

## NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**FILE:** S11-0013

**PROJECT NAME:** AT&T Telecommunications Tower-Hilltop Lane

**NAME OF APPLICANT:** AT&T

**ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.:** 319-210-05

**SECTION:** 36 T: 10N R: 9E

**LOCATION:** West side of Hilltop Lane approximately 0.5 miles southwest of the intersection of Red Rock Lane and Tennessee Drive, in the Shingle Springs area.

- GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT:**                      **FROM:**                      **TO:**
- REZONING:**    **FROM:**
- TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP**     **SUBDIVISION**  
**SUBDIVISION (NAME):**
- SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW** the construction of a wireless telecommunication facility consisting of an 84-foot tall monopine tower with, with 6 antennas mounted at the 58-foot level, and 6 antennas mounted at the 68-foot level. The facility is also proposed to include an 11.5-foot by 20-foot prefabricated ground equipment shelter to house equipment cabinets and associated equipment, to be enclosed within a 6-foot tall chain link fenced area with vinyl slats, within a 29-foot by 27-foot lease area.
- OTHER:**

---

---

**REASONS THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:**

- NO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS WERE IDENTIFIED DURING THE INITIAL STUDY.**
- MITIGATION HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED WHICH WOULD REDUCE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.**
- OTHER:**

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

This Negative Declaration was adopted by the Planning Commission on \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Secretary



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

**INITIAL STUDY  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

**Project Title:** Special Use Permit S11-0013/AT&T Telecommunications Tower-Hilltop Lane

**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, RE: Site CN1201, Shingle Springs, CA, 4430 Rosewood Drive, Building 3, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Pleasanton, CA 94588

**Project Agent's Name and Address:** Rebekah Anderson, SAC Wireless, P.O. Box 2088, West Sacramento, CA 95691

**Project Engineer's Name and Address:** Larry Houghtby, Streamline Engineering and Design, Inc., 3268 Penryn Road, Suite 200, Loomis, CA 95650

**Project Location:** West side of Hilltop Lane approximately 0.5 miles southwest of the intersection of Red Rock Lane and Tennessee Drive, in the Shingle Springs area, in El Dorado County.

**Assessor's Parcel Number:** 319-210-05

**Acres:** 6.03

**Zoning:** Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5)

**Section:** 36      **T:** 10N    **R:** 9E

**General Plan Designation:** Low Density Residential (LDR)

**Description of Project:** Request for a special use permit to allow the construction of a wireless telecommunication facility consisting of an 84-foot tall monopine tower with, with 6 antennas mounted at the 58-foot level, and 6 antennas mounted at the 68-foot level. The facility is also proposed to include an 11.5-foot by 20-foot prefabricated ground equipment shelter to house equipment cabinets and associated equipment, to be enclosed within a 6-foot tall chain link fenced area with vinyl slats, within a 29-foot by 27-foot lease area.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

|              | <b>Zoning</b> | <b>General Plan</b> | <b>Land Use/Improvements</b>         |
|--------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Site</b>  | RE-5          | LDR                 | Residential/Single-family residence  |
| <b>North</b> | RE-5          | LDR                 | Residential/Vacant                   |
| <b>South</b> | RE-5          | LDR                 | Residential/Single-family residences |
| <b>East</b>  | RE-5          | LDR                 | Residential/Single-family residences |
| <b>West</b>  | RE-5          | LDR                 | Residential/Single-family residences |

**Briefly Describe the environmental setting:** The site is located on a 6.03-acre parcel that is located between the 1,400 and 1,560 foot elevations above sea level. There is an existing single family dwelling, a garage and two small storage sheds. The existing asphalted access driveway travels uphill and dead ends at the top of the knoll where the buildings are located. The topography slopes sharply downhill in all directions except north. Approximately 80 percent of the site is covered with tree canopy. Tennessee Creek, classified as an intermittent stream on the Shingle Springs U.S.G.S. 7.5 Minute Quadrangle, runs through the western portion of the project parcel at a distance of approximately 740 feet from the proposed lease area.

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

1. Building Services-Grading and Building Permits
2. El Dorado County Environmental Management-Hazardous Waste Division.
3. Air Quality Management District-Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan

**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: Tom Dougherty Date: 12-30-11  
 Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Project Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: Pierre Rivas Date: 12-30-11  
 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. This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. The project would allow the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility.

### **Project Description**

The project would allow the construction of a wireless telecommunication facility consisting of an 84-foot tall monopine tower with, with 6 antennas, an 11.5-foot by 20-foot prefabricated ground equipment shelter, to be enclosed within a 6-foot tall chain link fenced area with vinyl slats, within a 29-foot by 27-foot lease area.

### **Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses**

The project site is located within a Rural Region Planning Concept Area. The project site is surrounded by existing developed and vacant parcels with residential uses.

### **Project Characteristics**

#### 1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the project would be provided from an encroachment onto Hilltop Lane which is not 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 driveway and turnaround would terminate at the lease area and existing residence. The turnaround within the project would be required to meet Fire Safe standards.

The project proposes to require the utilization of one parking space. The project has shown there is space for this extra, in addition for the two required for the existing single-family residence.

#### 2. Utilities and Infrastructure

There are existing telephone company and electrical facilities which would be extended approximately 325 feet within the parcel to the proposed tower facilities.

#### 4. Construction Considerations

Minor lease area site construction and grading would be required for the project. Grading would be required for interior site preparation including asphalt removal, surface grading, tower and equipment enclosure structures, foundations and concrete flooring, and overall site surfacing preparation. The extension of existing utilities would require trenching. It is anticipated that the cellular telecommunications tower site would take between three to six weeks to construct

### **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**

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| <b>I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |   |   |
| 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 impacts anticipated.
- 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/schwyl.html>)). There would be no impacts anticipated.
- c. **Visual Character:** The proposed ground equipment fenced lease area within the project site would not be readily visible from surrounding residences, however the top of the tower would be visible intermittently from various locations in the surrounding area. The project is designed and conditioned to resemble a pine tree in shape and color. The antennas would be painted with a non-reflective paint, and covered with antenna socks to blend in with the branches.

The applicant is proposing to place equipment cabinets and support equipment within a building enclosed by a 6-foot tall chain link fenced enclosure within the lease area. The total lease area is proposed to measure 29 feet by 27 feet. Based on the submitted photo simulations, site plan and elevations, the tower and ground equipment are designed to standards set by Zoning Code Section 17.14.210 to blend with the existing vegetation as best as possible with current technology.

The ground equipment will further be screened from views from surrounding parcels by existing native trees and shrubs. Zoning Ordinance Sections 17.14.210.F and G require screening in order to reduce the aesthetics impacts to a less than significant level. The project has been designed to address those requirements. As conditioned, and with 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

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

America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation. As designed and conditioned, impacts from outdoor lighting would be anticipated to be less than significant.

**FINDING:** As conditioned and with adherence to County Code, for this "Aesthetics" category, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p><b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.</b> 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:</p> |  |  |  |   |
| 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 lease area site contains AxD (Auburn very rocky silt loam with 2 to 30 percent slopes), AxE (Auburn very rocky silt loam with 30 to 50 percent slopes), and SuC (Sobrante silt loam with 3 to 15 percent slopes) soils. SuC is classified as unique, soils of local importance, however none of the three are classified as either prime farmland, statewide important

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

farmland. The map layer shows just a small strip of SuC soils in the western portion of the parcel that would not be utilized by the project. There would be no impacts anticipated.

- 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 impacts anticipated.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use:** No conversion of agriculture land would occur as a result of the project. There would be no impacts anticipated.
- 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. As discussed above in Section a, there would be no loss or conversion of prime farmland as well. There would be no impacts anticipated.

**FINDING:** For this "Agriculture" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no impacts would be anticipated to 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<sub>x</sub>, 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 PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and No<sub>x</sub>, 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.



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

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, NOx, and O3). The project's grading and construction activities would be required to comply with an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and reduction of air pollutants from vehicles and equipment in order to reduce the likelihood of defined particulate in this category. Therefore, the potential impacts of the project would be anticipated to be less than significant.

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 Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan 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 for consistency with General Plan Policies, impacts would be anticipated to 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 grading permit requirements 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 be anticipated to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Operational air quality impacts would be minor, and would be anticipated to be cause an insignificant contribution to existing or projected air quality violations. This would be anticipated to 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. There are no known sensitive receptors as described above in the vicinity of the proposed facility. Impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

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 anticipated impacts.

**FINDING:** The proposed project would not be anticipated to 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 be anticipated to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. As conditioned and with adherence to County code, the proposed project would not be anticipated to cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts.

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

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

**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 site is located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2 which is defined as lands not known to contain special status plant species but within the EID service area. No impacts would be anticipated.

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. No impacts would be anticipated.

**Potentially Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.:** Tennessee Creek, classified as an intermittent stream on the Shingle Springs U.S.G.S. 7.5 Minute Quadrangle, runs through the western portion of the project parcel at a distance

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

of approximately 740 feet west of the proposed lease area within a portion of the parcel not utilized by the owner or the proposed project. No impacts would be anticipated.

- d. **Migration Corridors:** The project proposes to preserve all areas of the 6.03-acre parcel that have existing trees and shrubs and are presently used by wildlife, with the exception of oak trees within the proposed access and lease areas as described below in Section e. Review of the Deer Herd map indicates the project is not located within a mapped deer herd area. Therefore, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.
- e. **Local Policies: Biological Resources:** El Dorado County Code and General Plan Policies pertaining to the protection of biological resources would include protection of rare plants, setbacks to riparian areas, and mitigation of impacted oak woodlands.

Policy 7.4.4.4 establishes the native oak tree canopy retention and replacement standards. Impacts to oak woodlands have been addressed in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR, available for review online at <http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanEIR.htm> or at El Dorado County Planning Services offices located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667. Mitigation in the form of General Plan policies has been developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels. In this instance, adherence to General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 and measures contained within the Oak Woodlands Management Plan would mitigate impacts to oak woodland to less than significant levels.

The submitted Oak Tree/Vegetation Survey dated October 23, 2011 found that the project area has about 85 percent canopy coverage. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 would therefore require the retention of 60 percent of the indigenous oak tree canopy for the project area. The project is anticipated to remove 5.51 percent of the existing oak canopy. The applicant would be required to mitigate for oak canopy replacement at a 1 to 1 ratio by payment of the Oak Conservation In-lieu fee. The applicant would initiate compliance with this policy during the grading and building permit processes. As conditioned, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

- 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 impacts anticipated in this category.

**FINDING:** This site is not located within the County's adopted Ecological Preserve or within the USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries. The intermittent stream is located away from the development area. The oak tree removal is mitigated by the payment of fees. As conditioned, no significant impacts to biological resources beyond the pre-project levels would be anticipated.

| <b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| 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 |

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

**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. **Archaeological Resource, Historic Resource, Paleontological Resource:** According to the submitted Cultural Resource Assessment, no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, features, or artifacts were found and the project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil strata/locales. In the event sub-surface historical, cultural, or archeological sites or materials are disturbed during earth disturbances and grading activities on the site, standard conditions of approval would be included to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

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 anticipated to be less than significant.

**FINDING:** No significant cultural resources were identified on the project site. Standard conditions of approval would be required with requirements for accidental discovery during project construction. This project would be anticipated to have a less than significant impact within the Cultural Resources category.

| <b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| 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 |   |

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

|  |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>  |                          |                          |                                     |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**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 impacts anticipated.
- 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. There would be no impacts anticipated.
- 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 within the proposed development area. No impacts would be anticipated.
- 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 be anticipated to 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 insure 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 are anticipated to be less than significant.