exposure to seiche, tsunami, or mudflows would be remote. There would be no impact.

FINDING: The proposed project would require a site improvement and grading permit through the El Dorado County Building Services that would address erosion and sediment control. No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the development of the project either directly or indirectly. For this "Hydrology" category, impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| X. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| a. Physically divide an established community? | | | X |
| b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | | X |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | X |

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Land Use would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
 - Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
 - Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
 - Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
 - Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.
- a. Established Community:** The project site is a partially developed parcel in a residential zone district that is surrounded by single-family residences. The project would provide improved wireless cellular telecommunications within a Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designated area. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community within a Community Region Planning Concept area. Impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

- b. **Land Use Consistency:** Operation of the proposed cell tower in an area zoned for One-Acre Residential (RIA) would allowed with a Special Use Permit under Section 17.14.200 D 5 (b) of the County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use would not conflict with the MDR General Plan land use designation for the site. The applicant has designed the wireless facility in compliance with County regulations, addressing aesthetics and health and safety concerns. As conditioned, and with strict adherence to County Code, impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan:** The proposed project is not located in an area covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or a Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). There would be no impact.

FINDING: The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the zoning and the General Plan with the issuance of a Special Use Permit. There would be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan or zoning designations for use of the property. As conditioned, and with strict adherence to County Code, no significant impacts are expected. For this "Land Use" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | | | X |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | | | X |

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

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

a-b. **Mineral Resources:** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist are present, (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001), and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. (El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7). There would be no impacts.

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

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| XII. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i> | | | |
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | X | |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | X |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

| XII. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i> | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | X | |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | X |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level? | | | X |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | X |

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect due to Noise would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL;
 - Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
 - Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- b. **Ground borne Shaking:** The project may generate ground borne vibration or shaking events during project construction. These potential impacts would be limited to project construction. Adherence to the time limitations of construction activities to 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am to 5:00pm on weekends and federally recognized holidays would limit the ground shaking effects in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Short-term Noise Increases:** Short-term noise impacts would be associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities. El Dorado County would require that all construction vehicles and equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with properly maintained and functioning mufflers. All construction and grading operations would be required to comply with the noise performance standards contained in the General Plan.

The subject parcel adjoins Cold Springs Road to the north and Kelli Drive to the west. Routine maintenance visits would occur once a month. Changes in traffic-generated noise levels along these roads with the addition of the maintenance vehicle(s) would not be measurable. Construction of the facility would consist of moderate grading for the lease area, setting the monopine, placing ground equipment within the lease area, installing nine equipment cabinets, laying gravel, installing a chain link fence and landscape plants. These activities would occur weekdays only over an approximately four- to six-week period during daylight hours, on intermittent days, and would not involve extensive use of heavy equipment that would be a substantial source of noise or vibration at the residence. The short-term noise increases would potentially exceed the thresholds established by the General Plan. This is a potentially significant impact. Standard Conditions of Approval would limit the hours of construction activities to 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday through Friday and 8:00am to 5:00pm on weekends and federally recognized holidays. Adherence to the limitations of construction would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

a, d. Noise Exposures, Long-term Noise Increases: The project does not include air conditioners nor a backup generator however, nine equipment cabinets are proposed. An acoustic dispersion specifications sheet for the cabinets was submitted for the project. That report shows noise levels would not exceed those dictated by General Plan Table 6-2. As proposed, the project would not increase the ambient noise levels in the area in excess of the General Plan established noise thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

e-f. Aircraft Noise: There are no airstrips or airports within the project vicinity. There would be no impacts.

FINDING: As conditioned, and with strict adherence to County Code, no significant impacts to excessive noise are expected with the development of the wireless telecommunications facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | | | X |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | X |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | X |

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

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

a-c. Population Growth, Housing Displacement, Replacement Housing: No housing or people would be displaced. Routine maintenance visits to the facility would be limited to employees or SBA Tower approved maintenance personnel. There would be no impact.

FINDING: The project would not displace housing. There would be no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the communications facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i> | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| a. Fire protection? | | X | |
| b. Police protection? | | | X |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i> | | | |
| c. Schools? | | | X |
| d. Parks? | | | X |
| e. Other government services? | | | X |

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

- Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department's/District's goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;
 - Substantially increase or expand the demand for public law enforcement protection without increasing staffing and equipment to maintain the Sheriff's Department goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents;
 - Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services;
 - Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources;
 - Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
 - Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.
- a. Fire Protection:** The parcel is within the El Dorado County Fire Protection District. The proposed project would construct a fenced ground equipment enclosure and monopine tower. The new, unoccupied facility would represent a minimal increase in the demand for structural fire protection at the project site. The project would be conditioned by the District to meet Fire Safe regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Police Protection:** Police services would continue to be provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department. No new or expanded law enforcement services would be required. There would be no impact.
- c-e. Schools, Parks and Government Services:** There are no components of operating the proposed project that would include any permanent population-related increases that would substantially contribute to increased demand on schools, parks, or other governmental services that could, in turn, result in the need for new or expanded facilities. There would be no impact.

FINDING: As discussed above, no significant impacts would be to public services with the communications facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Public Services" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

| XV. RECREATION. | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | | | X |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | | | X |

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

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

a, b. Parks and Recreational Services: The proposed project does not include any increase in permanent population that would contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. There would be no impact.

FINDING: No impacts to recreation would be expected for this wireless telecommunications facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Recreation" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | | | X |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | X |
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | | | X |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | | X |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | X |
| f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety | | | X |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | |
| of such facilities? | | | | |

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

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
 - Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
 - Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.
- a. **Traffic Increases:** Comments were received from the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) indicating that the level of service (LOS) would not be significantly impacted by the proposed project. The impacts would be less than significant.
 - b. **Levels of Service Standards:** The LOS established by the County would not be exceeded by the project, nor would the surrounding road circulation system be impacted. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - c. **Air Traffic:** The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - d. **Design Hazards:** The project would not create any significant traffic hazards. The proposed encroachment would be designed and constructed to County standards. The DOT analysis did not identify any hazards associated with the design of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - e. **Emergency Access:** The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The project includes recommended Conditions of Approval by El Dorado County Department of Transportation and Garden Valley Fire Protection District to ensure that adequate access would be provided to meet County Fire Safe and County Design Improvement Manual standards. Impacts would be less than significant
 - f. **Alternative Transportation:** The project would not conflict with adopted plans, policies or programs relating to alternative transportation. There would be no impact.

FINDING: As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected with the wireless telecommunications facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | X |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | X | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

| XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | X |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | X |
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | X |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | X |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | X |

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

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

a. Wastewater Requirements: Construction and operation of the project would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. Stormwater runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). There would be no impact.

b, d, e. Construction of New Facilities, Sufficient Water Supply and Adequate Capacity: No new or expanded wastewater facilities would be required for the project because operation would not require these services. The shrubs for buffering would utilize the existing hose bib fed by domestic water. The proposed shrubs would require supplemental water when established and a water source would no longer be needed. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. New Stormwater Facilities: All required drainage facilities for the project would be built in conformance with the standards contained in the "County of El Dorado Drainage Manual," as determined by Development Services and DOT. The project would be conditioned to comply with the County requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

f, g. Solid Waste Disposal and Solid Waste Requirements: Operation of the ground equipment shelter would not generate solid waste or affect recycling goals. There would be no impact.

FINDING: No significant utility and service system impacts are expected with the wireless telecommunications facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Utilities and Service Systems" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project: | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| a. Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | | X |
| b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | | | X |
| c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | X |

Discussion:

- a. No substantial evidence contained in the project record has been found that would indicate that this project would have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment when using thresholds pre-established pursuant to Code as a benchmark. As conditioned, mitigated, and with strict adherence to County permit requirements, this project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project would be less than significant due to the design of the project and required standards that would be implemented by any required project specific improvements on or off the property.
- b. The project would not result in significant cumulative impacts. The project would not require the extension of infrastructure or utilities outside of the road and public utility easement for the driveway encroachment, and to connect Telco and electrical power to the existing PG&E pole at the northwest parcel corner. As conditioned, and with strict adherence to county Code, and with the approval of a Special Use Permit, the project would be consistent with the existing General Plan Land Use Designation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. The project would include standard Conditions of Approval required for screening and buffering the tower ground equipment, fencing and pole base with native plant landscaping which would apply to project construction. Adherence to these standard conditions would reduce potential impacts to less than significant. As discussed in the Noise section, the increases in noise levels would be intermittent and would not exceed the thresholds for interior or exterior noise as established by the County General Plan. Short term noise increases in the project area as a result of project construction would be reduced by standard Conditions of Approval regarding hours and days of

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

construction. Any future development of the project by future carriers would require environmental review through the Special Use Permit revision process. As conditioned, and with strict adherence to County Code, impacts would be less than significant.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Planning Services in Placerville.

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9
Appendix A
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

El Dorado County General Plan – A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief (Adopted July 19, 2004)

Findings of Fact of the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors for the General Plan

El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 - County Code)

County of El Dorado Drainage Manual (Resolution No. 67-97, Adopted March 14, 1995)

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170)

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards Manual

El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinances (Title 16 - County Code)

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.)

Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (Section 15000, et seq.)

Project Specific Resource Material

RBS 2106 Equipment Cabinet acoustic dispersion specifications sheet.

North Central Information Center records research document, dated October 7, 2009

Radio Frequency Analysis report, prepared by AT&T Mobility dated September 17, 2009