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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

Project Title: Special Use Permit S05-0026/Verizon Wireless/El Dorado Site Number 161763

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

Contact Person: John Heiser | **Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Harry Krieger, 4041 Strickland Mine Road, Placerville, CA 95667

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Verizon Wireless, 255 Parkshore Drive, Folsom, CA 95630

Project Agent's Name and Address: Complete Wireless/Jennifer Walker, 9300 Tech Center Dr., Suite 190, Sacramento, CA 95826

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Manual S. Tsihlas, Architect, Inc., 225 30th St., Sacramento, CA 95816

Project Location: On the west side of Strickland Mine Road, approximately 1.53 miles west of the intersection with El Dorado Road, in the El Dorado area

Assessor's Parcel No: 329-020-28

Zoning: Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5)

Section: 27 **T:** 10N **R:** 10E

General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential (LDR)

Description of Project: Special Use Permit to construct and operate a new wireless telecommunications facility consisting of a 69-foot monopine with 6 panel antennas with a future expansion of an additional 6 panel antennas and 2 future microwave dishes, a 240 square foot equipment shelter, two air conditioning units, electrical and telephone connections and an emergency back up generator within a fenced enclosure located within a 2,000 square foot lease area on the Krieger property at the 1,685-foot elevation above sea level at 4041 Strickland Mine Road in the El Dorado area. Six antennas will be located 60 feet up at centerline of the pole from ground level. The antennas and tower will be painted with flat brown paint. Also proposed is one GPS unit to be mounted on the 240 square foot equipment shelter along with an outdoor light. The tower is designed to accommodate up to six additional wireless carriers. The 2,000 square foot lease area is proposed to be surrounded by a six-foot-high chain-link fence with barbed wire atop for security, along with a twelve-foot entrance gate.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RE-5	LDR	Single family residential
North:	A/RE-5	RR	U.S Highway 50 and Single-family residential
East:	RE-5/R3A	RR	Single-family residential
South:	R2A/RE-5	RR	Single-family residential
West:	RE-5	RR	Single family residential

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The proposed location of the cell tower and equipment shelter lease area within the project site is located atop a knoll adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 with a single family residential unit on the property and surrounded by manzanita and brush. Access to the site will be provided by an existing improved driveway and a new, graveled access connected to the existing driveway encroaching directly onto Strickland Mine Road and to be improved as required by the Diamond Springs/El Dorado 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.

X	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources	**X**	Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	**X**	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: November 21, 2005

Printed Name: John Heiser 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 installation and operation of a wireless facility for Verizon Wireless to be located at 4041 Strickland Mine Road in the El Dorado vicinity.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The 5-acre project site is located at 4041 Strickland Mine Road, approximately 0.68 miles northwest of the intersection with El Dorado Road in the El Dorado/Diamond Springs area. The project area lies at an elevation of approximately 1,685 feet above mean sea level. Existing structures on the 5-acre parcel include a single-family residence with attached garage. The proposed monopine tower and equipment shelter will be located approximately 200 feet to the west of the main residence, within a 40-foot by 50-foot graveled, chain link fence enclosed lease area. Vegetation on the site consists predominantly of annual grassland along with dense manzanita brush. An existing overhead distribution line runs parallel to Strickland Mine Road within a 50-foot non exclusive road and public utilities easement. The surrounding properties contain single-family residences and the parcel located on the north side of U.S. Highway 50 contains an orchard. Access to the site is from Strickland Mine Road in the Diamond Springs/El Dorado area of El Dorado County.

Project Characteristics

This proposal is for the construction and operation of a new wireless communications facility. Proposed are six panel antennas to be placed on a 69-foot tower designed to resemble a pine tree, often called a monopine, with associated ground support equipment, within a 40 foot by 50 foot lease area on the Krieger property at the 1,685-foot elevation above sea level at 4041 Strickland Mine Road in the Diamond Springs/El Dorado area. Six antennas will be located 60 feet up at center line from ground level and future antennas will also be located at this height along with two future microwave dish antennas. The antennas and tower will be painted flat brown. Also proposed is a 240 square foot equipment shelter, one GPS unit mounted on the equipment shelter, two air conditioning units on the equipment shelter and an emergency back up generator within the fenced lease area. The tower is designed to accommodate six total carriers with the potential that each one can place 12 antennas per carrier. The 2,000 square foot lease area is proposed to be surrounded by a six-foot-high chain-link fence with barbed wire atop for security, along with a twelve-foot entrance closed by two six-foot gates. A new access driveway will connect to an existing driveway that will encroach directly onto Strickland Mine Road is proposed and shall meet all requirements requested by the Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Department.

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

Access to the site is provided by an existing driveway encroaching directly onto Strickland Mine Road. The access driveway to the wireless facility is to be 12-feet wide and approved pursuant to fire safe regulations requiring a fire turn-around, to maintain a minimum 13’6” vertical clearance above the access road and to support a 40,000 pound load. The project has been conditioned to comply with these requirements. Please see Item XV in the Initial Study checklist for a discussion of traffic impacts.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

The project does not require water, sewer or drainage improvements. Power utilities and telephone service will be extended to the proposed site by local utility companies.

3. Visual Elements and Landscaping

The proposed wireless facility and cellular tower site is located on an improved parcel of land above the roadside cut bank for U.S. Highway 50 approximately 1 mile west of the Highway 50/El Dorado Road interchange. The remainder of the parcel is characterized by dense manzanita brush and annual grasses. An existing overhead distribution line and transformer exist adjacent to the proposed site. Utility trenching is proposed to provide power and telephone service to the wireless facility location. Since the only options presently available to “disguise” the tower are to make it resemble a pine tree, palm tree, flag pole, religious cross, bell tower, clock tower, water tank, cactus or just have a basic mono-pole without camouflage design, whether or not this project as proposed and conditioned to resemble a pine tree while sitting by itself away from existing pine trees, is compatible or not with the surrounding environment seems a matter of personnel opinion. Planning staff believes that the “monopine” provides the best camouflage for this site given the existing technology.

4. Population

The wireless facility will be visited approximately once or twice a month for maintenance purposes. The wireless facility will not add to the population in the project vicinity.

5. Construction Considerations

Construction of the project would consist trenching for utility connections, grading for the access road, installation of a concrete building pad, graveling, utility connections, fence installation and finish work. Construction access to the site would be from Strickland Mine Road via the existing driveway and improved gravel road with all equipment and materials staging occurring on-site.

The project applicant would be required to obtain permits for grading from the Department of Transportation and from the Building Department for structures and electrical facilities.

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.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. The project is for a new wireless facility for Verizon Wireless that would include a 69-foot "monopine" and ground mounted equipment within a 2,000 square foot lease area and a 450-foot access driveway with required fire turnaround and the new access driveway are to support a 40,000 pound load.

a. **Scenic Vista.** The project site is located on the south side of U.S Highway 50 and north of Strickland Mine Road. The lease area is located approximately 320 north west of Strickland Mine Road. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.[1] There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.

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.[2]

c. **Visual Character.** The proposed ground equipment fenced lease area within the project site will not be readily visible from an off-site public view (Strickland Mine Road); however the monopine will be visible. The monopine and the equipment shelter have been designed to blend with the surroundings as well as possible by being painted a neutral color. The native pines in the direct area are ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*). The imitation trees more closely resemble ponderosa pines. There are no ponderosa pines in the direct vicinity of the project site, although they can be seen on the outskirts of the project. Due to the pine-like design and non-reflective paint, the visual contrast would not be substantial and the visual impact has been reduced to less than significant.

d. **Light and Glare.** `The ground equipment would include minimal reflective surfaces due to the use of non-reflective paint, gravel, and chain link fencing. The potential for glare from the tower and antennas is minimized by the non-

---

1 *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1.*

2 *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).*

reflective paint color of each. A 300-watt light fixture is proposed to be placed adjacent to the entrance of the equipment shelter, the light fixture will be shielded and be placed on a self-timer. Due to the location of the equipment shelter and the lack of any direct visual contact from Highway 50 and or from Strickland Mine Road, the light as proposed would not affect views at night if only the light is used during emergency or night time maintenance scheduled events at the facility. As a condition of approval, a self-timer will be required to be installed to reduce the potential for the light to stay on longer than necessary during night time maintenance requirements. Therefore, the impacts of light and glare as seen from U.S. Highway 50 or from Strickland Mine Road would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural 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. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not considered to be "Prime Farmland" nor is this property designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses and there would be no loss of productive agricultural land or conflict with agricultural uses.

b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract because the site is not designated for residential or agricultural use.

c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The site is classified as other farmland under the Farmland Mapping Program and the soil type has been classified as per the USDA Soil Survey as Metamorphic Rock Land. Metamorphic rock land is in areas of highly resistant schist and slate formations. Rock outcrops and stones occupy from 50 to 90 percent of the

surface, and the rest has a thin mantle of soil material. Furthermore, there are no agricultural operations or lands designated for agricultural uses present. [3] There would be no impact.

Finding

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the development of the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. For this "Agriculture" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

III. AIR QUALITY. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 nonattainment 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 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-c.

Air Quality Plan and Standards. Installation of the monopine, ground equipment shelter area, and trenching and access driveway would require grading that could generate air pollutant emissions from construction equipment vehicle exhaust or dust generated during the construction phase of the project. Operation of the facility would consist of periodic maintenance visits, which would be limited to one vehicle trip on an approximately monthly basis. Because construction and operation of the proposed project would not be a substantial source of air emissions,

[3] State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map, 2002.

it would not conflict with or obstruct any air quality plan, violate any air quality standards, or result in any cumulatively considerable net increases in criteria pollutants. Impacts would be less than significant.

d-e.

Sensitive Receptors and Objectionable Odors. Cell tower operation does not include any features that would be a source of substantial pollutant emissions that could affect sensitive receptors or generate objectionable odors. There would be no impact.

Finding

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the proposed project would not impact air quality. For this "Air Quality" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:

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

- 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-f. **Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities.** The site will be readily accessible via the 15-foot by 450-foot long access driveway. Based on a recent aerial photograph of the site and submitted site and grading plans, minor grading would be required for the wireless facility and associated equipment as well as the proposed access easement will require minimal removal of manzanita shrubs in that direct area. No trees will be removed to accommodate project development. The site is not located within an area containing sensitive habitats or special-status species.[4] There would be no impact on biological resources.

Finding

No impacts from biological resources are expected with the development of the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Biological" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
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:

[4] *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7*

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

- 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-d. A cultural resources records search was conducted and a report prepared for the proposed project area in September 23, 2005. [5]. The study consisted of a records review and found the site contains no recorded Native American or historic-period archeological resources. However, the records search did indicated four records of archaeological studies conducted within approximately ½ mile of the project area, none of the studies include the project parcel. State and federal inventories list no historic properties (buildings, structures, or objects) within ½ mile of the proposed project area. The record search did conclude that there is a moderate possibility of identifying both prehistoric archaeological sites and historic-period resources in the project area; further archival and/or field study is recommended by a cultural resource professional. Because of the common possibility that any parcel in the County may turn up archeological finds during grading, the project will be conditioned with the following conditions:

1. During all grading and construction activities in the project area, an archaeologist or historian approved by the Planning Director shall be on-call. In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological interest is discovered during grading and construction activities, the project proponent shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until the on-call archaeologist can examine the find in place and determine its significance. If the find is determined to be significant and authenticated, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item. Grading and construction activities may resume after appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance. The project grading plans shall include this mitigation on the plans. The Planning Department shall review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

2. In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The treatment and disposition of human remains shall be completed consistent with guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission. The project grading plans shall include this mitigation on the plans. The Planning Department shall review the grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Finding

Based upon the cultural resource survey prepared for the site, it is determined that all feasible conditions have been incorporated in the project to reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance. For this "Cultural Resources" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

---

5 *North Central Information Center, CSU Sacramento, October 28,2004.*

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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**
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 ground shaking, 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

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

- 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. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction**. There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. [6] No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.[7] There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated west of the Melones fault, approximately 4.2 miles away from the site, approximately 0.8 miles north of the El Dorado fault and approximately 3.2 miles east of the East Bear Mountains fault. The East Bear Mountains fault zone is associated with the Foothills fault system, previously considered inactive but re-classified to potentially active after a Richter magnitude earthquake measuring 5.7 occurred near Oroville in 1975. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive.[8]

Earthquake activity on the closest active faults (Dunnigan Hills, approximately 50 miles to the west and Tahoe, approximately 50 miles to the east) and larger fault systems to the west (San Andreas) could result in groundshaking at the project site. However, the probability of strong groundshaking in the western County where the project site is located is very low, based on probabilistic seismic hazards assessment modeling results published by the California Geological Survey.[9] While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located.[10] The project site is flat to gently sloped and situated on a knoll in gently rolling terrain; there would be no risk of landslide. There would be no impact. .[11]

Development of the project would result in an unoccupied ground equipment shelter and cell tower situated in an area subject to low to moderate groundshaking effects. The proposed project would not include uses that would pose any unusual risk of environmental damage either through the use of hazardous materials or processes or through structural design that could be subject to groundshaking hazard. There would be no significant impacts that could not be mitigated through proper building design, as enforced through the County building permit process,

---

6 *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, p.5.9-29.*

7 *California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

8 *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, p.5.9-5.*

9 *California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002. (http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha)*

10 *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.*

11 *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, pages.5.9-6 to 5.9-9.*

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

which requires compliance with the Uniform Building Code, as modified for California seismic conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil**. All grading activities exceeding 250 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* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). 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. During site grading and construction of the foundation and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

The project includes the construction of a 69-foot tall monopine with 6 panel antennas three to be mounted at centerline at approximately 60 feet. Access to the site is provided from Strickland Mine Road to a proposed gravel drive that shall terminate at the tower entrance. The access road to the tower is to be widened to 12 feet, graveled, have a 13'6" vertical clearance, and be capable of supporting a 40,000 lb. load. A Fire District approved turnaround at the project site will be required.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the proposed project and has no conditions of approvals.

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. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. The project site has been classified per the USDA Soil Survey as Metamorphic Rock Land. Metamorphic rock land is in areas of highly resistant schist and slate formations. Rock outcrops and stones occupy from 50 to 90 percent of the surface, and the rest has a thin mantle of soil material. At the lower elevations, it is associated with Auburn soils, and at the higher elevations it is associated with Maymen and Mariposa soils. The applicant may be required to submit a site-specific geotechnical study prior to obtaining a building permit for the tower structure. The results of the site-specific geotechnical study would be used to ensure that any site-specific conditions related to shrink-swell potential are identified and reflected in project design to minimize the risk to property and people. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. There would be no impact related to septic systems because no septic system use is necessary for the project.

Finding

No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Geology and Soils" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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**	

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. **Hazardous Substances.** Cell tower construction and operation would not involve the routine use, transport, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant. However, the proposed facility will utilize an emergency back up generator that is a 3 liter diesel engine with a 210 gallon fuel tank that is doubled walled with a leak detection alarm. The El

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

Dorado County Environmental Management Department will require a hazardous materials business plan pursuant to the issuance of a building permit. Impacts related to diesel fuel spillage would be less than significant.

b. **Creation of Hazards.** 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 is 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 (RF) Report was prepared for the Verizon Wireless facility.[12]

c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.

d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.[13] No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the proposed cell tower site are known to have occurred. There would be no impact.

e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.

f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impact.

g. **Emergency Response Plan.** There is no through access to other properties to or from the project site. Project construction, including staging, would occur entirely on-site. There would negligible or no disruption of emergency access to and from occupied uses along South Shingle Road because equipment delivery trucks to construct the

---

12 *Radio frequency report, Dan Neumann, Sr. RF Engineer, Verizon Wireless, July 19, 2005..*

13 *California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List, accessed September 23, 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Quarterly Report, April 2004; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Site Cleanup List, April 2004.*

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

facility and subsequent routine maintenance vehicle trips would be limited in number and intermittent. There would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.

h. **Fire Hazards.** The project would be constructed on a parcel located in an area classified as having moderate fire hazard.[14] Electrical equipment would be enclosed, and the project would not include any operations (e.g., use of hazardous materials or processes) that would substantially increase fire hazard risk. Emergency response access to the site and surrounding development would not be adversely affected, as discussed above. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

Finding

No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the development of the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Hazards" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the project:*				
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**
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**

[14] *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2001082030) , May 2003, Exhibit 5.8-4.*

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 storm water pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

a & f. **Water Quality Standards.** Construction of the proposed project would involve little, if any, ground disturbance that could increase the level of sediments in storm water discharges at the site. Operation of the proposed project would not involve any uses that would generate wastewater. Therefore, no water quality standards would be violated, and no impact would occur.

b. **Groundwater.** There would be no increased demand on groundwater resources as a result of project implementation because water would not be required. There would be no impact.

c. **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit storm water runoff and discharge from a site. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. The Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed project and finds that an erosion control plan is not warranted for the size of the proposed facility.

d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** The parcel on which the proposed project is to be situated is 5 acres. The project is for a new wireless facility for Verizon Wireless that would include a 69-foot monopine, ground mounted equipment within a 2,000 square-foot leased area and an approximately 450-foot access driveway with required fire turnaround. The project site is currently undeveloped, and storm water is naturally discharged from the site. With the implementation of approved Drainage, Erosion Control and Grading Plans, as required by the Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed plans and has determined that a drainage, erosion control and grading plans are not warranted for the proposed facility.

e. **Storm Water Run-off.** There are no natural drainages on or adjacent to the proposed cell tower site that would be affected by project implementation. Installation of the equipment enclosure and cell tower would not measurably alter the rate or amount of storm water runoff from existing impervious surfaces. The proposed project would not

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

involve any operations that would be a source of polluted water. Therefore, there would be no impact on drainage patterns, flooding, drainage systems, or water quality.

g, h, & i.

Flooding. The level project site is situated in an area of undulating terrain at an elevation of approximately 1,685 feet above sea level. There are no 100-year flood hazard areas at or adjacent to the site. The site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is not in an area subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. There would be no impact.

FIRM. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0750 B, last updated October, 18, 1983) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

Finding

No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the development of the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Hydrology" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING. *Would the project:*				
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 surrounded by residential uses. The cell site would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact.

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

b. **Land Use Plan.** Operation of the proposed cell tower in an area zoned for Estate Residential 5-Acre (RE-5) and is 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 adopted General Plan land use designation for the site (Low Density Residential (LDR)) or adjacent uses. The applicant has designed the wireless facility in compliance with County regulations, addressing aesthetics and health and safety concerns. There would be no impact.

c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** As noted in Item IV (Biological Resources), the project site is not located in an ecological preserve mitigation area established for the Pine Hill rare plants or red-legged frog core area. There would be no impact.

Finding

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

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
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 is present.[15] There are no MRZ-2-classified areas within or adjacent to the project site[16], 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.[17] There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site that could affect proposed uses or be affected by project development. There would be no impact.

---

15 *California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.*

16 *California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.*

17 *El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.*

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

Finding

No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the development of the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Mineral Resources" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XI. NOISE. *Would the project result in:*				
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**
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.

a-d. **Noise Standards.** The property is residential. Construction of the facility would consist of setting the monopine, placing ground equipment in the lease area, and installing a fence. These activities would occur weekdays only over an approximately four- to six-week period during daylight hours and would not involve extensive use of heavy equipment that would be a substantial source of noise or vibration at the residence. Operation of the ground equipment would generate noise comparable to a household refrigerator. In addition, the equipment shelter will have two air conditioning units and a separate detached emergency back up generator. When the backup generator is in use will produce approximately 53.1 dB hourly Leq at 55 feet from the generator. The emergency back up generator as proposed will be 75 feet from the south property line, approximately 50 feet from the north property line that is adjacent to US Highway 50 and approximately 260 feet away from the nearest residence. Both the air

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

conditioning units and the back up generator fall within the noise guidelines pursuant to the noise policies in the General Plan. It is anticipated that routine maintenance visits would occur once a month as well as the back up generator will be operating for approximately 1 hour per week between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Changes in traffic-generated noise levels along Strickland Mine Road with the addition of the maintenance vehicle(s) would not be measurable. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

e & f. **Airport Noise.** The project site is not within the airport land use plan. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no aircraft-related noise impacts.

Finding

No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the development of the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Mineral Resources" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*				
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.** The project site is in an area zoned for residential use, and utility services are available at the project site. No housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required except for a drop line from a transformer. Routine maintenance visits to the facility would be limited to Verizon Wireless employees, and no increase in permanent employees who would work at the project site would occur. There would be no impact.

Finding

The project will not displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth with the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Population and Housing" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XIII. **PUBLIC SERVICES.** *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:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?			**X**	
b. Police protection?				**X**
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 Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District. The proposed project would construct a ground equipment shelter and monopine. The new, unoccupied facility would represent a minimal increase in the demand for structural fire protection at the project site. The Fire Protection District has required an approved turn-a-round at the end of project access road. The access road is to have a 13'6" vertical clearance and be capable of supporting a 40,000 pound load. The project will be conditioned to comply with the Fire District requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Police Protection.** No new or expanded law enforcement services would be required. There would be no impact.

c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** There are no components of operating the proposed cell tower 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.

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

Finding

As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services with the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Public Services" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XIV. 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 Recreation.** The proposed project does not include any increase in permanent population that would substantially contribute to increased demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. There would be no impact.

Finding

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Recreation" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			**X**	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard 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				**X**

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
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. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				**X**
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				**X**

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&b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** Construction of the proposed project would be limited to vehicles delivering facility components to the site for installation, which is expected to occur over a four to six-week period. Routine maintenance visits would occur on a monthly basis. The number of vehicles associated with construction and operation would represent a negligible increase to the vehicles per day that use Strickland Mine Road in the project vicinity and would not measurably affect traffic volumes or levels of service on a permanent basis such that County standards would be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. The 69-foot monopine would not present an air traffic hazard. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.

d. **Hazards.** The project site is readily accessible from Strickland Mine Road. Delivery of the facility components during the construction period or routine maintenance visits would not involve frequent or substantial number of turning movements onto Strickland Mine Road that would interfere with traffic flow. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. **Emergency Access.** The driveway access that dead ends at the tower site enters directly onto Strickland Mine Road. Project construction, including staging, would occur entirely on-site. There would be no disruption of emergency access to and from the existing residence or those in surrounding parcels. There would be no impact.

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

f. **Parking.** Cell tower facility construction and operation at the proposed location within the parcel would not involve any uses that would displace existing parking or increase the demand for parking facilities. There would be no impact.

g. **Alternative Transportation.** No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected because such features are not present at or adjacent to the project site. There would be no impact.

Finding

As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected with the Verizon Wireless cellular facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Transportation/Traffic" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*				
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**
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**
h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.			**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;

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

- 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.** Construction and operation of the cell tower facility would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. Storm water runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). There would be no impact.

b., d., e. **New Facilities** No new or expanded water or wastewater facilities would be required for the cell tower facility because operation would not require these services. There would be no impact.

c. **Storm Water Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the "*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*," as determined by the Department of Transportation. The project will be conditioned to comply with the County requirements. There would be no impact.

f & g. **Solid Waste.** Operation of the ground equipment shelter would not generate solid waste or affect recycling goals. There would be no impact.

h. **Power.** Power and telecommunication facilities are available at the project site. The power demands of the facility would be accommodated through connection to existing lines, which are available at the parcel. The proposed cell tower facility would add to regional coverage to meet increasing demand for wireless facilities, which would be considered a benefit of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. 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. As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have no significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources as mitigated. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be no significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV).

b. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant. The project's contribution to changes in the visual environment has been mitigated to less-than-significant levels through project design. The cumulative contribution to the view shed would not be considerable.

c. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly.

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

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

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

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume II - Response to Comment on DEIR
Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR
Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR
Volume V - Appendices

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume I - Goals, Objectives, and Policies

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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.)