

EXHIBIT H



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Special Use Permit S05-0036/KXCL FM Radio Antenna			
Lead Agency Name and Address: El Dorado County, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667			
Contact Person: Tom Dougherty		Phone Number: (530) 621-5355	
Project Owner's Name and Address: John and Wilma Woods, P.O. Box 693/6960 Mehwald Lane, Somerset, CA 95684			
Project Applicant's Name and Address: First Broadcasting Sacramento, LLC, 750 North St. Paul, Tenth Floor, Dallas, Texas 75201			
Project Agent's Name and Address: Jessie Yang, Taylor and Wiley, Inc., 2870 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite. 200, Sacramento, CA 95833			
Project Location: The project site is located on the west side of Mehwald Lane, 0.3 mile northwest of the intersection with Grizzly Flat Road, in the Somerset area.			
Assessor=s Parcel No(s): 093-250-23			
Zoning: RE-10	Section: 15	T: 9N	R: 12E
General Plan Designation: NR			
Description of Project: Special use permit to allow the construction of a 160-foot tall metal lattice tower with two, two-bay FM radio antennas mounted at 160 and 150 feet respectively, and a 4-foot diameter microwave antenna mounted at 60 feet above ground level. Also included is a 12 by 12 foot pre-fabricated concrete shelter and associated ground support equipment within a 40 by 25-foot, 6-foot tall chain link fence-enclosed lease area on the 20.233-acre parcel.			
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:			
	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
North:	PA-20	NR	Single Family Residences
East:	TPZ	NR	Single Family Residences
South:	RE-10	RR	Single Family Residences
West:	PA-20	NR	Single Family Residences
Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The 20.233-acre property is set at the 3,076-foot elevation above sea level approximately 7 miles east of the community of Somerset. The vegetation on the parcel was burned in the 1992 Grizzly fire up to the house and barn. There are some mature trees in the direct vicinity of the developed area but the proposed project site includes second growth stump re-sprouts of interior live oaks no more than 15-feet tall. The existing vegetation includes black oak (<i>Quercus kelloggii</i>), interior live oak (<i>Quercus wislizenii</i>), blue oak (<i>Quercus douglasii</i>), ponderosa pine (<i>Pinus ponderosa</i>), foothill pine (<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>), buckbrush (<i>Ceanothus cuneatus</i>), white-leaf manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos viscida</i>), coyote brush (<i>Baccharis pilularis</i>), yerba santa (<i>Eriodictyon californicum</i>), toyon (<i>Heteromeles arbutifolia</i>) and various annual grasses and starthistle. The area of existing and proposed improvements is located atop a cone-shaped hill. Existing improvements include a 2,226 square-foot single-family residence built in 1981, a 70 square-foot shed that is to be removed, and a 1,200 square-foot barn. The barn is 47 feet from the proposed lease area. The semi-graveled and dirt driveway to the dwellings travels approximately 2,400 feet from Grizzly Flat Road along an access easement through the eastern portions of two parcels to the south.			
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):			
El Dorado County Air Quality Management District Pioneer Fire Protection District El Dorado County Environmental Management District, Hazardous Materials Division El Dorado County Transportation Department			

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 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		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Fact		

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: January 23, 2006

Printed Name: Tom Dougherty For: El Dorado County

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, 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©(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

- a. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource (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). There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- b. The project site is not within a State Scenic Highway (California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, p.2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>). There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site.
- c. The associated equipment shelter building and support equipment are not anticipated to substantially degrade the scenic qualities of the project site and its surroundings because the fencing will be recommended to be conditioned to be covered with brown slats, the ground support structures will be recommended to be painted brown to match the slats and it will be setback at least 420 feet from the property line on three sides, and 30 feet and disguised by native vegetation on the southern boundary. There will be a discernable visual impact from the addition of the radio tower in the Somerset area but the thin lattice tower does not stick out like a building or even tall trees. The lattice tower color will be non-reflective and due to the hilly terrain and abundance of trees in the vicinity, the visibility of the tower will be obscured or minimized.

Discussion: Radio towers need to be tall in order to receive and send signals adequately. There are very few options available to disguise a tower of this type, for this purpose. The proposed tower has been circulated to the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and CalTrans Division of Aeronautics (CalTrans) in order to seek their opinion and to solicit advice and or concerns. Neither agency has responded with concerns and recommendations. Planning staff will not recommend the tower be painted since the steel-gray color is as unobtrusive. Staff believes that the slats and matching ground support equipment will provide adequate camouflage for the ground level support equipment only should another fire remove the trees and shrubs or the surrounding lands be split or developed closer to the proposed lease area.

Section 17.14.200(E) and (F) of the County Code require that all wireless communication facilities meet certain criteria for screening, setbacks, exposure to hazardous materials, maintenance and co-locations. Section 17.06.050 H defines antennas as any system of wires, poles, rods, reflecting discs or similar devices used for the transmission and/ or reception of electromagnetic waves when such system is either external to or attached to the exterior of a building or structure. The above definition means that FM antennas are included in the term antennae pursuant to Zoning Code Chapter 17.14. After review of the submitted site plan, visual simulations and an on-site reconnaissance, it has been determined that the proposed project, as conditioned, meets the standards contained in Section 17.14.200 E and F of the County Code.

Overall, potential impacts to the scenic qualities of the project site area as a result of the proposed project are anticipated to be less than significant.

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

- d. The proposed storage building is proposed to have an exterior light above the door. Planning Services will recommend any lighting associated with this project conform to § 17.14.170, and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America’s (IESNA) full cut-off designation, and function with a motion detector. The tower, antennas microwave dish and ground support structures are anticipated to have a potential for glare. The proposed lease area, equipment shelter and fenced area are approximately 900 feet from Grizzly Flat Road and are not anticipated to be visible from there. Planning Services will recommend that all elements of the proposed project within the lease area be conditioned to be painted with non-reflective, flat colors that do not reflect any light. Should the proposed project be conditioned as such, it is not anticipated to create a new source of light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding:

No impacts to views and viewsheds are expected with the development of the FM radio tower either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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. Although some parcels adjacent to the project site to the north and west and east are zoned as PA-20 and to the east is TPZ, the proposed tower lease area is at least 400 feet from either of those parcel boundaries. The zoning designation for the parcel site is RE-10 and the proposed project is not expected to have any potential for conversion of agricultural lands or uses to non-agricultural uses.
- b. The project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract.
- c. No existing agricultural land is anticipated to be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

Finding:

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the development of the FM tower 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. <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 nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality			X	

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

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X

Discussion:

a. The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan, which establishes the rules and standards for the reduction of stationary air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NOx, and O₃). Implementation measures from this plan are required to be implemented at the project level. In addition, a project is required to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as required under the Federal Clean Air Act as well as the State of California Ambient Air Quality Standards.

b., c. The proposed project is anticipated to generate approximately three to four daily vehicle trips during the construction phases of the project. The long-term operations of the project would entail one vehicle visit on an average of once per month, by representatives from the individual service providers and a representative from First Broadcasting for routine maintenance inspection. Minimal grading is expected to create the proposed pad for the tower and associated equipment shelter buildings on the already flat site. There is an existing dirt access road to provide access to the tower within the project site parcel which will be graveled. The project is not anticipated to create substantial mobile or stationary emissions, and there are no asbestos containing rock types underlying the project site.

District Rule 223 shall be adhered to during the construction process, which addresses the regulation and mitigation measures for fugitive dust emissions. A Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the District prior to beginning project construction.

The URBEMIS 7G air quality model provided by the California Air Resources Board does not evaluate potential air quality impacts associated with the construction of wireless telecommunications facilities. Potential air quality impacts associated with FM tower facilities are considered too negligible for the intended use of the URBEMIS 7G model. As such, this analysis was not conducted for the proposed project. The proposed project is not expected to result in construction or operations emissions of ROG, NOx, CO, PM₁₀, SO₂, sulfates, lead, or air contaminants in excess of the established thresholds of significance for county, state, and federal air quality standards. The proposed project is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase for any criteria pollutant within the project region.

d. Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children, the elderly, and such sites as schools, hospitals, day-care centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. There are no sensitive receptors in the project site vicinity.

e. No objectionable odors are anticipated from either the construction or operational phases of the proposed project.

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.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or 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. Due to the small footprint area of the project site, the proposed project is not anticipated to have any substantial adverse impacts on special status species or habitats.

 The El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR identifies special status species and habitats occurring within El Dorado County. Special status species data within this document was compiled from the California Natural Diversity Data Base and the California Native Plant Society. Inspection of the Important Biological Resources map for the project vicinity revealed these species are not expected to be impacted by the proposed project since none were identified to exist near the project site.
- b., c. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory Map was reviewed to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist within the project site lease area. No wetlands or riparian habitat areas were indicated by the Wetlands Inventory Map, nor were observed during a site visit made by Planning Department staff within the project lease area.
- d. Although the project site is located within the critical winter range for the Ruth deer herd (Important Biological Resources Map at Planning Services), no substantial habitat modifications are expected from the proposed project that would disrupt the movement of deer through or around the project site.
- e. One tree (black oak, *Quercus kelloggii*, an approximately 3-foot diameter by 15-foot tall storm-damaged stump/trunk is proposed for removal for the project. The turnouts proposed for fire safety purposes could require the removal of trees in the immediate area of the action, but no removal of any trees over 6" in diameter are anticipated.
- f. The proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of a proposed or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The project site is not located in an area identified as critical habitat for the Red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), or for the Gabbro soil rare plants which are subject to draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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

Finding:

No impacts from biological resources are expected with the development of the FM tower facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Biological” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

Discussion:

- a., b. A Cultural Resources Report did not identify any potential for historical or archaeological resources within the project area. The report consisted of historical and archaeological investigations conducted by Historic Resource Associates (September 2005). These investigations included a record search at the North Central Information Center at California State University, Sacramento (August 16, 2005), and a pedestrian surface survey of the project area. The field survey of the project area did not reveal any significant prehistoric or historic archeological sites, features, or artifacts.
- c. A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata. The project site does not contain any known paleontological sites or known fossil locales.
- d. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the steps outlined in Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines shall be implemented immediately. This is a standard grading requirement which applies to all discretionary projects.

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 of Approval”:

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.

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

Finding:

Based upon the North Central Record Search and Cultural Resource Study prepared for the site, it is determined that all feasible conditions of approval will be incorporated in the project to reduce impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance. For this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
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. 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. No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. 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 zone and east of the East Bear Mountains fault zone. 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.

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. While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

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

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. 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.

Development of the project would result in an unoccupied ground equipment shelter and FM radio 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, 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 Department of Transportation (DOT) is requesting a site improvement/grading plan prepared by a professional civil engineer, if it is determined that a grading permit will be required during the road improvements. DOT will then determine whether the proposed plan is in compliance with the El Dorado County "Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance," the "Design and Improvement Standards Manual," the "Storm Water Management Plan," the "Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance," and the State of California Handicapped Accessibility Standards," prior to issuance of a grading permit. The erosion and sediment control plan will include an effective revegetation program to stabilize all disturbed areas.

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 Holland course sandy loam (HgD) has a low shrink-swell capacity. 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 FM tower facility either directly or indirectly. For this "Geology and Soils" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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). A Radio Frequency (RF) Report was prepared for the proposed First Broadcasting FM tower facility on September 28, 2005 (Denny and Associates). Taking into account transmitter power output, transmission line loss, and antenna gain, the maximum effective radiated power (ERP) will not exceed 6,000 watts, circularly polarized. KXCL operates on 92.1 megahertz (MHz). The maximum permissible level for general population/uncontrolled exposures at the KXCL operating frequency is 0.2 milliwatts per square centimeter (mW/sq cm).² The greatest calculated power density along the parcel boundary is 5.33 percent of the maximum permissible exposure limits specified in the federal regulations of Section 1.1310 of the FCC Rules. Therefore, the risk of release of hazardous materials or emissions to the public is remote.

The proper use and storage of any hazardous material or substances is expected to limit exposure, and the potential for explosion or spills. If explosives are used for construction activities, such activity would only occur in conformance with State and County applicable laws. In this case, the *El Dorado County Hazardous Waste Management Plan* serves as the implementation program for the management of any hazardous wastes in order to protect the health, safety, and property of residents in the vicinity of the project. The project does not involve transport of significant amounts of hazardous substances or materials, and no hazardous materials or substances are anticipated to be removed from the site as a result of the project. A generator would be relied upon as a back-up power source. Environmental Management-Hazardous Materials Division has required that if the project will involve the storage of reportable quantities of hazardous materials for this generator, a hazardous materials business plan for the site must be submitted to them. The proposed project is not anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through exposure of hazardous materials. Therefore, any potential for exposure of hazardous materials to the public or the environment is considered less than significant.

- b. The proposed project is not expected to result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. No significant amounts of hazardous materials will be utilized for the project.
- c. The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of any known or proposed schools.

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

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

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 proposed First Broadcasting FM tower facility on September 28, 2005 (Denny and Associates). *Taking into account transmitter power output, transmission line loss, and antenna gain, the maximum effective radiated power (ERP) will not exceed 6,000 watts, circularly polarized. KXCL operates on 92.1 megahertz (MHz). The maximum permissible level for general population/uncontrolled exposures at the KXCL operating frequency is 0.2 milliwatts per square centimeter (mW/sq cm).² The greatest calculated power density along the parcel boundary is 5.33 percent of the maximum permissible exposure limits specified in the federal regulations of Section 1.1310 of the FCC Rules.*¹

- d. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
- e. The project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Plan, or located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f. Inspection of the San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart indicates that there are no recorded privately operated airstrips within the general vicinity of the project site. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft over flights in the vicinity of the project site.
- g. The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the project area. This is based upon the location of the nearest fire station, availability of multiple access points to the project site, availability of water for fire suppression, and provisions within the County emergency response plan. The County emergency response plan is located with the County Office of Emergency Services located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.
- h. The project parcel is located within an area impacted by the Grizzly Fire of 1992, and is considered as having a moderate fire hazard potential according to the California Department of Forestry. However, the project site parcel complies with State Fire Safe Regulations requiring a 30-foot setback from all property lines, which is intended to ensure adequate emergency access to the project site parcel. Title 14, Subchapter 2 SRA Fire Safe Regulations, of the Public Resources Code which have been adopted by El Dorado County requires project compliance with all applicable requirements specific to this proposed project.

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.

¹ Radio Frequency (RF) Report for First Broadcasting for the proposed tower at 6960 Mehwald Lane in Somerset, CA, September 28, 2005, Denny and Associates, P.C., Consulting Engineers, Oxon Hill, Maryland.

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

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	

Discussion:

- a. If the project is approved, it could potentially be subject to an approved Improvement/Grading Plan that would be in conformance with the County of El Dorado “Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance,” and the “Drainage Manual.”

No restroom facilities or any other type of waste discharge activities are proposed with the project. Therefore, construction and operational activities associated with the proposed project are not anticipated to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- b. No water supply facilities are proposed for the project. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to impact groundwater supplies or recharge rates.

- c. The area proposed to be graded for the foundation pad for the tower and equipment shelter buildings is already relatively flat although tree stumps from the after fire, re-sprouted trees will have to be removed from the lease area.

Grading and other construction related ground disturbing activities have potential to alter the existing surface and subsurface drainage patterns of the project site. However, implementation of the El Dorado County Improvement/Grading Plan, should a grading permit be required, will require drainage improvements that are expected to minimize impacts regarding drainage alterations potentially caused by the proposed road improvements leading up to at the project site. The decision on whether a grading permit is going to be

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

required depends on the final submission of the final approved project and the quantity of soil involved. Proper implementation of the required drainage improvements is expected to minimize and/or avoid erosion and siltation on and off-site to a less than significant level. There are no existing drainage courses within the footprint area of the proposed project site.

- d. The proposed project will not result in the substantial creation of impervious surface areas capable of substantially increasing the rate and amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in on- and off-site flooding. The total combined impervious square footage of all the proposed equipment shelter buildings and the tower would consist of an impervious area of approximately 350 square feet. Implementation of drainage improvements required by El Dorado County’s Improvement/Grading Plan, are intended and expected to minimize the amount and rate of surface runoff from the project site to a less than significant level.
- e. Surface runoff from the project site is predominantly expected to naturally infiltrate within the project site parcel and move off-site as subsurface drainage. Road improvements associated with the access road to the project lease area off Mehwald Lane are expected to include roadside ditches to convey surface runoff, which will be discharged at appropriate locations through culverts. There are existing stormwater drainage systems down slope of the project site area along the existing access driveway. Overall, the proposed project is not anticipated to generate substantial sources of polluted runoff, due to the minimal amount of impervious surfaces areas that are proposed for the project (as discussed in item “d” above).
- f. During the construction phases of the proposed project, implementation of the drainage improvements that will potentially be required by the El Dorado County’s Improvement/Grading Plan, are intended and expected to minimize and/or avoid any potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

g, h, i& j.

Flooding. The level project lease area is proposed to be situated at the top of a “snow cone” shaped hill at an elevation of approximately 3070 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 0775C) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

Finding:

The proposed project will potentially require a site improvement and grading permit through the El Dorado County Department of Transportation that will address erosion and sediment control. No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the development of the FM radio tower facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Hydrology” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

- a. The project parcel is predominantly surrounded by large parcel containing single-family residences There are no establishes residential communities surrounding the project parcel. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to have any potential for physically dividing an established community.
- b. The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, including Policy 5.6.1.4, and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project was reviewed for compliance with the Wireless Communication Facilities Ordinance. The Ordinance specifies that in all zoning districts other than industrial, commercial, and research and development, “new towers or monopoles shall be subject to approval of a special use permit by the planning commission pursuant to Section 17.22.500 et seq.”

Another applicable provision is the requirement that “the application for a land use permit shall contain a report or summary of the estimates of the non-ionizing radiation generated by the facility. The report shall include estimates of the maximum electric and magnetic field strengths at the edge of the facility site, the extent that measurable fields extend in all directions from the facility.”

- b. The project site is not located within a habitat or natural community conservation planning area.

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

Discussion:

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

Finding:

No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected with the development of the FM radio antenna facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Mineral Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X
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., c., d. Short-term noise impacts during the construction phases of the project may be associated with grading, construction vehicles, and other construction related activities. Three to four daily vehicle trips are expected during the construction phases of the project. No measurable noise impacts are expected from operational use of the project. Operation of the ground equipment, including the backup generator, would generate noise comparable to a household air conditioner or refrigerator. The applicant submitted the manufacturer’s specification sheet for the heating, ventilation and air conditioning unit (Bard Heat Pump) which states the unit will result in noise levels of less than 50 dBA at 10 feet. At the distance of the closest property line to the south at 33 feet, noise levels are described as not to exceed 40 dBA. The project is not anticipated to generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any substantial temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise levels, or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.
- b. Persons adjacent to the project vicinity are not expected be subjected to excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of project construction or upon completion of the project.
- e., f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip.

Finding:

No impacts to excessive noise are expected with the development of the FM tower facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would provide FM transmission service which is currently lacking in the project region. The proposed facility could also potentially have additional carriers to co-locate antennas on the tower. The proposed project is not expected to influence the construction or expansion of growth inducing infrastructure such as sewer or water supply systems. All road improvements associated with the proposed project would occur within private property. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to induce population growth within the project area.
- b., c. The project site is not located in an area with potential for displacement of existing or future housing and people.

Finding:

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

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

Discussion:

- a. The project parcel is located within an area impacted by the Grizzly Fire of 1992, and the project site is considered as having a moderate fire hazard potential according to the California Department of Forestry. However, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the need for increased fire protection or services.
- b. Police Protection. No new or expanded law enforcement services would be required. There would be no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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.

Finding:

As discussed above, no significant impacts are expected to public services with the FM tower 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. The proposed project is not anticipated to have any potential for the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, or other recreational facilities.
- b. The proposed project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Finding:

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected FM tower facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Recreation” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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 levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

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

Discussion:

a., b. A negligible and temporary increase in traffic is expected along access roads to the project site during the construction phases of the project. Specifically, three to four daily vehicle trips are expected during a 30- to 45-day construction period. Operational use of project site facilities is expected to result in an average of one vehicle visit per month by representatives from the individual service providers, and a representative from First Broadcasting for routine maintenance inspection.

Vehicle trips resulting from the construction and operational phases of the proposed project are not expected to cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Vehicle trips resulting from the construction and operational phases of the proposed project are not expected to substantially increase or exceed the Level of Service (LOS) for access roads to the project site, which include Grizzly Flat Road and Mehwald Lane.

c. The height and location of the FM transmission tower is not anticipated to have any influence on air traffic patterns within the project site vicinity. There are no public or private airplane landing strips within 2 miles of the proposed tower site, (San Francisco Aeronautical Chart, January 5, 2001).

d. Since a negligible and temporary increase in traffic is anticipated only during the construction phase, the proposed project is not anticipated to increase hazards due to roadway design features or incompatible uses.

e. Title 14, Subchapter 2 SRA Fire Safe Regulations, of the Public Resources Code which have been adopted by El Dorado County requires project compliance with all applicable requirements specific to this proposed project.

Project compliance with State Fire Safe Regulations and Pioneer Fire District requirements is expected to ensure adequate emergency access to the project site.

f. The project will comply with Ordinance 17.18.060 for off-street vehicle parking requirements, which will require one designated parking space for weekly maintenance and inspection visits.

g. The proposed project is not anticipated to have any affect or influence on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Finding:

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

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

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

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
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., b., e. No restroom facilities are proposed, and no additional wastewater is anticipated to be generated from the proposed project. The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.
- c. Stormwater runoff from the project site is predominantly expected to naturally infiltrate within the project site parcel and move off-site as subsurface drainage. Proposed road improvements associated with the access road to the project lease area off Mehwald Lane, is expected to include turnouts and minor adjustments to existing roadside ditches to convey stormwater runoff, which will be discharged at existing locations through existing culverts. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities but only minor expansion of existing facilities.
- d. Although the project parcel is not located within the El Dorado Irrigation District service area, compliance with State Fire Safe regulations and conditions of approval with the Pioneer Fire District are expected to require an available water supply to minimize potential hazards regarding forest fires.
- f., g. The proposed project is not served by a landfill, and will not generate any solid waste.
- h. Power and telecommunication facilities are available at the project site. The power demands of the facility would be accommodated through underground connection to existing lines, which are available at the parcel. The proposed FM tower facility would add to regional coverage of FM radio use, 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 FM tower 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. Due to the small footprint area of the project site, the proposed project is not anticipated to have substantial adverse impacts on special status species or habitats, including resident fish and wildlife species, and important examples of California history and prehistory. 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 viewshed would not be considerable.
- c. The proposed project is not anticipated to cause any substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. 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.

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.)

Radio Frequency (RF) Report for First Broadcasting for the proposed tower at 6960 Mehwald Lane in Somerset, CA, September 28, 2005, Denny and Associates, P.C., Consulting Engineers, Oxon Hill, Maryland

Cultural Resources Study, September 2005, Historic Resource Associates.

Record Search Results, North Central Information Center, August 16, 2005.

Manufacturer's Specifications for the Bard Heat Pump, (HVAC), unit regarding noise levels.