



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

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

**Project Title:** Special Use Permit S 06-0004/Georgetown Divide Public Utility District

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

**Contact Person:** Tom Dougherty

**Phone Number:** (530) 621-5355

**Property Owner's Name and Address:** Georgetown Divide Public Utility District (GDPUD), P.O. Box 4240, Georgetown, CA, 95634

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

**Project Agent's Name and Address:** Tim McFadden. C/O Comsites, Inc., P.O. Box 33, Rescue, CA 95672

**Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address:** Tim Fry-Lionakis Beaumont Design Group, 1919 Nineteenth Street, Sacramento., CA 95814

**Project Location:** East side of Chipmunk Ridge Road approximately 550 feet north of the intersection with Chipmunk Trail in the Georgetown Area.

**Assessor's Parcel No:** 061-740-47

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

**Section:** 1      **T:** 12N **R:** 10E

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

**Description of Project:** Construction and operation of a new wireless communications facility to support cellular and emergency agency radio transmission consisting of a 120-foot tall monopine tower that will have branches on top making the total height 128 feet tall, and hold sixty (60) antennas. The pole is proposed to be located within a 3,005 square-foot area enclosed six (6)-foot tall, green slatted, chain link fence in a shape resembling a triangle somewhat with approximate side lengths of eighty-five (85) feet, seventy-seven (77) feet and seventy (70) feet. (For true shape see attached site plan, drawing number A01). Proposed are to be two twelve (12)-foot wide entrances with two (2) six (6)-foot wide gates each. The existing fence will be removed and the area around the existing twenty-six (26)-foot diameter by twenty (20)-foot tall water tower will be expanded by cutting 1240 ft<sup>3</sup> and filling 1953 ft<sup>3</sup> of the existing soil surface to enlarge the fenced area to the above mentioned dimensions. Two of the existing Comcast Cable microwave antennas mounted on the water tower will remain there and the others will be relocated to the new proposed monopine tower. The monopine is proposed to have the following antennas mounted at nine (9) different levels:

| Agency                                  | Height on the Pole Their Antennas are Proposed to Be (from ground level) | Number of Antennas |
|---|--|--------------------|
| Proposed PCS/Cellular Antennas (Future) | 120 feet   | 12                 |
| Proposed PCS/Cellular Antennas (Future) | 112 feet   | 2                  |
| Proposed PCS/Cellular Antennas (Future) | 105 feet   | 12                 |
| Proposed PCS/Cellular Antennas (Future) | 94 feet  | 12                 |
| Proposed PCS/Cellular Antennas (Future) | 83 feet  | 12                 |
| El Dorado County Sheriff's              | 75 feet  | 2                  |

|  |         |   |
|--|---------|---|
| Department and El Dorado County Fire Protection District |         |   |
| Georgetown Divide Public Utility District                | 65 feet | 2 |
| Pacific Gas and Electric Company                         | 55 feet | 4 |
| Georgetown Fire Protection District                      | 45 feet | 2 |

Within the within the approximately 3,005 square-foot fenced area, along with the monopine and water tank are proposed to be two fifteen (15) foot by ten (10)-foot future radio equipment locations at the southern fence line, one (1) twenty (20) foot by fifteen (15) foot six (6) inch future PCS/cellular carrier lease area for equipment cabinets, a five (5) foot by ten (10) foot Verizon generator area and an eleven (11) foot by two (2) foot site house panel for power. The future PCS/cellular carrier lease area is projected in the future to potentially include one equipment shelter with two air conditioning units and one back-up generator. The entire fenced in area for the tower, water tank and support equipment is proposed be graveled.

**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:  | RE-5          | LDR                 | Water tank with radio antennas and communications tower                 |
| North: | RE-5          | LDR                 | Single-family residence   |
| East:  | RE-5          | LDR                 | Single-family residence   |
| South: | RE-5          | LDR                 | Single-family residence   |
| West:  | RE-5          | LDR                 | Single family residence   |

Briefly Describe the environmental setting: The site is located on a 0.69-acre parcel that is located on top of a hill at the 3229-foot elevation above sea level. It is located almost to the end of Chipmunk Ridge Road which is blacktopped for about half the way up and then graveled the rest of the way. There is one single-family dwelling located approximately 250-300 feet to the south of the proposed site that shares the road. The vegetation surrounding the proposed tower site includes ponderosa pines (*Pinus ponderosa*), Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), pacific madrone (*Arbutus menziesii*), black oaks (*Quercus kelloggii*) and a few scattered sugar pines (*Pinus lambertiana*). The dominant shrub in the direct project vicinity is the non-native scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*). There is another existing tower on the adjoining parcel to the north at the very end of this road. It is an approximately 110-foot tall lattice Federal Aviation Administration tower that they have been using since 1989 as a radar microwave transmitting facility to transmit radar and communication data for air traffic control between their Sacramento facility and their Salt Lake City facility. Co-location on Federally owned towers is not permitted for security reasons.

**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):** El Dorado County Building Department: Building Permits

**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: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Project Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: Peter Maurer, Principal Planner 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**

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

**Discussion:**

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

- a. **Scenic Vista.** The project site and the lease area are located on the end of Chipmunk Ridge Road and are screened from view by vegetation from Chipmunk Trail and Wentworth Springs. The project site and vicinity is not identified by the County as a scenic view or resource.<sup>1</sup> There would be no impact as a result of development of the proposed project.
- b. **Scenic Resources.** The project site is not located within a State Scenic Highway. There are no trees or historic buildings that have been identified by the County as contributing to exceptional aesthetic value at the project site.<sup>2</sup> There is one single-family dwelling located approximately 250-300 feet to the south of the proposed site that shares the road but their view towards the fenced in area is obscured by existing vegetation. Considering the lease area equipment and fencing will be obscured from view from Wentworth Springs and Chipmunk Trail by vegetation, there would be no negative visual impact as a result of project development.
- c. **Visual Character.** The proposed ground equipment fenced lease area within the project site will not be readily visible from Wentworth Springs; however the top of the pole will be visible. The proposed mono-pine and the equipment shelter have been designed to blend with the surroundings by painting the pole flat brown and covering it with “faux” bark up. The antennas and microwave dishes will be painted green to blend in with the “branches.” Planning staff currently believes that the mono-pine provides the best camouflage for cell towers. The predominate native vegetation in the direct vicinity are ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), incense cedar (*Calocedrus decurrens*), black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*), Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), pacific madrone (*Arbutus menziesii*), and a few

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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>).

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

scattered sugar pines (*Pinus lambertiana*). Considering the resemblance to the silhouette and height of the surrounding trees, and the fact the equipment and fenced lease area is shielded from public view, and that the chain link fence is proposed to be covered with dark-green slats, this proposed tower would not seem to make the visual contrast substantial and the impact of either choice would be less than significant.

- c. **Light and Glare.** The ground equipment would include minimal reflective surfaces due to the use of non-reflective paint, gravel, and green plastic slatted chain link fencing. The potential for glare from the tower and antennas is minimized by the non-reflective paint color of each. No lighting is proposed for the tower that would affect the views at night. Therefore, the impacts of light and glare from this proposed project would be less than significant.

**Finding**

No impacts to views and viewsheds are expected with the development of the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District (GDPUD) communications facility either directly or indirectly. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| <b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| 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? |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?  |  |  | <b>X</b> |

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

- a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** El Dorado County has established the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district and included this overlay on the General Plan Land Use Maps. Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not considered to be “Prime Farmland” nor is there properties designated as being within the Agricultural (A) General Plan land use overlay district area adjacent to the

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

project site. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses and there would be no loss of productive agricultural land or conflict with agricultural uses.

- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract because the site is not designated for residential or agricultural use.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The site is classified as other farmland under the Farmland Mapping Program; however, there are no agricultural operations or lands designated for agricultural uses present.<sup>3</sup> There would be no impact.

**Finding**

No impacts to agricultural land are expected with the development of the GDPUD communications 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.

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

**Discussion:**

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No<sub>x</sub>, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
- Emissions of 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.

<sup>3</sup> State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map, 2002.

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

a-c.

**Air Quality Plan and Standards.** Installation of the monopole and ground equipment shelter area would require grading that could generate criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust or dust. Operation of the facility would consist of periodic maintenance visits, which would be limited to one vehicle trip on an approximately monthly basis. The parcel is located in an asbestos review area. The existing roads all the way up to half the way up to the tower to within approximately 250-300 feet of the proposed tower are blacktopped and the remaining access is graveled with limestone rock. Construction of the tower requires a building and grading permit, and those activities are required to comply with the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District condition listed below prior to and during construction:

“If the project construction will involve grading and excavation operations which will result in a temporary negative impact on air quality with regard to the release of particulate matter (PM10) in the form of dust, then District Rules 223, 223.1 and 223.2, which address the regulations and mitigation measures for fugitive dust emissions and asbestos emission, shall be adhered to during the construction process. Mitigation measures for the control of fugitive dust and asbestos shall comply with the requirements of Rule 223, 223.1 and 223.2, whichever rule is appropriate. In addition, the appropriate Fugitive dust Plan (FDP) Application or Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) Application shall be submitted to and approved by the District prior to the start of project construction.”

Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not be a substantial source of air emissions, it would not conflict with or obstruct any air quality plan, violate any air quality standards, or result in any cumulatively considerable net increases in criteria pollutants. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Finding**

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

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| <b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <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  |  |  | X |



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

| <b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |  |          |          |
|--|--|----------|----------|
| Service?   |  |          |          |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? |  |          | <b>X</b> |
| 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?                                   |  | <b>X</b> |          |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  |  |          | <b>X</b> |
| 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?   |  |          | <b>X</b> |

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-f. **Special Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities.** The site will be readily accessible via the existing access road named Chipmunk Ridge Road. Minor grading would be required to enlarge the proposed fenced in area. The slight increase in the fenced in area size would not significantly impact wildlife migration any more than the existing fenced in area presently does. No trees are proposed to be removed to accommodate project development. The site is not located within an area containing sensitive habitats or special-status species.<sup>4</sup> Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding**

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

<sup>4</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003, Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7, and pursuant to staff review of the “California Natural Diversity Database.”

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

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

**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-d. A records search was done by the North Central Information Center, CSU-Sacramento (January 5, 2006). The search consisted of a records review and found the site contains no recorded Native American or historic-period archeological resources. Review of historical literature and maps on file in their office gave no indication of the presence of archeological sites in the immediate project area. However, 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”:

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

**Finding**

Based upon the cultural resource study prepared for the site, it is determined that all feasible mitigation measures have been 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.

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

| <b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |          |          |
|--|--|----------|----------|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |  |          |          |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |  |          | <b>X</b> |
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |  |          |          |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |  |          | <b>X</b> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   |  | <b>X</b> |          |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   |  |          | <b>X</b> |
| iv) Landslides?  |  |          | <b>X</b> |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  |  |          | <b>X</b> |
| 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?   |  |          | <b>X</b> |
| 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?  |  | <b>X</b> |          |
| 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?   |  |          | <b>X</b> |

**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

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

- Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.

a. **Seismicity, subsidence and liquefaction.** There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County.<sup>5</sup> No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup> While strong groundshaking is not anticipated, the site could be subject to low to moderate groundshaking from activity on regional faults.

No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., a regulatory zone classification established by the California Geological Survey that identifies areas subject to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides). Lateral spreading, which is typically associated with liquefaction hazard, subsidence, or other unstable soil/geologic conditions do not present a substantial risk in the western County where the project site is located.<sup>9</sup> The project site is situated on a knoll in gently rolling terrain; there would be no risk of landslide. There would be no impact. There would be no impact.

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

<sup>5</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030) May 2003*, p.5.9-29.

<sup>6</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1.*

<sup>7</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003*, p.5.9-5.

<sup>8</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment, Interactive Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Map, 2002.* (<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha>)

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

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

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

b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During site grading and construction of the foundation and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

d. **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the site has Cohasset loam (Andesite) soils. These soils are listed as having low to moderate shrink-swell potential. 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 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. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

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

| <b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</b>   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| 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                                   |  |  | X |

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

| <b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>   |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?   |  |   |   |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |   | X |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  |  |   | X |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |  | X |   |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   |  | X |   |

**Discussion:**

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

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

a. **Hazardous Substances.** Cell tower construction and operation would not involve the routine use, transport, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

| Frequency Range (F) (MHz) | Occupational Exposure (mW/cm <sup>2</sup> ) | General Public Exposure (mW/cm <sup>2</sup> ) |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| 0.3-1.34                  | 100   | 100   |
| 1.34-3.0                  | 100   | 180/F <sup>2</sup>                            |
| 3.0—30                    | 900/F <sup>2</sup>                          | 180/F <sup>2</sup>                            |
| 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 existing antennas at the GDPUD facility by Diamond Services.<sup>10</sup>

- c. **Hazardous Emissions.** There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site. The proposed project would not include any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>11</sup> No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the proposed cell tower site are known to have occurred. There would be no impact.
- e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. Georgetown Airport is located approximately 2.7 miles to the east of the subject site as the crow flies. The flight landing and taking off from that airport is in a north and south direction. There would be no impact.
- f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impact.
- g. **Emergency Response Plan.** There is no through access to other properties to or from the project site. Project construction, including staging, would occur entirely on-site. There would negligible or no disruption of emergency access to and from occupied uses along Chipmunk Ridge Road because equipment delivery trucks to construct the facility and subsequent routine maintenance vehicle trips would be limited in number and intermittent. There would be no impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans.
- h. **Fire Hazards.** The map of El Dorado County Fire Hazard Zones (V-4-2, El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report December 1994) identifies the project site as being located in an area of “Very High Fire Hazard”. Any potential development activity would be subject to SRA Fire Safe Regulations, which provide standards for basic emergency access and perimeter wildfire protection. While no development is currently proposed, future compliance with state and local fire district regulations will reduce the risks associated with wildland fires to a less than significant level. Electrical equipment would be enclosed, and the project would not include any operations (e.g., use of hazardous materials or processes) that would substantially increase fire hazard

<sup>10</sup> Radio Frequency (RF) Report for Georgetown PUD, 6671 Chipmunk Trail, Diamond Services, January 23, 2006. Radio Frequency (RF) Report for Verizon Wireless (Site No. SC4812MC), Dan Neumann., Sr. RF Engineer, Verizon Wireless, July 19, 2005.

<sup>11</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List, <http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/...>

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

risk. Emergency response access to the site and surrounding development would not be adversely affected, as discussed above. Impacts related to wildland fire hazard would be less than significant.

**Finding**

No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the development of the GDPUD communications facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Hazards” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

| <b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|----------|
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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)? |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |



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

**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 & f. **Water Quality Standards.** Construction of the proposed project would involve removing the existing fence and the area around the existing twenty-six (26)-foot diameter by twenty (20)-foot tall water tower will be expanded by cutting 1240 ft<sup>3</sup> and filling 1953 ft<sup>3</sup> of the existing soil surface to enlarge the fenced area to the above mentioned dimensions. Erosion control is required of the future building/grading permit and the expansion of the existing fenced in area would not increase the level of sediments in stormwater discharges significantly more at the site than the current discharge levels. Operation of the proposed project would not involve any uses that would generate wastewater. Therefore, no water quality standards would be violated, and no impact would occur.

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

c. **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit stormwater runoff and discharge from a site. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. Compliance with an approved erosion control plan will reduce erosion and siltation on and off site. The Department of Transportation is requiring as a condition of approval that the project applicant obtain a site improvement/grading permit, which would address grading, erosion and sediment control.

d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** The parcel on which the proposed project is to be situated is 0.069 acres. The project is for a new wireless facility for GDPUD that would include a wood 120-foot mono-pine and ground mounted equipment proposed to be located within an approximately 3,005 square-foot fenced in area. The project site and access roads are existing and the project is proposed to include minor grading for expansion of the fenced in area. Because of its location on top of a knoll, stormwater is naturally discharged from the site. With the implementation of approved Drainage, Erosion Control and Grading Plans, as required by the Department of Transportation, the rate of surface runoff from the project site will be minimized.

e. **Stormwater Run-off.** There are no natural drainages on or adjacent to the proposed cell tower site that would be affected by project implementation. Installation of the equipment enclosure and cell tower would not measurably alter the rate or amount of stormwater runoff from existing impervious surfaces. The proposed project would not involve any operations that would be a source of polluted water. Therefore, there would be no impact on drainage patterns, flooding, drainage systems, or water quality.

g, h, i& j.

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

**Flooding.** The level project site is situated in an area of undulating terrain at an elevation of approximately 3229 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. 06040 0225) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

**Finding**

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
- Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
- Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
- Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.

a. **Established Community.** The project site is a partially developed parcel in a residential zone district that is surrounded by single-family residences. The project site is an existing water tank and communications facility. The proposed wireless facility would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact.

b. **Land Use Plan.** Operation of the proposed cell tower in an area zoned for Residential Estate 5-Acre (RE-5) and is allowed with a special use permit under Section 17.14.200 D 5 (b) of the County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed

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

use would not conflict with the adopted General Plan land use designation for the site (Low Density Residential (LDR)) or adjacent uses. The applicant has designed the wireless facility in compliance with County regulations, addressing aesthetics and health and safety concerns. There would be no impact.

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

**Finding**

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist is present.<sup>12</sup> There are no MRZ-2-classified areas within or adjacent to the project site<sup>13</sup>, 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.<sup>14</sup> 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**

<sup>12</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.

<sup>13</sup> California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7.

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

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

| <b>XI. NOISE.</b> <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-d. **Noise Standards.** The subject parcel adjoins Chipmunk Ridge Trail. Construction of the facility would consist of moderate grading for the expansion of the existing fenced in area, setting the mono-pine, placing ground equipment in the lease area, and installing a fence. These activities would occur weekdays only over an approximately four- to six-week period during daylight hours and would not involve extensive use of heavy equipment that would be a substantial source of noise or vibration at the residence. Operation of the ground equipment, including the backup generator, would typically generate noise comparable to a household air conditioner at a 20 foot distance away. The air conditioning units projected for the projected equipment shelter typically show a maximum of 57.97 decibels at a 20 foot distance from the units. Routine maintenance visits would occur once a month. Changes in traffic-generated

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

noise levels along Chipmunk Trail and Chipmunk Ridge Road with the addition of the maintenance vehicle(s) would not be measurable. Short-term and long-term impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Finding**

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

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

**Discussion:**

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

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

a-c. **Population Growth.** The project site is in an area zoned for residential use, and utility services are available at the project site. No housing or people would be displaced, and no extensions of infrastructure would be required except for a drop line from a transformer. Routine maintenance visits to the facility would be limited to employees or GDPUD approved maintenance personnel. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

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

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

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> <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 parcel is within the Georgetown Fire Protection District. The proposed project would construct a ground equipment shelter and monopole. The new, unoccupied facility would represent a minimal increase in the demand for structural fire protection at the project site. The existing access road has an all weather surface. The access road has a 13’6” vertical clearance and be is capable of supporting a 40,000 pound load. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

c-e. **Schools, Parks and Other Facilities.** There are no components of operating the proposed communications tower project that would include any permanent population-related increases that would substantially contribute to increased demand on schools, parks, or other governmental services that could, in turn, result in the need for new or expanded facilities. There would be no impact.

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

**Finding**

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

| <b>XIV. RECREATION.</b>  |  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| 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? |  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?                        |  |  |  | <b>X</b> |

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

**Finding**

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

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

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

c. **Air Traffic Patterns.** The project site is not within an airport safety zone. The 120-foot monopole would not present an air traffic hazard. No changes in air traffic patterns would occur or be affected by the proposed project. There would be no impact.



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

- d. **Hazards.** The project site is readily accessible from Chipmunk Ridge Road. Delivery of the facility components during the construction period or routine maintenance visits would not involve frequent or substantial number of turning movements onto Chipmunk Ridge Road that would interfere with traffic flow. No traffic hazards such as sharp curves, poor sight distance, or dangerous intersections exist on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **Emergency Access.** The project site is accessible from Chipmunk Ridge Road with no through access. Project construction, including staging, would occur entirely on-site. There would be no disruption of emergency access to and from Chipmunk Ridge Road and Chipmunk Trail. There would be no impact.
- f. **Parking. Communication** tower facility construction and operation at the proposed location within the parcel would not involve any uses that would displace existing parking or increase the demand for parking facilities. There would be no impact.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** No public transportation systems, bicycle lanes or bicycle storage would be affected because such features are not present at or adjacent to the project site. There would be no impact.

**Finding**

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

| <b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|----------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?                            |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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?                                      |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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? |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid  |  |  | <b>X</b> |

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

| <b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |  |          |  |
|---|--|----------|--|
| waste?  |  |          |  |
| h. Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand. |  | <b>X</b> |  |

**Discussion:**

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

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
  - Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
  - Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
  - Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.
- a. **Wastewater.** Construction and operation of the communications tower facility would not involve discharges of untreated domestic wastewater that would violate water quality control board requirements. Stormwater runoff would be negligible (see Item c, below). There would be no impact.
- b,d,e. **New Facilities** No new or expanded water or wastewater facilities would be required for the communications tower facility because operation would not require these services. There would be no impact.
- c. **Stormwater Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the project shall be built in conformance with the standards contained in the “*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*,” as determined by the Department of Transportation. The project will be conditioned to comply with the County requirements. There would be no impact.
- f & g. **Solid Waste.** Operation of the ground equipment shelter would not generate solid waste or affect recycling goals. There would be no impact.
- h. **Power.** Power and telecommunication facilities are available at the project site. The power demands of the facility would be accommodated through connection to existing lines, which are available at the parcel. The proposed communications tower facility would add to regional coverage to meet increasing demand for wireless facilities, and improve the ability for emergency service providers to improve their communication capabilities which would be considered a benefit of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Finding**

No significant utility and service system impacts are expected with the GDPUD communications facility either directly or indirectly. For this “Utilities and Service Systems” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

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

**Discussion**

- a. As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have no significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources as mitigated. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be no significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV).
- b. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic/transportation, or utilities/service systems that would combine with similar effects such that the project’s contribution would be cumulatively considerable. For these issue areas, it has been determined there would be no impact or the impact would be less than significant. The project’s contribution to changes in the visual environment has been mitigated to less-than-significant levels through project design. The cumulative contribution to the viewshed would not be considerable.
- c. Due to the small size of the proposed project, types of activities proposed, and site-specific environmental conditions, there would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly.

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

**SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST**

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

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

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

El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information

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

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

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

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

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

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

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

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

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

Radio Frequency Report for Georgetown PUD, by Diamond Services, dated January 23, 2006.