



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Special Use Permit S05-0007/Nextel Communications-Five Mules

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

Contact Person: Michael C. Baron

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Sierra Pacific Industries (Agent: Gary Blanc), PO Box 496014, Redding, CA 96049

Project Applicant's Name and Address: Nextel Communications (Agent: Timothy Miller), 2180 Harvard St. #100, Sacramento, CA 95815

Project Agent's Name and Address: Nextel Communications (Agent: Timothy Miller), 2180 Harvard St., #100, Sacramento, CA 95815

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: Western Planning & Engineering, 11860 Kemper, #3, Auburn, CA 95603

Project Location: The property is located on the south side of Carson Road, 1,000 feet east of the intersection with Carson Road and U. S. Highway 50.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 043-011-02

Zoning: SA-10

Section: 32 **T:** 11N **R:** 12E

General Plan Designation: MDR

Description of Project: Special use permit to construct and operate a new wireless tower disguised as a 95-foot monopine. The facility will consist of three antenna sectors with four antennas per sector three proposed and one future collocation antenna per sector (12 total antennas), and ground equipment within a 35-foot by 45-foot lease area.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

| | <u>Zoning</u> | <u>General Plan</u> | <u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School) |
|--------|---------------|---------------------|---|
| Site: | SA-10 | MDR | Tree Farm |
| North: | R1A | MDR | Single-family Residential |
| East: | I & R1 | I & HDR | Vacant Industrial & Single-family Residence |
| South: | SA-10 | LDR | Vacant |
| West: | SA-10 | AL-A | Multi-family Residence |

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The proposed project area lies at an approximate elevation of 4,000 ft. above sea level. The site is adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 and the topography is gentle sloping with a southern aspect. Furthermore, the project site is predominantly vegetated by Ponderosa and Bristle Cone Pines, Japanese Maple, and Dogwood tree species. Included in the vegetation are numerous species of shrubs.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): El Dorado County Development Services Department, Building Services Division, El Dorado County Fire Protection District, El Dorado County Department of Transportation, El Dorado County Environmental Management 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 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: May 16, 2006

Printed Name: Michael C. Baron 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, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Discussion:

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

- a) Because the location is the highest point in the vicinity, the proposed tower/stealth mono pole will be designed to look like a pine tree in order to blend into the view shed in relation to the natural and man-made features of the surrounding country side.
- b) No identified public scenic vistas or designated scenic highway will be substantially affected by this project.
- c) The proposed development will not substantially degrade the existing visual character quality of the site and its surroundings because it has been designed as a stealth mono pine that will blend into the surrounding landscape.
- d) The proposed project will not create a new source of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. The proposed project does not have any lighting and the building materials are non-reflective

FINDING: It has been determined that the design of the proposed project would minimize the impacts to aesthetic or visual resources will be less than significant.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| 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 | | | X |

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

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | | | |

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) Review of the Important Farmland GIS map layer for El Dorado County developed under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicates that no areas of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance will be affected by the project. In addition, El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use map for the project 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 there are no areas of “Prime Farmland” or properties designated as being within the Agricultural (-A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the project site. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- b) The proposed project will not conflict with existing agricultural zoning in the project vicinity, and will not adversely impact any properties currently under a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) No existing agricultural land will be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

FINDING: It has been determined that the project will not result in any impacts to agricultural lands, or properties subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The surrounding area is developed with commercial development. For this “Agriculture” category, the identified thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | | X |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | X |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is 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 |

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

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | X | |

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and No_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a) El Dorado County has adopted the *Rules and Regulations of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District* (February 15, 2000) establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
 - b) El Dorado County is classified as being in “severe non-attainment” status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone. Additionally, the County is classified as being in “non-attainment” status for particulate matter (PM₁₀) under the State’s standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County’s Air Pollution Control Program to meet the State’s ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado Air Pollution Control District administers point source air pollution control. While the proposed project will result in a temporary negative impact on air quality with regard to the release of particulate matter (PM₁₀) in the form of dust. The District provides conditions for approval to reduce impacts from particulate matter to a level of insignificance, as noted in the staff report.
 - c) Regarding cumulative air quality impacts, the proposed project does not require a change in existing land use designation or exceed the project alone significance criteria. CO, NO₂, PM₁₀, and SO₂ emissions cumulative impacts are considered to be less than significant. The project will generate no more than one vehicle trip per month following construction, and three to four daily trips during the construction phase of the project. The one additional trip per month is not significant from an individual or cumulative standpoint. Based on the project information provided, the proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
 - d) The proposed wireless telecommunication facility is not considered to be a sensitive receptor. There are no existing uses considered to be sensitive receptors located nearby the proposed project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
 - e) The project will include grading and the construction of an access road and equipment associated with the wireless telecommunication facility which may generate some odors; however, the construction period will be temporary and the

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

odors will dissipate upon completion of development activities. No use of chemicals or other odor creating activities are proposed. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact from exposure of a significant number of people to objectionable odors.

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 include the policies set forth by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department Air Quality District to reduce impacts on air quality to a level of insignificance. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

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

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

- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.
- a) Development of the parcel with the proposed wireless telecommunication facility will not 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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Development will only occur within the 35-foot by 45-foot leased area off of an access road connected to a paved street.
- b & c)
 The United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory Map for the project area (Camino, CA Quadrangle, 1995) was reviewed to determine if any identified wetland or riparian habitat areas exist on or adjacent to the project site. This review indicates that there are no mapped wetlands or riparian habitat areas on or adjacent to the project.
- d) Review of the Planning Department GIS *Deer Ranges Map* (January 2002) indicates that there are no mapped deer migration corridors on the project site. The project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.
- e) This project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- f) 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 the draft Recovery / Habitat Conservation Plans proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

FINDING: It has been determined that all potential biological resource impacts as a result of the proposed project are less than significant. Therefore, the established thresholds for significance in the “Biological Resources” category will not be 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 | |

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

Discussion:

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

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

a & b)

The applicant supplied a Record Search completed by Historic Research Associates, March 2005. No cultural resource sites have been identified within the subject property and no archaeological remains were noted on the subject property.

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. In the event a heritage resource or other item of historical or archaeological value is discovered during grading and construction activities, the following condition has been imposed on the project by the Department of Transportation and noted in the staff report:

(c.1) 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 an 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 the appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined not to be of significance.

d) Due to the size, location, and scope of the project, there is very little potential to discover human remains in the construction area. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the Department of Transportation has provided the following condition for approval found in the staff report:

(d.1) 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.

FINDING: Although the project has the potential to create significant impacts to sub-surface cultural or historic resources, or disturb human remains located outside of a designated cemetery, the incorporation of policies required by the Department of Transportation will reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. Established thresholds of significance will not be exceeded within the “Cultural Resources” category.

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

| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i> | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | 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 substantial adverse effect on Geologic Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

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

a) As shown in the Division of Mines and Geology’s publication Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, there are no

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

Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones mapped in El Dorado County. The impacts from fault ruptures, seismically induced ground shaking, or seismic ground failure or liquefaction are considered to be less than significant. Any potential impact caused by locating structures in the project area will be offset by the compliance with the Uniform Building Code earthquake standards. The project is not located in an area with significant topographic variation in slope. Therefore, the potential for mudslides or landslides is less than significant.

- b) All grading activities shall comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which will reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- c) The soils on the project site are classified as Cohasset Cobbly Loam and Aiken Loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes (CoC) and (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). According to the soil survey, both are characterized as having “surface runoff is medium and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate.” All grading must be in compliance with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance which will reduce any potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.
- d) The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has mapped soils on the site as Cohasset Series Cohasset Cobbly Loam Series and Aiken Series Aiken Loam both characterized as, 5 to 15 percent slopes (CoC) (*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California, 1974*). Review of the *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area* indicates that the mapped soil types for the proposed project area have a low shrink-well potential. Based upon this review, the impact from expansive soils is less than significant.
- e) The project does not require septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

FINDING: No significant impacts will result from geological or seismological anomalies on the project site. The site does not contain expansive soils or other characteristics that will result in significant impacts. For the “Geology and Soils” category, established thresholds will not be exceeded by development of the project and no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

| 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 | |
| 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 | | | 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> | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|
| project area? | | | |
| 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) The proposed project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous/combustible materials. Therefore, the risk of accidental explosion and/or release of hazardous substance are remote.
- b) 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 emissions that exceed the guidelines. PCS, such as the proposed project, are categorically excluded from the FCC evaluation process if they are located more than 10 meters or more off the ground (other than on a rooftop) or if the total power of all channels is 2,000 watts (Effective Radio Power (ERP)) or less. The proposed Nextel Wireless facility is expected to transmit no more than 4% of the ANSI standard or 17.83 $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$; therefore it is excluded from the FCC evaluation. Based on the information discussed above, the risk of release of hazardous materials or emissions to the public is remote.
- c) As proposed, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

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

- d) The project site is not identified on any list compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 identifying any hazardous material sites in the project vicinity. As such, there will be a less than significant impact from hazardous material sites.
- e) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 17, 2005, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. As such, the project is not subject to any land use limitations contained within any adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There are less than significant impacts to the project site resulting from public airport operations and the over-flight of aircraft in the vicinity of the project.
- f) *The San Francisco Sectional Aeronautical Chart*, last updated March 17, 2005, was reviewed and the project site is not located within two miles of a privately owned airstrip. As such, there is no significant safety hazard resulting from private airport operations and aircraft overflights 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 County.
- h) The degree of hazard in wildland areas depends on weather (temperature, moisture, wind), the amount of dryness and arrangement of vegetation, slope and accessibility to human activities, accessibility of firefighting equipment, and fuel clearance around structures. Current development activity is subject to “Fire Safe” requirements designed to provide a minimum 18-foot wide roadway access to all parcels. Dead-end roads are discouraged, but if proposed, turnarounds and maximum length limitations apply. Driveway standards require a minimum 10-foot width with turnouts if the length is over 150 feet long. A minimum 30-foot fuel clearance from all structures and roads is required.

FINDING: As discussed above, the proposed project will be subject to El Dorado County “Fire Safe” requirements to reduce potential impacts from hazardous conditions to a level of insignificance. For this “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” category, the thresholds of significance will not be exceeded by the proposed project.

| 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 | | | X | |

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
 - Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
 - Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
 - Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.
- a) Permit applicants are required to prepare and retain on the construction site, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that describes the site, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste control, implementation of local plans required by the Resource Conservation District, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control, and non-stormwater management controls. Compliance with the Erosion Control Plan will limit water runoff and discharge that would violate water quality standards or discharge requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board
- b) There is no evidence that the project will substantially reduce or alter the quantity of groundwater in the vicinity, or materially interfere with groundwater recharge in the area of the proposed project. The proposed project does not require the use of a well.
- c) There is no evidence that the grading and ground disturbances associated with the project will substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on or off the site. The *Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* contains specific requirements that limit the impacts to a drainage system (Section 15.14.440 & Section 15.14.590). The standards apply to this project.

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

d & e)

In this case, the project will include minimal grading. An erosion control plan is required to reduce erosion and sediment discharge off the site to a less than significant level.

f) The project will not result in substantial degradation of water quality in either surface or sub-surface water bodies in the vicinity of the project area. All stormwater and sediment control methods contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* must be met during all construction activities, as well as the required development of any permanent storm drainage facilities and erosion control measures on the project site.

g & h)

The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel 060040 0775 B, October 18, 1983) for the project area establishes that the project site is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

i) The subject property within the Camino area is near a dam but, not located adjacent to or downstream from a dam or levee that has the potential to fail and inundate the project site with floodwaters.

j) The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant. Potential for a mudflow is also considered to be less than significant.

FINDING: As discussed above, the proposed project will be required to submit a commercial grading permit for review and approval by the Department of Transportation. The commercial grading permit is required to include provisions addressing erosion and sediment control. An approved commercial grading permit will reduce on-site stormwater runoff water quality to a level of insignificance. No other additional significant hydrological impacts will result from development of the project. For the “Hydrology and Water Quality” section, it has been determined the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance and therefore no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the project.

| 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 | |

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;

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

- 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.

- The project will not result in the physical division of an established community.
- The proposed project is consistent with the specific, fundamental, and mandatory land use development goals, objectives, and policies of the 2004 General Plan and is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.
- 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.

FINDING: For the “Land Use Planning” section, the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 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:

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.

- The project site is not mapped as being within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology or in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- The Western portion of El Dorado County is divided into four, 15 minute quadrangles (Folsom, Placerville, Georgetown, and Auburn) mapped by the State of California Division of Mines and Geology showing the location of Mineral and Resource Zones (MRZ). Those areas which are designated MRZ-2a contain discovered mineral deposits that have been measured or indicate reserves calculated. Land in this category is considered to contain mineral resources of known economic importance to the County and/or State. Review of the mapped areas of the County indicates that the subject property does not contain any mineral resources of known local or statewide economic value.

FINDING: No impacts to any known mineral resources will occur as a result of the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required. In the “Mineral Resources” section, the project will not exceed the identified thresholds of significance.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 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 & c)

The project will not result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. This conclusion is based upon the use of the property as an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility. By nature of the use, minimal noise is expected.

The project is not located in an area exposed to existing noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan. As such, an acoustical analysis was not provided as part of the project application submittal. The project will not generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 of the General Plan.

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

b & d)

Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term excessive ground borne noise or ground borne vibration as a result of project operation. This conclusion is based upon the use of the property as an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility. By nature of the use, minimal noise is expected. However, persons adjacent to the project vicinity may be subjected to short-term ground borne noise and vibration as a result of grading and excavation during construction of the project that will not exceed the thresholds of significance

- e) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a public airport and is not subject to any noise standards contained within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a public airport.
- f) The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project will not be subjected to excessive noise from a private airport.

FINDING: As mentioned above, project related short-term construction and related noise will not exceed the thresholds of significance within the vicinity of the project area. For the “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant adverse environmental effects will occur from the proposed development.

| 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 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) The proposed project has been determined to have no growth-inducing impact as the project does not include any proposal to extend, or expand infrastructure or roads, and does not include any school or large scale employment opportunities that lead to indirect growth. No residential development is proposed as part of the project.
- b) No substantial numbers of existing housing stock will be displaced by the proposed project.
- c) No substantial numbers of people will be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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

FINDING: The project will not displace any existing or proposed housing. The project will not directly or indirectly induce significant growth by extending or expanding infrastructure to support such growth. For the “Population and Housing” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental impacts will result from the project.

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 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 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 El Dorado County Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in the demand for fire protection services, but would not prevent the Fire Department from meeting its response times for the project or its designated service area. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District has reviewed the site plan for the project and has determined that modifications are required in order to reduce impacts on fire service to a less than significant level. For a complete discussion on fire safe modifications refer to the discussion under VII Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section H. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District will verify fire safe standard compliance during the building permit review process.

b) **Police Protection:** The project site will be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff’s Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80% of the population within Community Regions. No specific minimum level of service or

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

response time was established for Rural Centers and Rural Regions. The Sheriff’s Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The addition of the wireless telecommunications facility will not significantly impact current response times to the project area.

- c) **Schools:** The project site is located within the Pollock Pines School District. Impact to the affected school district from the proposed wireless telecommunications facility will be less than significant.
- d) **Parks:** The proposed project will not substantially increase the local population necessitating the development of new park facilities. Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, or the in-lieu fee amount for residential projects. Provisions to provide parkland or the payment of an in-lieu fee are not included as the project is not for a subdivision. The project will not increase the demand for parkland.
- e) No other public facilities or services will be substantially impacted by the project.

FINDING: Adequate public services are available to serve the project. Mitigation has been incorporated into the project for fire protection services; however, these mitigation measures are provided in Section VII Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section H. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, there is no potential for a significant impact due to the wireless telecommunications facility, either directly or indirectly. No significant public service impacts are expected. 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) The proposed project will not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.
- b) The project proposal does not include the provision of on-site recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing recreation facilities.

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

FINDING: No impacts to recreation or open space will result from the project. For this “Recreation” section, 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 |

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)

Once constructed, the project will add approximately one average daily trip per month to Carson Road. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation reviewed the proposed project and determined that due to the nature of project, the Level of Service is not expected to exceed the County standards. Therefore, traffic impacts will be less than significant.

c) The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing field in the project vicinity.

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

- d) The proposed project does not include any design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that will substantially increase hazards. No traffic hazards will result from the project design.
- e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access to the wireless telecommunications facility.
- f) The submitted site plan was reviewed to verify compliance with on-site parking requirements within the Zoning Ordinance. Section 17.18.060 of the Zoning Ordinance lists the parking requirements by use. The project will require one parking space on-site for monthly maintenance and inspection visits. The proposed project meets the minimum parking requirements for the wireless telecommunications facility use.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with the adopted General Plan policies, and adopted plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

FINDING: No significant traffic impacts are expected with the wireless telecommunications facility and mitigation is not required. For the “Transportation/Traffic” category, the identified 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 |
| e. | Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | X |
| f. | Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | X | |
| g. | Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | X | |

Discussion:

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

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

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

a & b)

The project does not require the connection to public wastewater collection facilities as restroom facilities are not proposed as part of the project. No new water or wastewater treatment plants are proposed or are required as a result of the project.

- c) All required drainage facilities for the project shall be constructed in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation.
- d) Potable water is not proposed for the project.
- e) Sanitary sewer facilities are not required for the project as restroom facilities are not to be provided.
- f) In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility / Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) may be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal Site. All other materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years.
- g) County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. As proposed, this project is not expected to produce a significant amount of solid waste.

FINDING: No significant impacts will result to utility and service systems from development of the project. For the “Utilities and Service Systems” section, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant environmental effects will result from the project.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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) There is no substantial evidence contained in the whole record that the project will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any impacts from the project will be less than significant due to existing standards and requirements imposed in the conditioning of the project.
- b) Cumulative impacts are defined in Section 15355 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as “two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not result in cumulative impacts.
- c) Based upon the discussion contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have any environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Project mitigation has been incorporated into the project. Mitigation measures have been designed to address air quality and cultural resources.

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.)

El Dorado County General Plan, Adopted July 19, 2004