

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FILE: CUP18-0012

PROJECT NAME: Horizon Tower Bavarian Hills

NAME OF APPLICANT: Horizon Tower, c/o John Merritt

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NOs.: 048-090-004

SECTION: 1 T: 10N R: 11E

LOCATION: Northern terminus of High Hill Road approximately 2,800 feet northwest of the intersection with Carson Road in the Camino/Apple Hill area, El Dorado County (Attachment 1).

- GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT:** FROM: TO:
- REZONING:** FROM: TO:
- TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP**
SUBDIVISION (NAME):
- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW:** Construction and operation of one 125 foot tall telecommunication tower.
- OTHER:**

REASONS THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

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

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

This Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted by the _____ on _____.

Executive Secretary

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT
EL DORADO COUNTY

**INITIAL STUDY AND PROPOSED MITIGATED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CUP18-0012**

Horizon Tower Bavarian Hills

**EL DORADO COUNTY
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT
INITIAL STUDY & PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE
DECLARATION FOR
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CUP18-0012**

1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

- A. **Applicant:** Horizon Tower, c/o John Merritt
- B. **Owner:** Richard and Leslie Bush
- C. **Staff Contact:** Aaron Mount, Senior Planner
- D. **Project Name:** Conditional Use Permit CUP18-0012 (Bavarian Hills)
- E. **Project Location:** Northern terminus of High Hill Road approximately 2,800 feet northwest of the intersection with Carson Road in the Camino/Apple Hill area of El Dorado County.
- F. **Type of Application:** Conditional Use Permit
- G. **Assessor's Parcel Number:** 048-090-004
- H. **Parcel Size:** 52.24 acres
- I. **Lease area size:** Approximately 1,600 square feet (SF) within the 52.24 acre project site, which equates to less than 1% of the site. A 15-foot wide access between the wireless communications facility lease area to the existing onsite driveway connecting to High Hill Road.
- J. **Zoning:** Planned Agricultural-Twenty Acre (PA-20) and Timber Production (TPZ). The project is within the TPZ zoned portion of the property.
- K. **General Plan Designation:** Agricultural Lands-Agricultural District (AL-A)
- L. **Environmental Setting:** The project site is approximately 2 miles south of the South Fork of the American River and 0.5 west of South Canyon Creek, and the area consists of managed forest and vineyards, and relatively flat terrain. The site location's elevation is approximately 2,800 feet. All equipment is proposed to be located within a 1,600-square foot enclosed lease area. A 15-foot wide access drive between the wireless communications facility lease area to existing driveway will provide access. The area and parcels surrounding the parcel consists of similar features of agriculture, forested areas, and a golf course.

The project parcel is located in the South Fork American Hydrologic Unit (Hydrologic Unit Code 18020129). There are no potentially jurisdictional waters on site. The project parcel and proposed lease area is identified as flood zone "X (Unshaded)." The parcel is not within an Airport Compatibility Zone. The site is not located within an earthquake fault zone.

M. Surrounding Land Uses:

There are rural agricultural uses located to the east, west and south of the subject parcel and a golf course located to the north of the property. The Facility is located approximately 300 feet south of nearest offsite residence.

- N. **Project Description:** The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Section 130.40.130 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, to construct and operate an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that consisting of a 40' x 40', 1,600 square foot enclosed compound (lease area). Horizon Tower, the applicant, is a tower development company. Verizon has committed to locating on the tower and therefore the project is not a speculative tower. The compound will include a 125 foot Stealth Monopine tower and eight

pre-manufactured equipment cabinet (Attachments 1 & 4). The proposed lease area is located on the property in an area that will not interfere with the existing use of the property. The telecommunication facility proposes to provide both broadband internet and cellular service. Maintenance workers will visit the site approximately once a month.

The power utility will be installed from an existing pad mounted transformer located approximately 1,200-feet to the leased area in an underground utility trench. A telco conduit will be placed within the ground lease area with a vault located just east of the fenced compound for future expansion. It is anticipated that power telco grounding, fence posts or coaxial subsurface installations will not exceed 52-inches in depth. A new ~1,500-foot long access route will utilize an existing vineyard unpaved road and a yet to be improved forested area road. The new access road will be improved gravel in portions with new fencing and a gate located between the forested area and the vineyard. The new access route will connect with an existing asphalt driveway with no planned improvements by Horizon Tower. The tower foundation depth is anticipated to be at least 30 feet below grade. The biological consultant assumes that depth to groundwater is greater than 50 feet below grade surface.

Co-Location: The tower will be built to allow for co-location opportunities with three future carriers. This current site was identified as the most optimum in providing additional services and capacity to the area. No potential co-locations were identified within the project vicinity (Attachment C). Five other properties were considered, however the applicant either received no response or no interest by the property owners, buildable site would require removal of agricultural land, or access was restricted. .

Site Selection Process: The selection of a location for a wireless telecommunication facility that is needed to improve service and provide reliable coverage is dependent upon many factors, such as: topography, zoning regulations, existing structures, co-location opportunities, available utilities, access, and the existence of a willing landlord. Wireless communication utilizes line-of-sight technology that requires facilities to be in relative close proximity to the wireless handsets to be served.

After establishing the need for the proposed facility, Horizon Tower set out to identify the least intrusive means of achieving the necessary service objective. Upon review of the region Horizon Tower found no existing wireless facility locations that would provide co-location within the search ring (Attachment C). The majority of the search ring region is rural residential, so a new build tower becomes essential.

RF Emissions: An EMF/RF Report (Electromagnetic Fields/Radio Frequency) for the proposed wireless facility was prepared and submitted to the El Dorado County Planning Department. It demonstrates compliance with the latest FCC Wireless Facility Standards for emissions and exposure levels (Attachment 6).

Construction Schedule: The construction of the facility will be in compliance with all local rules and regulations, and will be limited to 8:00 am – 5:00 pm. The crew size will range from two to ten individuals. The construction phase of the project is anticipated to last approximately two months and will not exceed acceptable construction noise levels.

Lighting: No lighting is proposed.

Compliance with FCC standards: The proposed project will not interfere with any TV, radio, telephone, satellite, or other signals. Any interference would be against federal law and a violation of the carriers Wireless's FCC license (Attachment 6).

- O. **Public Agency Approvals:** El Dorado County Community Development Services, El Dorado County Planning and Building Department, El Dorado County Fire Protection District, El Dorado County Air Quality Management District.

2.0 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS CHECKLIST SETTING

A. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below could 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.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.1 Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.2 Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.3 Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.4 Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.5 Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.6 Geologic Processes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.8 Hazards/Hazardous Material | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.9 Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.10 Land Use | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.11 Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.12 Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.13 Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.14 Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.15 Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.16 Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.17 Tribal Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.18 Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.19 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: Aaron Mount, Senior Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature:  Date: 12/4/19

Printed Name: Rommel Pabalinas, Planning Manager For: El Dorado County

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

3.1 AESTHETIC/VISUAL RESOURCES:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting:

The project site area is characterized as primarily rural agricultural. The 52-acre project parcel is developed with agricultural uses and a residence and winery. The project site has an approximate elevation of 2,800 feet above sea level. The site is not located within, or in the vicinity of, a identified scenic corridor or designated scenic highway.

Impact Discussion:

(a) & (b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project parcel is located at the northern terminus of High Hill Road in the Camino/Apple Hill area. The tower will be located in a portion of the parcel that is comprised of managed forest land with an active Timber Harvest Plan. The project site is not located along a designated state scenic-highway or an identified scenic area. The tower itself will be painted to resemble faux bark and has been designed as a stealth Monopine, and will blend into its surrounding environment. The antenna and tower will be concealed by

branches with antenna socks. Ground equipment will be screened by a six foot tall slatted chain-link fence.

The nearest off-site residential dwelling from the proposed communication tower is 300 feet north. The applicant supplied photo simulations of the proposed Monopine tower as seen from different locations in the project area (Attachment 4).

(c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site lease area is within a managed forest. A stealth Monopine is designed to resemble a pine tree to blend in better with the surrounding environment. In this case, there are various trees on the property and is within an area with an active Timber Harvest Plan. The Monopine would be similar in size, albeit taller, to the surrounding trees. The location proposed will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and is not expected to result in a significant impact to scenic vistas and to the area’s visual aesthetics for the purpose of CEQA.

(d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The tower will not be lighted, and the County discourages additional lighting in the area. Further, any future lighting would be subject to section 130.34.020 of the El Dorado County Zoning Code, which requires that all outdoor lighting shall be located, adequately shielded, and directed such that no direct light falls outside the property line, or into the public right-of-way. With the implementation of outdoor lighting regulations at the time of development, the proposed project would not create new sources of substantial lighting or glare that would generate a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: For this Aesthetic category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant impacts would be anticipated to result from the project.

3.2 AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

(a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is zoned Planned Agricultural-Twenty Acre (PA-20) and Timber Production (TPZ). The project is within the TPZ zoned portion of the property. The TPZ zone allows wireless communications facilities, with approval of a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to El Dorado County Zoning Code section 130.24.020.

The site is designated as Unique Farmland as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed project consisting of the construction and operation of a new 125’ monopine communication tower located within a Timber Production (TPZ) zoned parcel and was considered by the Agricultural Commission on May 08, 2019. The 1,600 square foot lease area constitutes less than one percent of the project parcel. The Agricultural Commission recommended approval of the project and found that the project would not be detrimental to agricultural production, would not conflict with agricultural production and would not reduce or destroy agricultural buffering. Further, they determined that relocation of the site to the current proposed site would reduce impacts to the timber operation.

The lease area would not interfere with continued agricultural uses. The construction of a new communication tower was determined not to be an incompatible use with agricultural uses. The construction and operation of a cellular tower is not considered to be an incompatible use with forest resources.

(b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site and surrounding parcels are zoned to allow varying intensities of agricultural uses. The Project would not conflict with any allowed agricultural uses. During a project hearing on May 08, 2019, the Agricultural Commission reviewed the project and confirmed that the project parcel is under a Williamson Act Contract and Timber Harvest Plan. However, the Agricultural Commission found that the project would have no impact on this Williamson Act Contract and Timber Harvest Plan and would be a compatible use.

(c-e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project consisting of the construction and operation of a new 125’ monopine communication tower located within a Timber Production

(TPZ) zoned parcel and was considered by the Agricultural Commission on May 08, 2019. The Agricultural Commission recommended approval of the project and found that the project would not be detrimental to agricultural production, would not conflict with agricultural production and would not reduce or destroy agricultural buffering. Further, they determined that relocation of the site to the current proposed site would reduce impacts to the timber operation. The lease area would not interfere with continued agricultural uses. The construction of a new communication tower was determined not to be an incompatible use with agricultural uses. The construction and operation of a cellular tower is not considered to be an incompatible use with forest resources.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: For this Agricultural category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no impacts would be anticipated to result from the project.

3.3 AIR QUALITY:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting:

El Dorado County’s air pollution management is the responsibility of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDCAQMD), and the project is subject to federal, state, and local regulations. The wider Sacramento Region, including portions of El Dorado County, is currently

designated nonattainment for federal 8-hour ozone and PM_{2.5}, while it currently meets the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and lead.

The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requires plans which identify how nonattainment areas will attain and/or maintain the NAAQS. The CAA requires the US EPA to review each plan and any plan revisions and to approve the plan or plan revisions if consistent with the CAA. Key elements of these plans include emission inventories, emission control strategies and rules, air quality data analyses, modeling, air quality progress and attainment or maintenance demonstrations. The Sacramento Air Quality Management District has a prepared attainment plans, available at: <http://www.airquality.org/air-quality-health/air-quality-plans/federal-planning>.

The CARB also prepares and submits to the EPA a State Implementation Plan (SIP) explaining how the state will attain compliance with Federal clean air standards. The EDCAQMD rules are federally enforceable as parts of the SIP, and are available at: <https://www.arb.ca.gov/drdb/ed/cur.htm>.

Impact Discussion:

(a) – (d) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities, a source of organic gas emissions, will be limited to the Monopine, related ground equipment, utilities and access drive. During construction, various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment would be in use. Construction diesel emissions are temporary, affecting an area for a period of days or perhaps weeks. Additionally, construction-related sources are mobile and transient in nature. Because of its temporary duration and the limited area of disturbance, health risks from construction emissions of diesel particulate would be less-than-significant impact. The project is not expected to create any significant amounts of fugitive dust, oxides of nitrogen, or reactive organic gases emissions.

The ongoing project is not expected to generate any significant amounts of fugitive dust because the only soil disturbance would be some very minor excavation for the facility.

The effects of construction activities would be an increase in dust fall, and locally elevated levels of particulates downwind of construction activity. However, due to its limited construction and operational scope, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Negligible amounts of emissions would be generated by construction equipment during site development activities, because of the limited amount of construction equipment and time needed to install the facility.

(e) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Monopine and ground related equipment will not use anything that will generate objectionable odors to the surrounding properties or area.

Mitigation Measure: None Required.

FINDING: The proposed project would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The proposed project would not be anticipated to cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 or the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish and wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Impact Discussion:

The 52-acre project parcel consists of managed forest and vineyard.

Jurisdictional Waters of the United States, including Wetlands

Waters of the United States (U.S.), including wetlands, are broadly defined to include navigable waterways, and tributaries of navigable waterways, and adjacent wetlands. Although definitions vary to some degree, wetlands are generally considered to be areas that are periodically or permanently inundated by surface water or groundwater, supporting vegetation adapted to life in saturated soil. Jurisdictional wetlands are vegetated areas that meet specific vegetation, soil, and hydrologic criteria defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The USACE holds sole authority to determine the jurisdictional status of waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Jurisdictional wetlands and Waters of the U.S. include, but are not limited to, perennial and intermittent creeks and drainages, lakes, seeps, and springs; emergent marshes; riparian wetlands; and seasonal wetlands. Wetland and waters of the U.S. provide critical habitat components, such as nest sites and reliable source of water for a wide variety of wildlife species.

The general topography of the project site is gently sloping with an average elevation of 2,856 feet above mean sea level (MSL). The proposed cellular tower location is located in the northwest portion of property within managed mixed oak woodland. The area is located in the North Fork American Hydrologic Unit (Hydrologic Unit Code 18020129). There are no wetlands or waters on the site.

Special-Status Species

Many species of plants and animals within the State of California have low populations, limited distributions, or both. Such species may be considered “rare” and are vulnerable to extirpation as the state’s human population grows and the habitats these species occupy are converted to agricultural and urban uses. A sizable number of native species and animals have been formally designated as threatened or endangered under State and Federal endangered species legislation. Others have been designated as “Candidates” for such listing; still others have been designated as “Species of Special Concern” by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) has developed its own set of lists of native plants considered rare, threatened or endangered. Collectively, these plants and animals are referred to as “special status species.”

Limited, direct and indirect impacts to biological resources may result from the small amount of development enabled by the project, including the loss and/or alteration of existing undeveloped open space that may serve as habitat. California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15065 requires a mandatory finding of significance for projects that have the potential to

substantially degrade or reduce the habitat of a threatened or endangered species, and to fully disclose and mitigate impacts to special status resources.

(a) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB Rarefind 5, Government Version, November, 2019) was reviewed to determine if any special status animal and plant species or habitats occur on the project site or in the project area.

According to a records search and biological field surveys conducted (Geist Engineering and Environmental, 2019), None of the special status species documented to occur within five miles of the site as indicated by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) GIS review were observed during the survey. As part of this Biological Reconnaissance Habitat Assessment, the consultant evaluated the potential for occurrence of special-status plant species and special-status wildlife species. Because common wildlife species found in the project area are locally and regionally common, potential impacts to these resources are considered less than significant. An onsite biological survey, by Geist Engineering and Environmental, concluded no populations of special-status plant species were present within the project area. The project does not contain serpentine rock or gabbro soils known to support certain rare plant species. No mitigation is required.

The site may potentially provide habitat for birds listed under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and/or regulated by the CA Fish and Game Code. Birds may nest in trees, shrubs, on the ground, and on structures within and adjacent to the site. The nests of raptors and most other birds are protected under the MBTA. Raptors are also protected by Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code, which makes it illegal to destroy any active raptor nest. Additionally, the USFWS and CDFW identified a number of avian species of conservation concern that do not have specific statutory protection. Avian species forage and nest in a variety of habitats throughout El Dorado County. While the trees and vegetation on and surrounding the site may provide nesting and foraging habitat for raptors and other protected birds, according to a records search and a biological field survey conducted on December 8, 2018, no active bird nests were observed on the site.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

If any grading or construction activities occur during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31), a preconstruction survey for the presence of special-status bird species or any nesting bird species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 500 feet of proposed construction areas, no more than three days prior to construction activities. The survey shall be submitted to Planning Services for review. If active nests are identified in these areas, CDFW and/or USFWS shall be consulted to develop measures to avoid “take” of active nests prior to the initiation of any construction activities. Avoidance measures may include establishment of a 40-foot, fenced buffer zone using construction fencing or the postponement of vegetation removal until after the nesting season, or until after a qualified biologist has determined the young have fledged and are independent of the nest site.

Monitoring Requirement: The applicant shall conduct all construction activities outside the nesting season or perform a pre-construction survey and the necessary avoidance measures prior to initiation of construction activities. This mitigation measure shall be noted on future grading and residential construction plans. If a pre-construction survey is required, the applicant shall provide evidence of the survey with the Development Services Division to verify prior to issuance of grading permit.

Monitoring Responsibility: El Dorado County Development Services-Planning Department

(b) and (c) Less than significant impact. The project site is located in an agricultural and recreational area and does not have any, streams, creeks or riparian habitat on site. South Canyon Creek is approximately 0.5 mile east and the South Fork of the American River is approximately 2 miles north of the project site and the project will not affect the Creek. The project site is located in an area where no federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act exists, or within proximity to the project site.

(d) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed ground equipment of the communication facility and the Monopine will be located within a 1,600 square foot fenced area and include a 15-foot access drive off of an existing driveway. The fenced area will not substantially interfere with native wildlife migration in the area. The project site area is characterized as primarily rural agricultural, with disturbed and vegetated areas. It is not considered a wildlife migration corridor, and therefore is not expected to result in impacts to wildlife migration corridors. The site is not located within an Important Biological Corridor identified by the El Dorado County General Plan. The proposed project will not cause significant reduction in the ecological functions of the site because the habitat in the area is already disturbed by human activities.

The construction of new communication towers creates a potentially significant impact on migratory birds covered by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C. 703-712) and related Code of Federal Regulations designed to implement the MBTA, the Endangered Species Act and Bald and Golden Eagle Act. The guidelines are based on the best information available at this time, and are the most prudent and effective measures for avoiding bird strikes at monopoles. Some of the guidelines are:

- a. New facilities should be collocated on existing towers or other existing structures.
- b. Towers should be less than 200 feet above ground level
- c. Towers should be freestanding (i.e., no guy wires)
- d. Towers and attendant facilities should be sited, designed and constructed so as to avoid or minimize habitat loss within and adjacent to the monopole “footprint”.

- e. New towers should be designed structurally and electrically to accommodate the applicant/licensee’s antennas and antennas for at least two additional users (minimum of three users for each monopole structure).
- f. Security lighting for on-ground facilities and equipment should be down-shielded to keep light within the boundaries of the site.
- g. Monopoles no longer in use or determined to be obsolete should be removed within 12 months of cessation of use.

The project is consistent with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service interim guidelines above. The footprint of the proposed lease area would not encroach onto any environmentally sensitive habitat.

Although the proposed project will be in a relatively small area of the project site, there is the potential for impact to the nesting of migratory and raptors in the project area. Mitigation Measure BIO-1, is therefore included to avoid potential impacts.

- (e) **No Impact:** Local protection of biological resources includes the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) oak woodland preservation, rare plants and special-status species with the goal to preserve and protect sensitive natural resources within the County. The project is not located in IBC. The site does contain native oak trees. No oak trees are proposed to be removed; therefore there would be no significant impacts.
- (f) **No Impact.** This site is not located within an approved habitat conservation plan area.

Finding: With mitigation measures incorporated, impacts to biological resources will be less than significant.

3.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
--	--	--	--	--

Impact Discussion:

(a) – (d) Less Than Significant Impact. Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic period archaeological sites; historical features, such as rock walls, water ditches and flumes, and cemeteries; and architectural features. Cultural resources consist of any human-made site, object (i.e., artifact), or feature that defines and illuminates our past. A complete records search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) maps for cultural resource site records and survey reports in El Dorado County within a ¼ mile radius of the proposed project area revealed that the proposed area contains zero (0) prehistoric-period resource(s) and four (4) historic-period cultural resource(s) with the property being determined to be potentially sensitive to historic resources. A field study was conducted by Archeological Resources Technology (ART) on November 21, 2018. No cultural, pre-historic or historic resources were found within the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

FINDING: As conditioned and with adherence to El Dorado County Code of Ordinances (County Code), for this Cultural Resources category, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

3.5 ENERGY:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in potential significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

(a) – (b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would construct and operate a new 125-foot tall communication tower. Energy would be used during both the construction phase and, upon project buildout, during the operational phase of the proposed project. Energy usage during the construction phase would originate from mobile and stationary construction

equipment. Construction-related energy usage can vary substantially depending on the level of activity, length of the construction period, specific construction operations, and types of equipment. Operational energy usage would be generated by electricity use for operating the tower.

The project would be serviced by Pacific, Gas and Electric (PG&E) and is anticipated to consume 1,550 kilowatts (kW) of power annually. All structures resulting from the proposed project will conform to building code and other state and local energy conservation measures, reducing the potential for wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

FINDING: As conditioned and with adherence to El Dorado County Code of Ordinances (County Code), for this Energy category, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

3.6 GEOLOGIC PROCESSES:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system where sewers are not available for the disposal or wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a.1) - a.4) Less Than Significant Impact. No seismic impacts, including seismic-related ground failure impacts are anticipated since no rupture of a known earthquake fault exists in the project area. Further, the proposed project would be consistent with El Dorado County General Plan Objective 6.3.2, to address county-wide seismic hazards.

Like most of north central California, the site can be expected to be subjected to strong seismic ground shaking at some future time. Accordingly, the proposed wireless communications facility extension would be designed and installed in accordance with building code requirements. Because the project appears to be located such that the probability of significant ground shaking is low, and because any structures that are built during the course of the project will be designed and installed in accordance with building code standards for the appropriate Seismic Hazard Zone, potential geologic impacts would be less than significant. Due to the relatively level proposed project area, minimum disturbance of the project and existing vegetation on the site, the potential for a land slide is unlikely.

(b) – (d) Less Than Significant Impact. The project does not involve large amounts of soil disturbance that could result in significant soil erosion impacts. The construction activities would result in a land disturbance of less than one acre and therefore are not expected to require a Storm water Pollution Prevention Permit (SWPPP) from State Water Resources Control Board prior to construction. Due to the relatively small amount of soils disturbance required for construction, erosion potential will be minimal. Due to the relatively small amount of soils disturbance required for construction, the potential for unstable soils, liquefaction, and expansion is minimal. Further, the project would be required to comply with applicable portions of the building code, which would offset potential impacts resulting from expansive soils.

(e) No Impact. The project does not require the use of septic systems.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: A review of the soils and geologic conditions on the project site determined that the project would not result in a substantial adverse effect. All grading activities would be required to comply with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Ordinance which would address potential impacts related to soil erosion, landslides and other geologic impacts. Future development would be required to comply with the UBC which would address potential seismic related impacts. For this Geology and Soils category, impacts would be less than significant.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

Global climate change is the observed increase in the average temperature of the Earth’s atmosphere and oceans along with other significant changes in climate (such as precipitation or wind) that last for an extended period of time. The term “global climate change” is often used interchangeably with the term “global warming,” but “global climate change” is preferred to “global warming” because it helps convey that there are other changes in addition to rising temperatures. Global surface temperatures have risen by $0.74^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 0.18^{\circ}\text{C}$ over the last 100 years (1906 to 2005). The rate of warming over the last 50 years is almost double that over the last 100 years.¹ The prevailing scientific opinion on climate change is that most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities. The increased amounts of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other greenhouse gases (GHGs) are the primary causes of the human-induced component of warming. GHGs are released by the burning of fossil fuels, land clearing, agriculture, and other activities, and lead to an increase in the greenhouse effect.²

GHGs are present in the atmosphere naturally, are released by natural sources, or are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. The following are the gases that are widely seen as the principal contributors to human-induced global climate change:³

- Carbon dioxide (CO₂)
- Methane (CH₄)
- Nitrous oxide (N₂O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF₆)

¹ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 2007. *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC.*

² The temperature on Earth is regulated by a system commonly known as the "greenhouse effect." Just as the glass in a greenhouse allows heat from sunlight in and reduces the amount of heat that escapes, greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide in the atmosphere keep the Earth at a relatively even temperature. Without the greenhouse effect, the Earth would be a frozen globe; thus, although an excess of greenhouse gas results in global warming, the *naturally occurring* greenhouse effect is necessary to keep our planet at a comfortable temperature.

³ The greenhouse gases listed are consistent with the definition in Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (Government Code §38505).

Over the last 200 years, human activities have caused substantial quantities of GHGs to be released into the atmosphere. These extra emissions are increasing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and enhancing the natural greenhouse effect, which is believed to be causing global warming, while manmade GHGs include naturally-occurring GHGs such as CO₂, methane, and N₂O, some gases, such as HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆ are completely new to the atmosphere.

Section 15064.4 of the CEQA Guidelines sets forth guidance for determining the significance of Impacts from Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The guidelines allow impacts from a particular project to be described quantitatively or qualitatively and direct that impacts should be evaluated in consideration of existing environmental setting, applicable thresholds of significance, and compliance with regulations and requirements adopted to implement the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions.

Section 15064 (h)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that a project's contribution to a cumulative effect may be found 'not cumulatively considerable' if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program, including plans or regulations for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. El Dorado County has not adopted a plan or mitigation program for the reduction of greenhouse gases as of the publication of this study. Likewise, it has not adopted thresholds of significance for evaluating greenhouse gas emissions. However, the General Plan provides applicable county-wide goals and policies aimed at improving energy efficiency, improving transportation efficiency, and reducing air emissions, which could reduce or sequester GHGs, including Goal TC-1, Policies TC-1p and TC-1q, Goal 5.6, Objective 5.6.2, and Policies 5.6.2.1 and 5.6.2.2.

(a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is a communication tower that would not significantly contribute to the existing greenhouse gas inventory for El Dorado County. Short term construction GHG emissions will occur during installation of the tower and ground equipment. Standby generators will only be used during power outages and for short duration during testing. Vehicle trips will be associated with very limited construction and routine maintenance. GHG emissions generated by the development and vehicle trips would be of an extremely limited scope and duration. The GHG emissions would be negligible and the impact would therefore be less than significant.

(b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The El Dorado County General Plan establishes numerous policies relative to greenhouse gases. The everyday operation of the proposed communication facility would not generate greenhouse gas emissions. Due to the short term construction, limited vehicle trips to the site and monthly testing of the standby generators, the anticipated increase in emissions would not conflict with the applicable with policies adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: The project would result in less than significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions. For this Greenhouse Gas Emissions category, there would be no significant adverse environmental effect as a result of the project.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environmental through the routine transport use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one- quarter mile of an existing or proposed schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is proposed to utilize a standby propane generator for back-up power, and would include a separate propane tank. The storage of propane is required only for emergency purposes during a power outage and will not be routinely used or transported. The amount of propane stored would be similar to that for a residential use. Storage and handling of propane, or any other chemicals or hazardous materials, would be subject to a Hazardous Materials Business Plan, administered by the El Dorado County Public Health Department at the time of development of the project. The plan would include an inventory of hazardous materials and chemicals handled or stored on the site, an emergency response plan, and a training program in safety procedures.

Construction activities associated with the development of the proposed project would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. However, all potentially hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers’ instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. In the event of an accidental release, construction personnel who are experienced in containing accidental releases of hazardous materials will likely be present to contain and treat affected areas in the event a spill occurs. If a larger spill were to occur, construction personal would generally be on-hand to contact the appropriate agencies. Hazardous materials used during construction would ultimately disposed of by a licensed hazardous waste transporter at an authorized and licensed disposal facility or recycling facility.

Radiofrequency (RF) Emissions

Radiofrequency (RF) radiation emanates from antenna on cellular towers and is generated by the movement of electrical charges in the antenna. The energy levels it generates are not great enough to ionize, or break down, atoms and molecules, so it is known as “non-ionizing” radiation.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is the government agency responsible for the authorization and licensing of facilities such as cellular towers that generate RF radiation. For guidance in health and safety issues related to RF radiation, the FCC relies on other agencies and organizations for guidance, including the EPA, FDA, the National Institute for Occupational

Safety and Health (NIOSH) and OSHA, which have all been involved in monitoring and investigating issues related to RF exposure. The FCC has developed and adopted guidelines for human exposure to RF radiation using the recommendations of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), with the support of the EPA, FDA, OSHA and NIOSH. According to the FCC, both the NCRP exposure criteria and the IEEE standard were developed by expert scientists and engineers after extensive reviews of the scientific literature related to RF biological effects. The exposure guidelines are based on thresholds for known adverse effects, and they incorporate wide safety margins. In addition, under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) the FCC is required to evaluate transmitters and facilities for significant impacts on the environment, including human exposure to RF radiation. When an application is submitted to the FCC for construction or modification of a transmitting facility or renewal of a license, the FCC evaluates it for compliance with the RF exposure guidelines, which were previously evaluated under NEPA. Failure to show compliance with the FCC's RF exposure guidelines in the application process could lead to the additional environmental review and eventual rejection of an application. The proposed telecommunication facility is subject to the FCC exposure guidelines, and must fall under the FCC's American National Standards Institute (ANSI) public limit standard of .58 mW/cm².

Finally, it should be noted that Section 704 of the Telecommunication Act of 1996 states that "No State or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Commission's regulations concerning such emissions." Because the proposed facility would operate under federally mandated limits on RF radiation for cellular towers and is regulated by the FCC in this respect, the County may not regulate the placement or construction of this facility based on the RF emissions.

An EMF/RF Report (Electromagnetic Fields/Radio Frequency) has been prepared and submitted for the project. This report summarizes the results of RF-EME modeling in relation to relevant FCC RF-EME compliance standards for limiting human exposure to RF-EME fields. It demonstrates compliance. Should the facility's emissions exceed FCC standards, the applicant would be responsible for the cost of additional tests and corrective measures to establish compliance with FCC standards. These County development standards would be reflected as conditions of approval in the use permit.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under 3.8(a), above.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. There are no schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. As discussed above, the proposed project may require the use of potentially hazardous materials during construction and operation of the telecommunication facility, including the storage of diesel fuel. Standard construction practices and implementation of the Business Plan Act, would minimize the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials within proximately to or on the school site to a less than significant level.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. A review of regulatory agency databases, which included lists of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section

65962.5, did not identify contamination sites as being located within, or in the vicinity of, the project site.

e) Less Than Significant Impact. The Placerville Airport (FAA ID PVF) is located approximately 2 miles southwest of the project site. The project site is located outside of all Airport Safety Zones for the Placerville Airport. Given the distance from the Placerville Airport and use of telecommunications equipment on non-FAA frequencies the installation and operations of the Project will not affect the operations at the Placerville Airport, not will the operations of the Placerville affect construction of the proposed Project. Project impacts are less than significant.

f) No Impact. No known private airstrips have been identified within two miles of the project site. As a result, no safety hazards associated with airport operations are anticipated to affect people working or residing within the project site.

g) No Impact. The proposed project is an unmanned facility, so no evacuation and/or emergency response plans are necessary. The proposed project does not include any actions that physically interfere with any emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. Development of the proposed project would add a small amount of trips onto the area roadways; however, area roadways and intersections would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service. In the event future construction activities require work to be performed in the roadway, appropriate traffic control plans would be prepared in conjunction with County requirements.

h) No impact. The proposed use is unmanned and will not subject additional people to risk of fire.

Mitigation Measure: None required

FINDING: For this Hazards and Hazardous Materials category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and no significant impacts would be anticipated to result from the project.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 preexisting nearby wells	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by Federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a) & b) No Impact. The project does not require the use of water and would not create any water discharges.

(c) - f) Less Than Significant Impact. Equipment cabinets are proposed within the 1,600-square foot fenced lease area. The proposed area to be developed, including the Monopine location and the ground equipment are in a managed forest and has previously been disturbed. The 20-foot wide access easement will not create any significant impact to drainage patterns or create significant amount of runoff.

(g) - i) No Impact. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is responsible for mapping areas subject to flooding during a 100-year flood event (i.e., 1 percent chance of occurring in a given year). According to floodplain mapping of the project area, the project site is located within the X zone (Unshaded). The X zone (Unshaded) is defined by FEMA as areas of minimal flood hazard from the principal source of flood in the area and determined to be outside of the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain.

(j) No Impact. The project site has an approximate elevation of 1,400 feet above sea level and the height of the improvements to the tower for co-location indicate that it will not be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

FINDING: The proposed project would not expose the area to hazards relating to the use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. For this Hazards and Hazardous Materials category, impacts would be less than significant.

3.10 LAND USE:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulations 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

The project parcel is zoned PA-20 and TPZ. The Monopine tower meets the necessary setback requirements from the all property lines.

Once constructed and operational, the communications facility would provide 24-hour service to customers seven days a week. Apart from initial construction activity, no personnel will be stationed at the site. Routine maintenance and inspection of the facility would occur once a

month during normal business hours. No water or sewer service is required as the site would be unmanned.

(a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** No new parcels or substantial development would result from this project. The project would not divide any established community.

(b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project was reviewed for consistency with the zoning code and General Plan, and is consistent with both. The proposed Monopine tower is conditionally permitted use in the RL-40 zone with a Conditional Use Permit, which the proposed project is seeking. The proposed project is subject to and will meet the development standards for communication facilities contained in El Dorado County Zoning Code Section 130.40.130.D, and the impact will therefore be less than significant.

(c.) **No Impact.** This site is not located within a habitat conservation or natural community plan area.

Mitigation Measure: None Required.

FINDING: The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan. There would be no impact to land use goals or standards resulting from the project.

3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES:

Would the proposal:	Potential ly Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a) & b) **No Impact.** The California Geological Survey (CGS) has not classified the project site as being located in a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ). The proposed project would not use or extract any mineral or energy resources and would not restrict access to known mineral resource areas.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: No impacts to mineral resources are expected either directly or indirectly. For this mineral resources category, there would be no impacts.

3.12 NOISE:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

The project site is located in an area with intensive agricultural uses. Noise levels vary in the project area. Noise is expected to be limited to construction of the proposed facility and occasional use of the emergency generator. The proposed wireless communications facility is unmanned and would not expose people at the facility to noise levels.

a) & c) Less Than Significant Impact. Uses associated with this project would not create a significant increase in ambient noise levels within or in proximity to the project site. The potential future use of onsite emergency standby generators would provide power until normal

power is restored. While not proposed, any future use of standby generators would be short term in duration and will not create significant impacts. Any future proposed onsite Emergency Backup Generator and HVAC systems would be evaluated for consistency with El Dorado County’s noise level standards according to the El Dorado County Title 130 Zoning and Noise Ordinance, Chapter 130.37 – Noise Standards.

(b) No Impact. The proposed project would not include the development of land uses that would generate substantial ground-borne vibration or noise or use construction activities that would have such effects. No structures are proposed that would require heavy footings where the use of heavy pile drivers would be required.

(d) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity on the site has the potential to generate high noise levels on and adjacent to the project site intermittently during project development activities. During construction, the highest noise levels would result from operation of heavy equipment, which can be expected to generate noise levels of between 85 to 90 decibels (dBA) at a distance of 50 feet from the source. Noise levels will be reduced, however, by a factor of six dBA with each doubling of distance from the noise source and by intervening topography. Construction noise activities related to the construction is temporary in nature and is not seen will not be significant, given the distance, approximately 300 feet to the nearest offsite residence. Consistent with County requirements, noise generating construction activities will be limited to daytime hours between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm on weekdays and non-holidays, and 8:00 am to 5:00 pm on weekends. Given the distance from the nearest off-site residential structures, construction noise is not expected to have a significant impact on nearby residence. Furthermore, any such noise disturbance would be intermittent, short-term in nature and required to be in compliance with County requirements. The impact would therefore be less than significant.

e) & f) No Impact. The project is located more than two miles from the nearest airport or private airstrip.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: As conditioned, and with adherence to County Code, no significant direct or indirect impacts to noise levels are expected either directly or indirectly. For this Noise category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded.

3.13 HOUSING:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The project would not affect the population of the area because no new parcels would be created and no additional dwellings would be placed on the project site as a result of this project.

b) & c) **No Impact.** The project would not displace individuals or housing. The project does not require the extension of any infrastructure, such as roads, water, or sewer systems. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: The project would not displace housing. There would be no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth either directly or indirectly. For this Population and Housing category, the thresholds of significance would not be anticipated to be exceeded.

3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Other public services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) - b) **No Impact.** The project would not increase the level of fire protection service needed on the site because wireless communication facilities do not normally require such services.
- c) **No Impact.** The proposal is not expected to result in an increase in demand for police services because wireless communication facilities do not normally require such services.
- d) **No Impact.** The communication facility is an unmanned facility and therefore will not result in an increase in demand for school facilities in the area.
- e) **No Impact.** The communication facility is an unmanned facility and therefore will not create an increase in park usage.
- e) **No Impact.** The communication facility is an unmanned facility and therefore will not require other public services

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: The project would not result in a significant increase of public services to the project. For this Public Services category, impacts would be less than significant.

3.15 RECREATION:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) & b) **No Impact.** The communication facility is an unmanned facility and therefore will not create an increase in park usage. No recreational facilities are proposed under this proposal and

none are located on the project site. No impacts on existing or future recreational facilities would occur.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: No significant impacts to open space or park facilities would result as part of the project. For this Recreation category, impacts would be less than significant.

3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with accepted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

Access to the facility will be provided by a 20-foot wide access drive from High Hill Road.

(a) & (b) Less Than Significant Impact. The project area is agricultural, and there are low traffic volumes at the project site itself. The proposed wireless communication facility would temporally generate additional vehicle traffic in the project area during construction activities. This would be minor and would not have a significant impact on vehicular circulation in the project area. Once construction has been completed, traffic will return to pre-construction levels. After construction activities have been completed, the project would require only one to two site visits per month. This very low number of vehicle trips would not have any impact on vehicular circulation in the project area.

(c) No Impact. The project site is not located within an Airport Compatibility Zone.

(d) No Impact. The project design does not involve any modifications to High Hill Road, nor create any additional hazards of safety concerns.

(e) – (g) No Impact. Since the project is an unmanned facility and does not involve a substantial number of vehicle trips, the project will not result in inadequate emergency access.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: The project would not exceed the thresholds for traffic identified within the General Plan. For this Transportation/Traffic category, the thresholds of significant would not be exceeded and impacts would be less than significant.

3.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and this is:</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No Impact</p>
<p>a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) or</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In apply the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

Impact Discussion:

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC), the Wilton Rancheria, the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, the Ione Band of Miwok Indians, the Nashville-El Dorado Miwok, the T’si Akim Maidu, and the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians were notified of the proposed project and given access to all project documents. No other tribe had requested to be notified of the proposed projects for consultation in the project area at the time. Pursuant to the records search and cultural resource report, the geographic area of the project site is not known to contain any resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as designed in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or considered significant by a California Native American tribe. The impact would be less than significant.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion 4.17(a) – *Tribal Cultural Resources*.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: No significant TCRs are known to exist on the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change to a TCR and there would be a less than significant impact.

3.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes, and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

(a) - g) No Impact. Implementation of the project would not require domestic water or wastewater treatment, or solid waste facilities. It would not be in non-compliance with any statutes or regulations relating to solid waste, nor would it employ equipment that would

introduce interference into any system. Thus, the project would have no impact on any utilities or service systems.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

FINDING: No significant utility and service system impacts would be expected with the project, either directly or indirectly. For this Utilities and Service Systems category, the thresholds of significance would not be exceeded.

3.19 Wildfire:

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities: that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

(a), (b) & (d) Less Than Significant Impact. The project is surrounded by grassland and oak woodland. The project site is within a State responsibility area and the California Department of

Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) has indicated the project site is within a very-high fire hazard rank. Implementation of the proposed project would not alter any roadways, access points, or otherwise degrade traffic operations and access to the area in such a way as to interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan. There are no proposed residences associated with the project, and project operations would not notably increase the risk of wildfire on the project site. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. The project is required to adhere to all fire prevention and protection requirements and regulations of El Dorado County including the El Dorado County Fire Hazard Ordinance and the Uniform Fire Code, as applicable. Pertinent measures include, but are not limited to, the use of equipment with spark arrestors and non-sparking tools during project activities. The project applicant would also be required to develop the project structures to meet ‘defensible space’ requirements as specified under Objective 6.2.1 of the Safety Element of the El Dorado County General Plan.

The proposed project would construct and operate a 125 foot tall communication tower within a 1,600 square foot lease area. The project has been reviewed by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District and CalFire and is not anticipated to exacerbate wildfire risks. The project lease area is flat and is not characterized by steep and sloping terrain. The project site is within a managed forest with an active timber harvest plan approved by CalFire. The potential for the proposed project to expose people or structures to significant risks related post-fire landslide would be limited. Impacts would be less than significant.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact. The communication tower would be accessed via a new 20 foot wide driveway connecting to High Hill Road via an existing driveway. The proposed project would not include or require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure associated with wildfires that would exacerbate fire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

FINDING: As conditioned and with adherence to El Dorado County Code of Ordinances (County Code), for this Wildfire category, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

3.20 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (SECTION 15065):

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have the potential to substantially 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-	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. With the implementation of mitigation measures included in this Initial Study, the proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment; result in an adverse impact on fish, wildlife, or plant species including special status species, or prehistoric or historic cultural resources. Prehistoric or historic cultural resources would not be adversely affected because no archeological or historic resources are known to exist in the project area and project implementation includes following appropriate procedures for avoiding or preserving artifacts or human remains should they be uncovered during project excavation.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. There are no identified impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Past, current, and probable future projects in the vicinity of the project site were reviewed to determine if any additional cumulative impacts may occur with the approval of this project. A two-mile radius was used in determining cumulative impacts. No cumulative impacts were discovered.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** There have been no impacts discovered through the review of this application demonstrating that there would be substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.

Attachments

- Attachment 1Site Plan
- Attachment 2Coverage Map and Co-Location Analysis
- Attachment 3Photo Simulations
- Attachment 4Radio Frequency Emissions
- Attachment 5NEPA Report