MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FILE: S17-0005

PROJECT NAME: Cal.Net Towers North

NAME OF APPLICANT: Cal.Net, Mark Herr

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NOs.: 060-090-24, 061-720-01, 061-540-14, 073-031-09, 060-361-48, 062-111-07, 060-200-52, 060-430-61, 060-180-27, and 062-500-33

SECTION: 20 **T:** 12N **R:** 10E, **S:** 31 **T:** 13N **R:** 10E, **S:** 9 **T:** 12N **R:** 10E, **S:** 10 **T:** 12N **R:** 9E, **S:** 27 **T:** 12N **R:** 10E, **S:** 30/31 **T:** 12N **R:** 11E, **S:** 33 **T:** 12N **R:** 11E, **S:** 15 **T:** 13N **R:** 11E, **S:** 15 **T:** 13N **R:** 11E, **S:** 15 **T:** 13N **R:** 11E

LOCATION: Throughout northern El Dorado County in the vicinity of the Cool, Greenwood, Georgetown, Garden Valley and Volcanoville areas (Attachment 1).

☐ **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT: FROM: TO:**

☐ **REZONING: FROM: TO:**

☐ **TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP** ☐
SUBDIVISION (NAME):

☒ **SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW:** Construction and operation of ten communication towers.

☐ **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 Planning Commission on October 26, 2017.

_____
Executive Secretary

Master
Initial Study/ Proposed
Mitigated Negative Declaration

for the

El Dorado North
Cal.Net Towers North
Conditional Use Permit S17-0004

Prepared For:

El Dorado County

Community Development Agency

2850 Fairlane Court

Placerville, CA 95667

Prepared By:

Cal.net Inc.

P.O. Box 1041

Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Table of Contents

Figures

Tables

Attachments

1. Project Information

1. Project Title:

Conditional Use Permit S17-0004/Cal.Net Towers North

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

El Dorado County Community Development Agency
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Evan Mattes, Assistant Planner, 530/ 621-5994

Mark Herr, Manager, Cal.net, 530/ 672-1078 x105

4. Description of Project:

Cal.net, Inc., a Wireless Internet Service Provider with its base of operations in Shingle Springs, proposes to construct and provision a last-mile fixed-wireless broadband Internet and VoIP telephony service project in rural underserved portions of northern El Dorado County. The El Dorado North Project (Project) will be partially funded by the California Public Utility Commission's California Advanced Services Fund (CASF) Wireless Broadband Grant. The Project will install communication facilities at 10 different locations in northern El Dorado County under one Conditional Use Permit. The Project is composed of exclusively fixed-wireless technology deployed on towers constructed by Cal.net.

The facilities are located on private properties. Tower and cabling configurations, parcel acreages, and project direct impact sizes, and site access are listed in Table 1.

5. Project Location:

The Project is located in northern El Dorado County in the vicinity of the communities of Cool, Greenwood, Georgetown, Garden Valley, Meadow Brook, and Volcanoville. The Project includes the ten sites listed in Table 1, below.

6. General plan designation:

Project sites and adjacent parcels' General Plan designations and zoning are listed in Table 1.

7. Zoning:

See Table 1.

8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

See Table 1.

9. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval May Be Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

- California Public Utilities Commission: Funding approval
- El Dorado County Building Department: Review and approval of Building Permit
- El Dorado County Transportation Department: Review of Conditions of Approval
- El Dorado County Fire Protection District: Review and approval of Building and Grading Permit
- Garden Valley Fire Protection District: Review and approval of Building and Grading Permit
- Georgetown Fire Protection District: Review and approval of Building and Grading Permit

Table 1. Project Site Descriptions

Project Site Name	Project Site Address	Project Site Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Portion of APN that is Project Site	USGS 7.5" Quad	Lat/ Long Coordinates	Section, Township, & Range (Mt. Diablo Meridian)	Tower and Cabling Configuration	Total Parcel Acreage	Project Impact Size	Access	General Plan Land Use Designation	Project Site Zoning Use Requirements, and Applicable Code Section	Adjacent Land General Land Use Designation	Adjacent Land Zoning	Distance from Tower to Residences; Visibility (see Attachment D)
1	4030 Brinks Lane	073-031-09-100	307 ft^2	Greenwood	38.90054 -120.9686	Sec 10, T12N, R9E	40 ft tower anchored to existing barn, supported on 2.5-ft diameter concrete pier bored to 4 ft. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet inside existing barn, to existing 110-V outlet for power.	2.5 ac	5.0 ft^2	Brinks Lane, private driveway	Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential, Two-Acre (R2A) Administrative and Conditional use permit 130.24.020	Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential, Two-Acre (R2A)	65 ft to residence, 165 ft to neighbor. The 40-foot-tall Site 1 tower is surrounded by 60 foot oak trees approximately 40-50 feet from the barn. From residential roads around the property, the oak trees on the property block the view of the tower. About 10 feet of the top of the tower is visible from along approximately 83 feet of CA-193 before view is blocked by trees along road and road cut.
2	2040 Sliger Mine Road	061-720-01-100	234 ft^2	Greenwood	38.93465 -120.9044	Sec 31, T13N, R10E	100-ft tower on 5.5 x 5.5 x 4 ft concrete pier atop a 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft foundation in area excavated to 4 ft depth. Six ft chain link fence installed around facility. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet installed on tower base, to secondary power pole installed on tower base, to shed, to existing utility pole 98 ft east for power.	13.35 ac	144.0 ft^2	Roquero Cerro Road, private driveway	Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential, Three-Acre (R3A) Administrative and Conditional use permit 130.24.020	Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential, Two- and Three-Acre (R2A, R3A)	130 ft to residence, 228 ft to neighbor. The 100-foot-tall Site 2 tower is surrounded by oak and pine trees. From approximately 0.15 miles away on Sliger Mine Road, and along Roquero Cerro Road where there are no trees, approximately 10 ft of the top of the tower is visible. Closer to the site, pine and oak trees along the roadways block the view of the tower.
3	5400 Reservoir Road	061-540-14-100	5,227 ft^2	Georgetown	38.90809 -120.8698	Sec 9, T12N, R10E	120-ft tower on 5.5 x 5.5 x 4 ft concrete pier atop a 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft foundation in area excavated 4 ft. Six ft chain link fence installed around facility. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet installed on tower base, underground cabling in 6 x 18-in trench in 2-in schedule 80 PVC from cabinet to proposed secondary pole 250 ft east, aerial to existing PG&E pole 50 ft southeast for power.	5.4 ac	333.5 ft^2	Reservoir Road, private driveway	Low Density Residential (LDR)	Residential Estate, Five-Acre (RE-5) Administrative and Conditional use permit 130.24.020	Low Density Residential (LDR)	Residential Estate, Five-Acre (RE-5)	330 ft to residence and nearest neighbor. 100 to 150-foot ponderosa pines surround the tower. Because the adjacent properties are similarly forested, and because tall pines line the roads, the view of the tower is screened from all areas off the property.

Project Site Name	Project Site Address	Project Site Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Portion of APN that is Project Site	USGS 7.5" Quad	Lat/ Long Coordinates	Section, Township, & Range (Mt. Diablo Meridian)	Tower and Cabling Configuration	Total Parcel Acreage	Project Impact Size	Access	General Plan Land Use Designation	Project Site Zoning Use Requirements, and Applicable Code Section	Adjacent Land General Land Use Designation	Adjacent Land Zoning	Distance from Tower to Residences; Visibility (see Attachment D)
4	8140 Wild Horse Trail	062-500-33	3,049 ft^2	Tunnel Mountain	38.96976 -120.7409	Sec 15, T13N, R11E	120-ft tower on 5.5 x 5.5 x 4 ft concrete pier atop a 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft foundation in area excavated 4 ft. Six ft chain link fence installed around facility. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet installed on tower base underground cabling in 6 x 18-in trench in 2 in schedule 80 PVC to a proposed secondary power pole installed 50 ft southeast from cabinet, aerial from pole to existing PG&E pole 50 ft southeast for power.	5.785 ac	191.0 ft^2	Wild Horse Trail, private driveway	Low Density Residential (LDR)	Residential Estate, Five-Acre (RE-5) Administrative and Conditional use permit 130.24.020	Low Density Residential (LDR); Natural Resource (NR)	Residential Estate, Five-Acre (RE-5); Forest Resource (FR-160)	224 ft to residence, 770 ft to neighbor The only clear view of the tower (top 70 ft of the tower) from outside the property is from Wild Horse Trail at the property gate. Beyond this location, tall pine trees that line the road block the view of the tower. There is no clear line of sight from other roads in the area.
5	3680 Greenwood Road	060-090-24-100	486 ft^2	Coloma	38.87326 -120.8835	Sec 20, T12N, R10E	100-ft tower on 5.5 x 5.5 x 4 ft concrete pier atop a 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft foundation in area excavated 4 ft. Six ft chain link fence installed around facility. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet installed on tower base, underground cabling in 6 x 18-in trench in 2-in schedule 80 PVC from cabinet to existing PG&E pole 75 ft east for power.	11.17 ac	211.5 ft^2	Greenwood Road, private driveway	Rural Residential (RR)	Limited Agriculture, Ten-Acre (LA-10) Administrative and Conditional use permit 130.21.020	Rural Residential (RR)	Rural Lands, Ten-Acre (RL-10); Limited Agriculture, Ten-Acre (LA-10)	110 ft to residence, 700 ft to neighbor Due to the height of the forest surrounding the site, approximately 10 feet of the tower is only visible from a distance (0.3 linear mi away). The curves in the road and travel speed limit the amount of time the tower is visible. the tower. The trees along the road block the view of all but less than 10 feet of the tower as the viewer approaches the tower from the east on Greenwood Road. Less than 5 feet of the tower is visible within 500 ft of the tower due to road cut and pine trees that block the view.

Project Site Name	Project Site Address	Project Site Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Portion of APN that is Project Site	USGS 7.5" Quad	Lat/ Long Coordinates	Section, Township, & Range (Mt. Diablo Meridian)	Tower and Cabling Configuration	Total Parcel Acreage	Project Impact Size	Access	General Plan Land Use Designation	Project Site Zoning Use Requirements, and Applicable Code Section	Adjacent Land General Land Use Designation	Adjacent Land Zoning	Distance from Tower to Residences; Visibility (see Attachment D)
6	3550 Brumarba Heights	060-200-52-100	669 ft^2	Garden Valley	38.85316 -120.8743	Sec 33, T12N, R10E	120-ft tower on 5.5 x 5.5 x 4 ft concrete pier atop a 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft foundation in area excavated 4 ft. Six ft chain link fence installed around facility. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet installed on tower base, underground cabling in 6 x 18-in trench in 2-in schedule 80 PVC from cabinet 25 ft southeast to proposed secondary pole to existing PG&E pole 56 ft south for power.	56.992 ac	165.5 ft^2	Brumarba Heights, private driveway and private road	Agricultural Lands (AL)	Planned Agriculture, Twenty-Acre (PA-20) Administrative and Conditional use permit 130.21.020	Agricultural Lands (AL), Medium Density Residential (MDR), Rural Residential (RR)	Rural Lands, Twenty-Acre (RL-20); Residential Estate, Ten-Acre (RE-10); Planned Agriculture, Twenty-Acre (PA-20)	735 ft to residence, 622 ft to neighbor From Acsarben Drive, approximately 5 feet of the top of the tower is visible. From other publicly accessible roads, tall pine and oak trees along the roads, all of which are downslope from the tower location, block the view of the tower. Approximately 25 feet of the tower is visible from the driveway of the property.
7	1030 View Ridge Lane	060-180-27-100	3,049 ft^2	Garden Valley	38.86817 -120.8584	Sec 27, T12N, R10E	120-ft tower on 5.5 x 5.5 x 4 ft concrete pier atop a 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft foundation poured in excavated 4 ft. Six ft chain link fence installed around facility. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet installed on tower base, underground cabling in 6 x 18-in trench in 2-in schedule 80 PVC from cabinet to residence 100 ft north, to existing 110-V outlet for power.	10.01 ac	5.0 ft^2	View Ridge Road, private driveway	Rural Residential (RR)	Rural Lands, Ten-Acre (RL-10) Administrative and Conditional use permit 130.21.020	Rural Residential (RR), Agricultural Lands (AL)	Rural Lands, Twenty-Acre (RL-20); Limited Agriculture, Ten-Acre (LA-10)	178 ft to residence, 451 ft to neighbor 100- to 150-foot ponderosa pine trees surround the tower. Although approximately 10 feet of the top of the tower extends above the trees in its immediate vicinity, the tower is not visible from locations off the property.
8	6060 Ambrosia Lane	060-361-48-100	173 ft^2	Garden Valley	38.86343 -120.8432	Sec 27, T12N, R10E	40 ft tower anchored to existing shed, supported on 2.5-ft diameter concrete pier bored to 4 ft. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet inside existing shed, to existing 110-V outlet for power.	5.67 ac	219.0 ft^2	Ambrosia Lane, private driveway	Rural Residential (RR)	Residential Estate, Ten-Acre (RE-10) Administrative and Conditional use permit 130.24.020	Rural Residential (RR), Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Rural Lands, Ten-Acre (RL-10); Residential Estate, 5-Acre (RE-5); Residential, 2-Acre (R2A); Limited Agriculture, Ten-Acre (LA-10)	183 ft to residence, 592 ft to neighbor The 40-foot tower is only visible from the cleared area that surrounds the structures on the property. Ponderosa pine trees around and downslope from the property block the view of the tower from other locations.

Project Site Name	Project Site Address	Project Site Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Portion of APN that is Project Site	USGS 7.5" Quad	Lat/ Long Coordinates	Section, Township, & Range (Mt. Diablo Meridian)	Tower and Cabling Configuration	Total Parcel Acreage	Project Impact Size	Access	General Plan Land Use Designation	Project Site Zoning Use Requirements, and Applicable Code Section	Adjacent Land General Land Use Designation	Adjacent Land Zoning	Distance from Tower to Residences; Visibility (see Attachment D)
9	4341 Raty Lane	060-430-61-100	1,307 ft^2	Garden Valley	38.86153 -120.8297	Sec 26, T12N, R10E	120-ft tower on 5.5 x 5.5 x 4 ft concrete pier atop a 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft foundation in area excavated 4 ft. Six ft chain link fence installed around facility. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet installed on tower base, underground cabling in 6 x 18-in trench in 2-in schedule 80 PVC cabinet to residence garage 215 ft northeast, to existing 110-V outlet for power.	3.7 ac	305.25 ft^2	Raty Lane, private driveway	Medium Density Residential (MDR)/ Rural Residential (RR)	Residential Estate, Five-Acre (RE-5) Administrative and Conditional use permit 130.24.020	Rural Residential (RR), Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential, Three-Acre (R3A); Rural Lands, Ten-Acre (RL-10); Residential Estate, Ten-Acre (RE-10); Residential Estate, Five-Acre (RE-5)	221 ft to residence, 173 ft to neighbor The 120-foot tower is in a clearing surrounded by pine trees similar in height to the tower. The tower is visible sporadically through gaps in the trees from and near the property. Due to intervening trees, hills and structures, the tower is not visible from CA 193 (west), Raty Lane (east), and Meadowbrook Road (south and east).
10	4841 Traverse Creek Road	062-111-07-100	1,307 ft^2	Garden Valley	38.85590 -120.7887	Sec 30, T12N, R11E	120-ft tower on 5.5 x 5.5 x 4 ft concrete pier atop a 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft foundation in area excavated 4 ft. Six ft chain link fence installed around facility. Cabling from antennas to equipment cabinet installed on tower base, underground cabling in 6 x 18-in trench in 2-in schedule 80 PVC from cabinet to existing PG&E pole 110 ft south-southwest for power.	242.75 ac	197.0 ft^2	Bear Creek Road, private driveway	Natural Resource (NR)	Timber Production Zone (TPZ) Conditional use permit 130.21.020	Natural Resource (NR); Rural Residential (RR)	Rural Lands, Ten-Acre (RL-10); Rural Lands, Forty-Acre (RL-40)	167 ft to residence, 574 ft to neighbor. Approximately 15 feet of the top of the tower is visible from Traverse Creek Road 0.25 mile southwest from the tower. The tower is visible for approximately 0.07 mile traveling north, then east on Bear Creek Road. Traveling west on Bear Creek Road for about 0.36 mile, the tower is visible from the approximately 150 feet of roadway that is not lined by trees.

2. Introduction

El Dorado County is the local lead agency and prepared this Initial Study to consider the significance of potential project impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.). This Initial Study was prepared in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Administrative Code, Section 14000 et seq.).

Based on the results of this Initial Study, the County has determined that the Project would have less than significant impacts on the environment with the incorporation of mitigation measures. The County may approve the Project with the adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

The remainder of this document is organized into the following sections:

- **Section 3, Project Description:** Provides a detailed description of the proposed Project;
- **Section 4, Initial Study Checklist and Supporting Documentation:** Provides CEQA Initial Study Resource impact checklists and supporting documentation. Identifies the thresholds of significance, evaluates potential impacts, and describes mitigation necessary to reduce impact significance;
- **Section 5, Initial Study Findings:** Provides a determination of the County's CEQA findings;
- **Section 6, Supporting Information Sources:** Identifies the personnel responsible for the preparation of this document and provides a list of the references cited throughout the document.
- **Attachment A, DRAFT Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan:** Contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan prepared for the proposed project. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan includes a list of required mitigation measures and includes information regarding the County's policies and procedures for implementation and monitoring of the mitigation measures.
- **Attachment B, El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Letter of Support:** Affirms the County's support for the Project's purpose and need.
- **Attachment C, Project Site Plans:** Provide details of each Site's design and equipment used.
- **Attachment D, Project Site Visual Simulations:** Provides photographic simulations of what the towers will look like from nearby and publicly accessible locations to inform the Aesthetics section of the document.
- **Attachment E, El Dorado County Zoning Code Section 130.40.130:** Establishes the level of discretionary and ministerial review required for installation of various types communication facilities.
- **Attachment F, Biological Resource Evaluation**: Biological Resource Evaluation for all 10 Project sites.

3. Project Description

Cal.net envisions helping some of California's most rural unserved or underserved communities in the Gold Country Broadband Consortium ("GCBC") region join the 21st century in terms of broadband connectivity. This Project encompasses the geographical area of northwestern El Dorado County and includes areas that have been submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) as "High Priority Areas" for the GCBC region.

3.1 Project History

Broadband access to rural and underserved communities has been supported by on both the federal and state level. In response to a 2009 Congressional mandate, The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) released the National Broadband Plan in March 2010. In the Plan, the FCC recognizes broadband infrastructure as a foundation for economic growth, job creation, global competitiveness, and quality of life. The goal of the Plan is to provide access to broadband capability to every American. Plan implementation consists of more than 60 key actions, proceedings, and initiatives for the FCC to undertake beginning in 2010. The actions are grouped into four categories:

A. Promoting World-Leading Mobile Broadband Infrastructure and Innovation;

B. Accelerating Universal Broadband Access and Adoption, and Advancing National Purposes Such as Education and Health Care;

C. Fostering Competition and Maximizing Consumer Benefits Across the Broadband Ecosystem; and

D. Advancing Robust and Secure Public Safety Communications Networks.

On that list, B (Accelerating Universal Broadband Access...) includes accelerating broadband access and adoption in rural America.

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) authorized the California Advanced Services Fund (CASF) in 2007 to bridge the "digital divide" in unserved and underserved areas in the state. The CASF supports projects that will a) provide broadband services to areas currently without broadband access and b) build out facilities in underserved areas, if funds are still available. The CASF was expanded in subsequent legislation between 2010 and 2014.

Cal.net, Inc. applied for and obtained a CASF Wireless Broadband Grant to construct and provision a last-mile fixed-wireless broadband Internet and VoIP telephony service project in rural underserved portions of northern El Dorado County. Cal.Net currently provides similar services in other underserved rural areas in the Sierra. The Project would provide last-mile fixed-wireless broadband Internet and VoIP telephony service to the following underserved communities:

- Quintette (zip code 95634)
- Buckeye (zip code 95634)
- Volcanoville (zip code 95634)
- Fornis (zip code 95634)

- Greenwood (zip code 95635)
- Meadow Brook (zip code 95633)
- Garden Valley (zip code 95633)

El Dorado County ranks El Dorado County as 34th of 58 California counties in broadband speed. The almost 2,000 residents in the areas listed above currently rely on dial-up modems or satellite connection.

The Project will install communication facilities at multiple locations in northern El Dorado County. The Project is composed exclusively of fixed-wireless technology deployed on towers. Where practical, equipment is colocated in leased space on existing towers and other structures. El Dorado County Zoning Code Section 130.40.130 - Communication Facilities subjects colocated communication equipment to an Administrative Permit or Zoning Administrator approval of a Minor Use Permit. Minor Use Permits provide for a discretionary review of minor projects or uses that are allowed, but do not meet the standards for administrative review. The approval of a Minor Use Permit is a discretionary project pursuant to CEQA. The County has determined that the colocation portion of the CASF Wireless Broadband Grant Project is exempt from further review under CEQA.

However, to reach the targeted communities, a majority of the proposed towers must be newly constructed by Cal.net. Section 130.40.130 establishes the level of discretionary review required for new tower construction. New tower construction requires a Conditional Use Permit and a CEQA Initial Study. This CEQA Initial Study evaluates potential environmental impacts associated with the construction of new tower facilities and installation of fixed-wireless technology (antennas) at 10 separate sites in northern El Dorado County.

3.2 Need and Purpose

The proposed Project will provide improved high speed internet service in northern El Dorado County. The National Broadband Map shows substantial service gaps in the County where residents still rely on dial-up modems. The National Broadband Map published by the FCC (www.broadbandmap.gov) ranks El Dorado County as 34th of 58 California counties in broadband speed. The current lack of reliable broadband infrastructure puts the County at a substantial economic disadvantage. The CPUC's CASF program considers areas only served by satellite internet as "unserved" due to slow upload speeds and latency. This condition occurs throughout the County, where the forested and mountainous landscape has prevented the provision of fiber or cable broadband access due to the high expense. Fixed wireless technology using microwave and TV White Space data can now reach these areas cost-effectively.

This is a priority project for El Dorado County, as described in the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors letter of support dated 2 June 2015. The letter expresses the County's support of the Project. Access to broadband is now a pillar of competitiveness; allowing businesses to order supplies and sell goods, and for the education of a workforce to power the economies of tomorrow. El Dorado County considers broadband deployment to be a crucial component of economic growth (Attachment B).

3.3 Project Description

The Project covers 155 Census blocks totaling 98.01 square miles and containing a total of 1,794 households with a combined population of 4,436. The proposed network will be scalable in a number of ways. Each tower location will be configured with sufficient backhaul capacity to enable long-term subscriber growth as well as increased bandwidth usage per subscriber. Some of the tower sites can serve as a base to extend the network beyond this Project service area into additional unserved and underserved areas; for example, to provide redundant failover interconnection with one or more of Cal.net's other CASF grant service areas (El Dorado County South and East, Alpine and Amador Counties). Microwave backhaul capacities on any link can be quickly doubled if needed by adding a microwave coupler on the back of an existing antenna. Additional links between any pair of sites can further increase backhaul capacity. Base stations are typically configured with 60°, 90°, or 120° sector antennae. By replacing these sectors with beam-forming technology, spectral efficiency at a tower location can be increased by a factor of up to eight, providing an equivalent increase in capacity at that site.

3.3.1 Location

The 10 Project sites that require CEQA review are listed in Table 1, above and shown on Figure 1. Descriptions of each Project site are as follows:

Site 1 is in the southwestern portion of APN 073-031-09-100. The parcel is located at 4030 Brinks Lane, approximately 0.07 mi south of the intersection with Lois Lane in the community of Cool. A private residence and graveled driveways are north of the 307 ft^2 project site. The site is on level ground on a hilltop surrounded by moderately sloping hills at 1,870 ft elevation. The mapped soil unit at Site 1 is Auburn very rocky silt loam, 2 to 30 percent slopes. The proposed tower location is a graveled area adjacent to the east side of an existing barn. Aerial images indicate that the area around the barn was graded and cleared prior to May 1993, and has been surfaced with gravel since at least July 2002 (Google Inc. 2015). The project site is more than 99% gravel. Wild oats (*Avena* sp.) emerging through the gravel comprise the remaining 1% cover. The natural community south and east of the project site is Black Oak (*Quercus kelloggii*) Woodland with some gray pine (*Pinus sabiniana*) and canyon live oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*), and California annual grassland with wild oats, ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), and medusahead (*Elymus caput-meduseae*) understory.

Site 2 is in the southwestern portion of APN 061-720-01-100. The parcel is located at 2040 Sliger Mine Road in the community of Greenwood and is zoned rural residential. The 566 ft^2 BSA is on level ground in an area of relatively flat topography at 2,455 ft elevation. The mapped soil unit at Site 2 is Boomer very rocky loam to clay, 3 to 30 percent slopes. The proposed tower location is a disturbed/cleared area adjacent to a dirt road west of the driveway that accesses Roquero Cerro Road approximately 0.12 west of Sliger Mine Road. The dirt road adjacent to the proposed tower location was graded prior to September 2016. The project site has been partially mowed and cleared, and has approximately 40% remaining cover of annual nonnative grasses including wild oats, ripgut brome and soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceous*), a blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), and a manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* sp.). The remaining area and the dirt road are bare ground. The natural community surrounding the BSA is Blue Oak Woodland with manzanita and annual grassland understory. There are large boulder outcrops

east and south of the project site. There is a residence and vehicle/equipment storage yard approximately 20 ft east of the BSA, and another residential structure and yard approximately 34 ft to the north. A dirt road runs along the west side of the project site and curves east approximately 41 ft south of the project site. Blue Oak Woodland occurs on the west side of the dirt road, and Roquero Cerro Rd. is approximately 25 ft south of the west-east portion of the dirt road.

Site 3 is in the southwestern portion of APN 061-540-14-100. The parcel is located at 5400 Reservoir Road, approximately 1.5 mi from the intersection with Georgetown Road in the community of Georgetown and is zoned estate residential. The 0.12-ac project site is on level ground surrounded by gently sloping hills at 2,796 ft elevation. The mapped soil unit at Site 3 is Sites clay loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes. The proposed tower location is just southwest of a concrete-lined riding arena and gravel driveway that were constructed between August 1998 and July 2002 (Google Inc. 2015). An approximately 290-ft-long cabling trench is proposed to extend from the tower to the southeastern parcel boundary along the existing fence on the south side of the property. East of the parcel boundary, the cabling will run aerially over the adjacent parcel to an existing utility pole on Reservoir Road. The project site was mostly devoid of vegetation and approximately 80% covered by leaf litter during the September 2016 survey. Nonnative annual grassland, dominated by ripgut brome and medusahead, comprises the remaining cover in BSA. There is a black oak approximately 30 ft southwest of the tower location, and a few incense cedars (*Calocedrus decurrens*) along the fence. There are four dead Ponderosa pine trees (*Pinus ponderosa*) immediately west of the project site boundary. A 0.10-ac fenced arena occurs 39 ft north-northwest of the project site. The driveway borders the northeast side of the project site. The project site is surrounded by Mixed Sierran Pine Forest with 10% black oaks in the canopy.

Site 4 is located in the southwestern portion of APN 062-500-33. The parcel is located at 8140 Wild Horse Trail, approximately 0.47 mi west of the intersection with Bear State Road in the community of Georgetown, and is zoned estate residential. The 0.07-ac project site is on level ground in an area of gentle to moderately sloping topography at 3,473 ft elevation. The mapped soil unit at Site 4 is Aiken loam, 3 to 9 percent slopes. The proposed tower is in a cleared area adjacent to an unused water tank and other equipment. A dirt road lined by madrones (*Arbutifolia menziesii*) is east of the tower location. The cabling route extends west-southwest through a cleared area and dirt driveway to an existing pole. The project site is primarily disturbed bare ground, with approximately 5% cover of pinemat (*Ceanothus prostratus* var. *prostratus*) and <1% cover forbs including bedstraw (*Gallium porrigens*) and California wild rose (*Rosa californica*). The area north and west of the project site is also disturbed and mostly devoid of vegetation. The area east and south of the project site is Mixed Sierran Pine Forest dominated by Ponderosa pine, incense cedar, and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), with madrone in the understory.

Site 5 is in the southern portion of APN 060-090-24-100. The parcel is located at 3680 Greenwood Road, approximately 2.35 mi north from the intersection with Marshall Road in the community of Greenwood and is zoned estate residential. The 0.03-ac project site is at 1,900 ft elevation on level ground on a hilltop. The surrounding topography is gently sloping hills. The mapped soil unit at Site 5 is Mariposa very rocky silt loam, 3 to 50 percent slopes. The proposed tower location is a cleared area within a Black Oak Woodland with Douglas fir. The cabling trench runs east through the cleared area and an unvegetated gravel parking area. The project site is primarily disturbed bare ground and leaf

litter. Approximately 5% of the project site is annual grass, including ripgut brome, soft chess, and rattail sixweeks grass (*Festuca myuros*). The parking area and a paved driveway extend north of the project site. Black Oak Woodland occurs to the east and south of the project site.

Site 6 is in the northern portion of APN 060-200-52-100. The parcel is located at 3550 Brumarba Heights, approximately 0.44 mi south of the intersection with Andy Wolf Road and is zoned planned agricultural. The 973-ft^2 project site is at 2,027 ft elevation on level ground in an area of gently sloping topography. The mapped soil unit at the site is Boomer gravelly loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes. The project site is Blue Oak Woodland with a nonnative annual grassland understory dominated by wild oats and dogtail grass. The proposed tower location is an opening in the Blue Oak Woodland near existing woody debris piles. An unmaintained dirt road leads to the project site from the east-southeast. The road connects with a PG&E utility easement that runs north-south through the parcel, approximately 45 ft west of the project site. The area to the east and southeast of the project site is Blue Oak Woodland interspersed with California annual grassland and a few Ponderosa pines. Blue Oak Woodland surrounds the northeast to southern sides of the project site.

Site 7 is in the eastern portion of APN 060-180-27-100. The parcel is located at 1030 View Ridge Lane, approximately 0.27 mi west of the intersection with Manhattan Creek Road and is zoned rural lands. The 0.05-ac project site is on level ground on a ridgetop that slopes gently west and moderately steeply east, at 2,260 ft elevation. The mapped soil unit at Site 7 is Mariposa very rocky silt loam, 3 to 50 percent slopes. The proposed tower location is in an annual grassland within Mixed Sierran Pine Forest. The project site is mowed annual grassland with rattail sixweeks grass, soft chess, ripgut brome with yellow star-thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*). A 167-ac fenced garden area occurs north-northwest of the project site. The western side of the project site is bordered by a gravel area at the junction of two gravel driveways. The area south and west of the project site is bordered by Mixed Sierran Pine Forest with Ponderosa pines, Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*), and manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* sp.) in the understory.

Site 8 site is located in the southeastern portion of APN 060-361-48-100. The parcel is located at 6060 Ambrosia Lane, approximately 0.48 mi north of the intersection with Black Oak Mine Road in the community of Garden Valley, and is zoned rural land. The 173 ft^2 project site is at 2,226 ft elevation on level ground on a moderately-sloped east-facing hillside. The mapped soil unit at Site 8 is Mariposa very rocky silt loam, 3 to 50 percent slopes. The proposed tower location is a disturbed area adjacent to the east side of a 50 ft^2 shed structure. Aerial images (Google Inc. 2015) indicate that the area around the shed was graded and cleared between July 2002 and July 2004, and has been surfaced with gravel since at least December 2005. The project site is annual grassland dominated by rattail sixweeks grass and nit grass (*Gastridium phleoides*), with pearly everlasting (*Anaphalis margaritacea*) and rose clover (*Trifolium hirtum*). The rest of the project site is bare ground with gravel and rocks. The area west of the project site includes similar vegetation with rocky/gravelly bare ground and residential structures. There is Canyon Live Oak Woodland with Ponderosa pines to the north and south, and a gravel road to the east.

Site 9 is in the eastern portion of rural residential APN 060-430-61-100. The parcel is located at 4341 Raty Lane, approximately 0.07 mi north of the intersection with Meadowbrook Road in the community of Garden Valley. The 0.03-ac project site is on level ground at 2,400 ft elevation. Topography around

the site consists of gently sloping hills. The mapped soil unit at Site 9 is Sites clay loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes. The proposed tower location is in an area that has been used and/or maintained as an access road since 2002 (Google Inc. 2015). A cabling trench extends from the tower location northeast to garage of the residence. The project site is annual grassland dominated by soft chess, nit grass, at approximately 50% cover. The remainder of the project site is bare ground. Mixed Sierran Pine Forest with Ponderosa pine, incense cedar, and black oak surround the project site and former road.

Site 10 is in the southwestern portion of APN 062-111-07-100. The parcel is located at 4841 Traverse Creek Road at the intersection of Bear Creek Road and is designated a Timber Production Zone (TPZ). The 0.03-ac project site site is on level ground just north of a hilltop in an area of gently sloping hills at an elevation of 2,567 ft. The mapped soil unit at Site 10 is Sites clay loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes. The proposed tower location is on an unused dirt road within Mixed Sierran Pine Forest. The proposed cabling trench extends 115 ft from the proposed tower location to an existing utility pole to the southwest along a second dirt road. Fifty percent (50%) of the project site is bare ground/leaf litter. The remaining 50% is disturbed ruderal, with soft chess, foxtail chess (*Bromus madritensis*), dogtail grass, and field hedge parsley (*Torilis arvensis*). There is a cleared area to the north of the project site at the intersection of the dirt road and another dirt road that extends to the north-northeast. A gravel road and a cleared area under the powerlines are south of the project site. The vegetation between the cleared areas is Mixed Sierran Pine Forest with Ponderosa pine, incense cedar, and Douglas fir.

3.3.2 Proposed Project

Cal.net, Inc., a Wireless Internet Service Provider with its base of operations in Shingle Springs, proposes to construct and provision a last-mile fixed-wireless broadband Internet and VoIP telephony service Project in rural underserved portions of northern El Dorado County.

This CEQA Initial Study evaluates potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of new tower facilities at 10 separate sites in northern El Dorado County. The broadband Internet delivery portion of the Project consists of a variety of tower-deployed fixed-wireless point-to-multipoint solutions for connectivity with the end-user subscribers of the service, plus very high capacity point-to-point FCC-licensed microwave links for backhaul connections to the Internet. End users will be serviced with one of the following technologies, depending on the circumstances of their location:

- Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure ("U-NII") equipment in various 5-GHz bands for line-of-sight situations;
- Fixed-LTE (a non-mobile variation of the LTE commonly used in cell phones) initially in the 3.65-GHz band primarily for near-line-of-sight (minor obstructions), and later in the 3.55- to 3.65-GHz CBRS band where authorized after the FCC approves this for use; and
- TV White Space in the UHF and upper-VHF bands for heavily-obstructed non-line-of-sight situations.

The VoIP telephony portion of the project will conform to FCC requirements, be enabled over the above described broadband wireless network, and be provisioned by Cal.net's existing VoIP infrastructure.

The Cal.net multi-homed fiber-connected Network Operations Center in Shingle Springs will serve as the primary connection to the Internet. Cal.net will also interconnect with the newly-built fiber network of the Central Valley Independent Network ("CVIN") for redundancy and additional capacity. The TV White Space equipment will be purchased from Carlson Wireless Technologies, a small business in Arcata, CA. The project will utilize local subcontractors as much as possible to construct the tower facilities. Specialized trades such as microwave communications equipment installers will be sourced from other California-based companies. The Project will create three new full-time jobs with Cal.net.

3.3.3 Right-of-Way

Cal.net will lease the land required for each installation from the various land owners. Access to each site will require coordination with Cal.net and is summarized in Table 1.

3.3.4 Construction Considerations

Tower, equipment cabinet, and cabling configurations for each site are described in Table 1, above. At Project Sites 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10, a 12 x 12 (144) square ft area will be excavated to a 4 ft depth and filled with 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft of concrete for the foundation pad. On top of the pad, a 5.5 x 5.5 x 3.5 ft pier (30.25 square ft) will be constructed for the tower base. The pier will extend up to 18 inches above grade. The foundation pad and pier will be reinforced with rebar. The excavated area will be backfilled and compacted after the concrete cures. An 8 x 8 x 6-ft chain link fence and padlocked gate will be installed around the pier above the buried foundation. A 100 to 120-ft galvanized steel tower will be erected on the

concrete foundation. A 25.5 x 34 x 63-inch equipment metal cabinet will be installed at each tower base for storage of network switching equipment and backup batteries. At Site 2, cabling will run aerially from the equipment cabinet to an existing power pole. At the other seven sites, cabling will be undergrounded in 2-inch schedule 80 PVC pipe in a trench excavated to a 6-inch width and 18-inch depth, then will be connected with existing utility poles directly or via proposed secondary poles.

At Sites 1 and 7, a 40-ft galvanized steel tower will be erected on a 2.5-ft diameter reinforced concrete pier bored 4 feet into the ground. Each tower will be anchored to the structure. Cabling will run from the antennas into a metal equipment cabinet inside each existing structure. Both structures have existing power. The equipment cabinets will house the network switching equipment and backup battery, which will be powered via existing 110-volt outlets.

Up to two 3-ft radius dish antennas; four to six 7 x 28-inch sector antennas; and up to three 9 x 32-inch sector antennas will be installed on tower structures at each of the 10 locations at heights between 35 and 115 ft. The antennas, cabling, network switch, and backup batteries will be manually installed in equipment cabinets by technicians. All 100- and 120-ft tower facilities will be surrounded by a 6-ft fence.

All self-supporting tower foundations for this Project (Project Sites 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10) will use the exact same foundation, and will follow the timeline set below with little variation.

Typically, there will be one to two trucks on the job site during construction days, with the exception of the couple hours a concrete truck will be on site, and the day a crane is needed to stack the towers. A typical construction sequence (approximate) is described below:

- Day 1. Two trucks arrive on site with four men, one truck pulling a mini excavator. After approximately 2 hours of mini excavator operations, the foundation dig will be complete. Four to six hours of labor will be spent to manually clean out the foundation hole and install rebar cage, after which the County will be called to inspect the foundation. After foundation inspection sign-off, Cal.net will schedule an 8-9 am concrete pour time for Day 2.

- Day 2. Two trucks, and a concrete truck arrive to pour the foundation. After approximately 2 hours, the concrete truck should be cleaned up and off site. Crew will finish foundation and leave.

- Day 3. One truck arrives to inspect/clear forms, and clean up foundation and site. Foundation needs a minimum of 14 days' cure time before tower can be stacked.

- Day 17 (approximate). Two trucks with a crew and a crane arrive to stack the tower. Erecting the tower, setting equipment mounts and radio equipment, and running cables takes approximately 6-8 hours. Construction is now complete.

- Day 18 (approximate). Cal.net wireless crew arrives in one truck, climbs tower, and completes the equipment configurations to bring site live.

The tower foundations at Sites 1 and 7 will follow a similar timeline except a shorter duration of cure time, since there is less concrete needed, and no crane will be needed to stack the towers. The tower sections will be stacked manually and bracketed to an existing structure.

All of the facilities are unmanned, and only require annual inspections unless an equipment failure occurs.

3.3.5 Utilities

No utility relocations are anticipated to occur as a result of the Project. Power for the new towers at several sites may require installation of a secondary pole to bridge the gap between the existing PG&E power pole and the new tower. Power dropped from existing poles by PG&E will be used to power the network switching equipment and equipment on towers. Cal.net will not be deploying generators for any of the tower sites since the equipment has extremely low power consumption requirements. All redundant back-up power sources are via an absorbed glass mat (AGM) battery, a type of vehicle battery available in most retail auto parts stores. The sulfuric acid contained in typical flooded lead acid batteries is considered a hazardous material. In an AGM battery, the sulfuric acid is absorbed into fiberglass mat and immobilized between the plates inside the battery to eliminate spill hazard and improve heat and cold tolerance. The battery is the same size as a typical standard-sized car battery. All materials will be handled in accordance with applicable State and Federal standards.

No offsite improvements are anticipated.

3.3.6 Schedule

It is anticipated that the Project will be completed in less than 12 months, and will be constructed and operative in 2017-18. The County anticipates processing a Conditional Use Permit for the ten Project sites, subject to consideration after public review and comment period. This Initial Study will serve as the environmental document for all of the sites.

3.4 Construction Contract

The following are a combination of standard and project-specific procedures/requirements applicable to Project construction:

- Contract special provisions will require compliance with El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) Rules 223, 223-1, and 223-2 to minimize fugitive dust emissions;
- Contract provisions will require notification and compliance with the following:
    - *State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that further disturbances and activities shall cease in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the County Coroner contacted.*
    - *Public Resources Code Section 5097.9 et seq. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who will then notify the Most Likely*

Descendent (MLD). Further provisions of PRC 5097.9 et seq are to be followed as applicable.

- *Public Resources Code Section 5097.5 et seq. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.5 no person shall knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure, or deface, any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, rock art, or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over the lands.*

- The Project would comply with El Dorado County General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11 pertaining to construction noise.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
X	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality
	Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise
	Population / Housing		Public Services		Recreation
	Transportation/Traffic		Tribal Cultural Resources		Utilities / Service Systems

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: Evan Mattes Date: 9/14/17

Printed Name: Evan Mattes, Assistant Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: Roger Trout Date: 9-14-17

Printed Name: Roger Trout, Planning Director For: El Dorado County

4. Initial Study Checklist and Supporting Documentation

4.1 Initial Study Checklist

This section of the Initial Study incorporates the Environmental Checklist contained in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Each resource topic section provides a determination of potential impact and an explanation for the checklist impact questions. The following 19 environmental categories are addressed in this section:

• Aesthetics	• Land Use and Planning
• Agricultural and Forestry Resources	• Mineral Resources
• Air Quality	• Noise
• Biological Resources	• Population and Housing
• Cultural Resources	• Public Services
• Tribal Cultural Resources	• Recreation
• Geology and Soils	• Transportation/Traffic
• Greenhouse Gas Emission	• Utilities/ Service Systems
• Hazards and Hazardous Materials	• Mandatory Findings of Significance
• Hydrology and Water Quality	

Each of the above listed environmental categories was fully evaluated and one of the following four determinations was made for each checklist question:

- **"No Impact"** means that no impact to the environment would occur as a result of implementing the Project.
- **"Less than Significant Impact"** means that implementation of the Project would not result in a substantial and/or adverse change to the environment and no mitigation is required.
- **"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated"** means that the incorporation of one or more mitigation measures would reduce the impact from potentially significant to less than significant.
- **"Potentially Significant Impact"** means that there is either substantial evidence that a project-related effect would be significant or, due to a lack of existing information, could have the potential to be significant.

4.2 Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

4.2.1 Aesthetics

I. AESTHETICS—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal regulations are applicable to aesthetics in relation to the Proposed Project.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

In 1963, the California State Legislature established the California Scenic Highway Program, a provision of the Streets and Highways Code, to preserve and enhance the natural beauty of California (Caltrans 2017). The state highway system includes designated scenic highways and those that are eligible for designation as scenic highways.

There are no officially designated state scenic corridors in the vicinity of any of the Project sites.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The County has several standards and ordinances that address issues relating to visual resources. Many of these can be found in the County Zoning Ordinance (Title 130 of the County Code). The Zoning Ordinance consists of descriptions of the zoning districts, including identification of uses allowed by right or requiring a special-use permit and specific development standards that apply in particular districts based on parcel size and land use density. These development standards often involve limits on the allowable size of structures, required setbacks, and design guidelines. Included are requirements for setbacks and allowable exceptions, the location of public utility distribution and transmission lines, architectural supervision of structures facing a state highway, height limitations on structures and fences, outdoor lighting, and wireless communication facilities.

Environmental Setting:

The 10 sites are located northwest unincorporated El Dorado County occur in a rural setting (Figure 1). The Project includes the installation of telecommunication equipment including new towers and antennas. Tower height ranges from 40 ft for sites 1 and 7 to 100-120 ft for the remaining 8 sites. The tower heights are dictated by the height of the adjacent existing vegetation. Per County zone code Section 130.40.130-C

visual simulations of the proposed wireless communications facilities were prepared by the Project applicant and illustrate the minor change in view with completion of the proposed Project (Attachment D).

Site-specific descriptions of tower visibility and proximity to nearest residences are in Table 1. While the towers are visible from within the Project site parcel, from many locations throughout northern El Dorado County, the viewshed is limited by the characteristic hilly terrain and tall pine trees of the area. On level terrain, an observer would not be able to see the top 10 feet of a 120-foot-tall communications tower if there were 100-foot-tall ponderosa pine trees 30 feet away from the tower. Portions of the tower would be visible if the viewer was a few hundred feet away with a clear line of sight and no other intervening trees or structures. Clear lines of sight do exist around Sites 1, 2, 5, and 6 from along public roads. The remaining towers are visible from roads, where they can be seen sporadically given the varying terrain, curves in the road, and tall trees adjacent to many of the roads. These factors, and the distance of the sites from one other (minimum three quarters of a mile), preclude the ability to see more than one of the towers at the same time from ground level. The visual density of utility poles and cables that line roads and structures throughout northern El Dorado County far outnumbers that of these few and widely-dispersed communication towers. See Visual Simulations with notes (Attachment D).

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Visual resources consist of two categories: scenic views and scenic resources. As per CEQA Checklist, *Scenic resources* are described as specific features of a viewing area (or viewshed) such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. *Scenic views* are elements of the broader view shed such as mountain ranges, valleys, and ridgelines. A *scenic vista* refers to the view of an area that is visually or aesthetically pleasing.

   Table 5.3-1 of the General Plan EIR identifies multiple scenic views and resources in the County (El Dorado County 2004a). The Project sites are not identified in Table 5.3-1 or Exhibit 5.3-1 of the General Plan EIR. None of the sites occur immediately adjacent to a state designated scenic highway. The 10 Project sites are not visible from any County identified scenic view or resource. Project impacts to identified scenic resource are less than significant.

b) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** See discussion of a) above.

c) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Installation of new tower structures at the 10 Project sites will alter the visual character of the site and surroundings. The 100- and 120-ft towers that extend above surrounding trees do so by about 10 ft. The towers are screened by the mature vegetation and thus do not require camouflaging. The tower base, as seen from the property on which it is constructed, is a 5 x 5 ft (25 ft^2) lattice structure extending upward. The lattice components are relatively thin and widely spaced (approximately two 2.5-inch lattice bars per 3.5 vertical feet). The tower base and cabinet will be behind a 6-foot-tall fence. While the new towers may be visible from adjacent properties, the presence of communications towers as a feature in the landscape is a common occurrence. The presence of these new towers at geographically separate points is not anticipated to substantially degrade the existing visual character. Post-project views from areas adjacent to the 10 Project sites are expected to remain largely unchanged.

d) ***No Impact.*** The Project does not introduce any new source of light or glare. The Project does not include any light sources. The galvanized steel towers have a non-reflective coating, and do not produce glare.

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

4.2.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal regulations are applicable to agricultural and forestry resources in relation to the Proposed Project.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), administered by the California Department of Conservation (CDC), produces maps and statistical data for use in analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources (CDC 2016a). FMMP rates and classifies agricultural land according to soil quality, irrigation status, and other criteria. Important Farmland categories are as follows (CDC 2016a):

> *Prime Farmland:* Farmland with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long-term agricultural production. These lands have the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. Prime Farmland must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the 4 years before the FMMP's mapping date.
>
> *Farmland of Statewide Importance:* Farmland similar to Prime Farmland, but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture. Farmland of Statewide Importance must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the 4 years before the FMMP's mapping date.
>
> *Unique Farmland:* Farmland of lesser quality soils used for the production of the state's leading agricultural crops. These lands are usually irrigated but might include non-irrigated orchards or vineyards, as found in some climatic zones. Unique Farmland must have been cropped at some time during the 4 years before the FMMP's mapping date.
>
> *Farmland of Local Importance:* Land of importance to the local agricultural economy as determined by each county's board of supervisors and a local advisory committee.

California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act)

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (commonly referred to as the Williamson Act) allows local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of preventing conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. In exchange for restricting their property to agricultural or related open space use, landowners who enroll in Williamson Act contracts receive property tax assessments that are substantially lower than the market rate.

Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act

Logging on private and corporate land in California is regulated by the 1973 Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act. This Act established the Forest Practice Rules (FPRs) and a politically-appointed Board of Forestry to oversee their implementation. The California Department of Forestry (CALFIRE) works under the direction of the Board of Forestry and is the lead government agency responsible for approving Jogging plans and for enforcing the FPRs.

Environmental Setting:

The Project sites are located in a rural area in the Sierra Nevada. The farmland classification of each Project site as per the States Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (California Department of Conservation 2016a) is listed in Table 3. No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or lands under Williamson Act contracts occur at the Project sites. Sites 3, 9 and 10 are located on parcels identified as ‘farmland of local importance”. Site 10 is located in a ‘Timber Production Zone’ as identified on Exhibit 5.2-4 (Timber Production Zones) of the County General Plan EIR (El Dorado County 2004a).

Table 2. State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Farmland Classification.

Project Site Name	Project Site Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Project Site Farmland Classification
1	073-031-09	Other Land[1]
2	061-720-01	Other Land
3	061-540-14	Farmland of Local Importance[2]
4	062-500-33	Other Land
5	060-090-24	Other Land
6	060-200-52	Grazing Land[3]
7	060-180-27	Grazing Land
8	060-361-48	Grazing Land
9	060-430-61	Farmland of Local Importance[2]
10	062-111-07	Farmland of Local Importance

[1] Other Land = Other land is land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments, brush, etc.

[2] Farmland of Local Importance = Lands that do not qualify for the prime, statewide, or unique designation but are considered existing agricultural lands, or potential agricultural lands, in the agricultural land element of the county general plan. Timberlands are Excluded.

[3] Grazing land is land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or lands under Williamson Act contracts occur at any of the 10 Project sites. Sites 3, 9 and 10 are located on parcels identified as 'farmland of local importance". Farmland of Local Importance are lands that do not qualify for the prime, statewide, or unique designation but are considered existing agricultural lands, or potential agricultural lands, in the Agricultural Land element of the General Plan. The Project will not impact Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or lands under Williamson Act contract.

b) ***No Impact.*** See response for item a).

c) ***Less Than Significant Impact***. Site 10 is located in the area identified as 'Timber Production Zone' on Exhibit 5.2-4 (Timber Production Zones) of the County General Plan EIR (El Dorado County 2004a). Per Table 17.21.020 (Agricultural and Resource Zone Districts Use Matrix) of the County Code, allowable uses within the Timber Production Zone include communication facilities. The proposed Project is consistent with the existing zoning and does not include any rezoning activities.

d) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The proposed Project Site 5 may require trimming of trees to facilitate Project completion. No other sites require trimming of trees. No tree removal is anticipated. The Project will not convert forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)).

e) ***No Impact.*** The Project sites are not anticipated to involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland or forest land.

FINDING: For this Agriculture category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded and impacts would be less than significant.

4.2.3 Air Quality

III. AIR QUALITY— Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The Clean Air Act is implemented by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and sets ambient air limits, the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), for six criteria pollutants: particulate matter of aerodynamic radius of 10 micrometers or less (PM10), particulate matter of aerodynamic radius of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM2.5), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), ground-level ozone, and lead. Of these criteria pollutants, particulate matter and ground-level ozone pose the greatest threats to human health.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) sets standards for criteria pollutants in California that are more stringent than the NAAQS and include the following additional contaminants: visibility-reducing particles, hydrogen sulfide, sulfates, and vinyl chloride. The Proposed Project is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin, which is comprised of seven air districts: the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (AQMD), Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), Amador County APCD, Calaveras County APCD, the Tuolumne County APCD, the Mariposa County APCD, and a portion of the El Dorado County AQMD, which consists of the western portion of El Dorado County. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District manages air quality for attainment and permitting purposes within the west slope portion of El Dorado County.

USEPA and CARB regulate various stationary sources, area sources, and mobile sources. USEPA has regulations involving performance standards for specific sources that may release toxic air contaminants (TACs), known as hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) at the federal level. In addition, USEPA has regulations involving emission criteria for off-road sources such as emergency generators, construction equipment, and vehicles. CARB is responsible for setting emission standards for vehicles sold in

California and for other emission sources, such as consumer products and certain off-road equipment. CARB also establishes passenger vehicle fuel specifications.

Air quality in the project area is regulated by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District. California Air Resources Board and local air districts are responsible for overseeing stationary source emissions, approving permits, maintaining emissions inventories, maintaining air quality stations, overseeing agricultural burning permits, and reviewing air quality-related sections of environmental documents required to comply with CEQA. The AQMD regulates air quality through the federal and state Clean Air Acts, district rules, and its permit authority. National and state ambient air quality standards (AAQS) have been adopted by the Environmental Protection Agency and State of California, respectively, for each criteria pollutant: ozone, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide.

Environmental Setting:

The Project area is located in the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB). The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin are located to the west, and the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is located to the south. Climate in the MCAB relates to elevation and proximity to the Sierra Ridge. Precipitation is greater and temperatures are lower at higher elevations. Summer temperatures in the project area are in the mid- to upper nineties. Winter temperatures are in the upper thirties to lower forties.

The air quality of a region is determined by the air pollutant emissions (quantities and type of pollutants measured by weight) and by ambient air quality (the concentration of pollutants within a specified volume of air). Air pollutants are characterized as primary and secondary pollutants. Primary pollutants are those emitted directly into the air, for example carbon monoxide (CO), and can be traced to a single pollutant source. Secondary pollutants are those pollutants that form through chemical reactions in the atmosphere; for example, reactive organic gasses (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_X) combine to form ground level ozone, or smog.

Congress established much of the basic structure of the Clean Air Act in 1970, and made major revisions in 1977 and 1990. The Federal Clean Air Act established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). These standards are divided into primary and secondary standards. Primary standards are designed to protect public health and secondary standards are designed to protect other values. Because of the health-based criteria identified in setting the NAAQS, the air pollutants are termed "criteria" pollutants. California has adopted its own, more stringent, ambient air quality standards (CAAQS).

The Mountain Counties Air Basin portion of El Dorado County is currently nonattainment for the national 8-hour ozone and particulate matter (PM) 2.5 (pollutants with a diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less) standards. The Mountain Counties Air Basin portion of El Dorado County is nonattainment for the following CAAQS: 8-Hour Ozone, 1-Hour Ozone, and 24-Hour PM10 (pollutants with a diameter of 10 micrometers or less).

The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) administers the state and federal Clean Air Acts in accordance with state and federal guidelines. The AQMD regulates air quality through its district rules and permit authority. It also participates in planning review of discretionary project applications and provides recommendations. The following District rules apply to the Project:

- **Rule 205 (Nuisance):** Prohibits the discharge of air containments which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance.
- **Rule 207 (Particulate Matter):** Limits the quantity of PM through concentration limits.
- **Rule 215 (Architectural Coatings):** Defines the quantities of reactive organic compounds permitted for use in new construction.
- **Rule 223 (Fugitive Dust):** The purpose of this rule is to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of anthropogenic (man-made) fugitive dust sources by requiring actions to prevent, reduce or mitigate fugitive dust emissions.
- **Rule 223-1 (Fugitive Dust – Construction):** Requires a Fugitive Dust Control Plan be prepared and submitted to the El Dorado County AQMD prior to ground disturbing activities. Pursuant to Rule 610, the El Dorado County AQMD charges a fee to review the Fugitive Dust Control Plan required by Rule 223-1.
- **Rule 223-2 (Fugitive Dust – Asbestos Hazard Mitigation):** The purpose of this Rule is to reduce the amount of asbestos particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of any construction or construction related activities, that disturbs or potentially disturbs naturally occurring asbestos by requiring actions to prevent, reduce or mitigate asbestos emissions.

El Dorado County AQMD's Guide to Air Quality Assessment (2002) specifies specific daily emissions thresholds that can be used to determine the significance of project emissions. The El Dorado County AQMD considers a significant cumulative impact to occur if the project requires a change in the existing land use designation (i.e., general plan) and would individually exceed the project-level thresholds of significance. Thresholds of significance for specific pollutants of concern are as follows:

- ROG: 82 lbs/day
- NOx: 82 lbs/day
- PM10: AAQS

Project Evaluation

The El Dorado County Guide to Air Quality Assessment (CEQA Guide; El Dorado County 2002) was used to evaluate the proposed development. Other resources used in our analysis include El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) rules for fugitive dust (Rules 223, 223-1, and 223-2); El Dorado County ordinances for projects in areas that may have naturally occurring asbestos (NOA); California Department of Mines and Geology NOA data, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California Air Resources Board (CARB) toxic air contaminants data.

The Project includes the installation of telecommunications equipment including new tower structures. The Project would disturb a combined maximum area of approximately 0.36 ac for all 10 sites. Equipment used to complete the Project will consist of a backhoe (to excavate the pad footing), a truck crane to erect the preassembled tower segments, small trencher, delivery vehicles for concrete and tower segments, worker vehicles, small gas generator, hand operated power tools.

Chapters 4 and 5 of the CEQA Guide provide both construction and operational screening criteria to assist in evaluating a projects potential to exceed the County's air quality significance thresholds.

Construction:

The El Dorado County AQMD evaluates the significance of ROG and NOx emissions during construction based on the maximum amount of fuel, diesel and regular gasoline that would be used on the peak equipment use day. Table 4.1 in the CEQA Guide lists the range of maximum daily fuel usage for the sum of all equipment, off-road vehicles, and auxiliary handheld equipment that can be used to ensure less than significant impacts resulting from ROG and NOx emissions.

If all of the equipment used (vehicles and hand held) is 1995 model year or earlier the maximum daily fuel usage for a less than significant impact is 337 gallons per day (diesel and gasoline). The maximum daily fuel usage for all equipment 1996 model year or later (vehicles and handheld) for a less than significant impact is 402 gallons per day (diesel and gasoline). A linear interpolation is used between 337 and 402 gallons per day, in proportion to the distribution of equipment into the two age categories, to determine that maximum daily fuel use for the specific fleet mix; for example, a 50/50 age distribution yields allowable fuel use of (337+ ((402-337)/2) or 370 gallons per day.

The proposed Project would most likely be constructed one site at a time. Based on the following 'high use' assumptions it has been determined that even if five sites were being constructed on the same day, a very unlikely scenario, to total fuel usage would not exceed the 370 gallons per day threshold.

- A CAT 416 backhoe/loader uses approximately 3.0 gallons per hour under a medium load factor (Caterpillar 2015).
- The same fuel usage assumption is being used for the trencher to be used for power supply installation. This is a very generous assumption given a trencher appropriate for the small nature of the work would have a much smaller engine than a CAT 416 backhoe/loader.
- Assume CAT 416 backhoe/loader and trencher run for 4 hrs per day.
- Assume 20 gallons of fuel used for a generator, crane, worker trips, and tower section delivery per day per site.
- Assume each tower pad requires approximately 15 cubic yards of concrete. The average diesel used per delivered cubic yard of concrete is 1.09 gallons (NRMCA 2014).
- Assume all fuel is diesel.

Based on the above liberal assumptions:

- Estimated fuel use per day for a CAT 420E backhoe/loader and trencher for 4 hrs per day on five sites is 120 gallons (5 sites x (2x (3 gal x 4hrs))).
- Estimated fuel use per day for a generator, crane, worker trips, and tower section delivery for five sites is 100 gallons (20 gallons per day x 5 sites)
- Estimated fuel use per day for a concrete delivery for five sites is 81.75 gallons (1.09 gallons per cubic yard x 15 cubic yards x 5 sites)
- Total estimated fuel use per day if five sites being constructed simultaneously, again a very unlikely scenario, is 301.75 gallons per day.

The analysis above indicates that even in the unlikely event that five sites are being constructed simultaneously, the Project would not exceed the 370 gallons per day threshold discussed in Section 4.2.1 and Table 4.1 of the CEQA Guide. If ROG and NOx emissions are deemed not significant under Table 4.1, then exhaust emissions of CO and PM10 from construction equipment, and exhaust emissions of all

constituents from worker commute vehicles, are also deemed not significant in accordance with the CEQA Guide.

Diesel PM has been identified as a potential health risk. Limiting the amount of diesel fuel used during the construction of a project reduces the potential health risks to a less than significant level. Table 4.2 in the CEQA Guide provides the maximum amount of fuel that is permitted to ensure less than significant health risks. As with the daily fuel limit described above, the maximum amount of diesel fuel allowed over the course of project construction is determined based on the year that the equipment was built. Based on the assumption above the total estimated diesel used during the Project would be approximately 603.5 gallons (10 site x 60.35 gallons of diesel per site). The District has determined that fuel use below 37,000 gallons (for 1996 and later model year or engines using low-sulfur diesel fuel) will not exceed health risk criteria.

Clearing, grading, excavating, use of heavy equipment or trucks on unpaved surfaces, and loading/unloading of trucks create fugitive dust, including PM10. Fugitive dust emissions from construction activities are temporary; however, they may have a significant impact on local air quality. The El Dorado County AQMD determined that mass emissions of PM10 do not need to be quantified and may be deemed less than significant with adherence to Rules 223, 223-1, and 223-2 to minimize fugitive dust emissions. The Project sites are not located within an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) or an area "more likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos" (California Department of Conservation 2000, El Dorado County 2005).

Operations

Operation of the new towers and antennas will not result in new or increased emissions of criteria pollutants. The new towers and antennas would be unmanned and only require annual site visits to conduct routine maintenance and inspection.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The analysis above indicates that the Project would not exceed the 370 gallons per day threshold discussed in Section 4.2.1 and Table 4.1 of the CEQA Guide. If ROG and NOx emissions are deemed not significant under Table 4.1, then exhaust emissions of CO and PM10 from construction equipment, and exhaust emissions of all constituents from worker commute vehicles, are also be deemed not significant in accordance with the CEQA Guide. The El Dorado County AQMD determined that mass emissions of PM10 do not need to be quantified and may be deemed less than significant with adherence to Rules 223, 223-1, and 223-2 to minimize fugitive dust emissions. The Project is consistent with the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District rules and regulations. Based on these conclusions, the 10 Project sites would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Short term air quality impacts are discussed under items b and d below.

b) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** El Dorado County is in nonattainment status for both federal and state ozone standards and the state PM10 standard. Construction activities at the 10 Project sites would result in short-term increases in emissions from the use of heavy equipment that generate dust, exhaust, and tire-wear emissions.

Project construction would create short-term increases in ROG, NOx, and PM10 emissions from vehicle and equipment operation. Based on the screening analysis described above the 10 Project

sites will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation

c) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** See the response for item b.

d) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Adjacent residences have the potential to be exposed to PM10, PM2.5, CO, ROG, and NOx during construction. These impacts are considered less than significant due to the limited nature of the Project and short-term construction period.

The 10 Project sites are not located within an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) or an area "more likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos" (California Department of Conservation 2000, El Dorado County 2005).

e) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Construction will involve the use of gasoline or diesel-powered equipment that emits exhaust fumes. These activities would take place intermittently throughout the construction process, and persons near the construction work area may find these odors objectionable. The associated odors would dissipate within the immediate vicinity of the work area. None of the project sites are in an area with a substantial number of people. Table 3-1 of the Guide to Air Quality Assessment (AQMD, 2002) does not list the proposed communications facility use as a use known to create objectionable odors. The infrequency of the emissions, rapid dissipation of the exhaust into the air, and short-term nature of the construction activities would result in less than significant odor impacts.

FINDING: The 10 proposed project sites would not affect the implementation of regional air quality regulations or management plans. The project would result in small increases in emissions due to construction and operation; however existing regulations would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. As conditioned and with adherence to County Code, the proposed project would not be anticipated to cause substantial adverse effects to air quality, nor exceed established significance thresholds for air quality impacts.

4.2.4 Biological Resources

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) (16 U.S. Code [USC] Section 1531 *et seq.;* 50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 17 and 222) provides for conservation of species that are endangered or threatened throughout all or a substantial portion of their range, as well as protection of the habitats on which they depend. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) share responsibility for implementing the ESA. In general, USFWS manages terrestrial and freshwater species, whereas NMFS manages marine and anadromous species.

Section 9 of the ESA and its implementing regulations prohibit the "take" of any fish or wildlife species listed under the ESA as endangered or threatened, unless otherwise authorized by federal regulations. The ESA defines the term "take" to mean "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct" (16 USC Section 1532). Section 7 of the ESA (16 USC Section 1531 *et seq.)* outlines the procedures for federal interagency cooperation to conserve federally listed species and designated critical habitats. Section 10(a)(l)(B) of the ESA provides a process by which nonfederal entities may obtain an incidental take permit from USFWS or NMFS for otherwise lawful activities that incidentally may result in "take" of endangered or threatened species, subject to specific conditions. A habitat conservation plan (HCP) must accompany an application for an incidental take permit.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 USC, Chapter 7, Subchapter II) protects migratory birds. Most actions that result in take, or the permanent or temporary possession of, a migratory bird constitute violations of the MBTA. The MBTA also prohibits destruction of occupied nests. USFWS is responsible for overseeing compliance with the MBTA.

Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

The federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668c), first enacted in 1940, prohibits "taking" bald eagles, including their parts, nests, or eggs. The Act provides criminal penalties for persons who "take, possess, sell, purchase, barter, offer to sell, purchase or barter, transport, export or import, at any time or any manner, any bald eagle ... [or any golden eagle], alive or dead, or any part, nest, or egg thereof." The Act defines "take" as "pursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect,

molest or disturb." The definition for "Disturb" includes injury to an eagle, a decrease in its productivity, or nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior. In addition to immediate impacts, this definition also covers impacts that result from human-induced alterations initiated around a previously used nest site during a time when eagles are not present.

Clean Water Act

Clean Water Act (CWA) section 404 regulates the discharge of dredged and fill materials into waters of the U.S., which include all navigable waters, their tributaries, and some isolated waters, as well as some wetlands adjacent to the aforementioned waters (33 CFR Section 328.3). Areas typically not considered to be jurisdictional waters include non-tidal drainage and irrigation ditches excavated on dry land, artificially irrigated areas, artificial lakes or ponds used for irrigation or stock watering, small artificial waterbodies such as swimming pools, vernal pools, and water-filled depressions (33 CFR Part 328). Areas meeting the regulatory definition of waters of the U.S. are subject to the jurisdiction of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under the provisions of CWA Section 404. Construction activities involving placement of fill into jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are regulated by USACE through permit requirements. No USACE permit is effective in the absence of state water quality certification pursuant to Section 401 of CWA.

Section 401 of the CWA requires an evaluation of water quality when a proposed activity requiring a federal license or permit could result in a discharge to waters of the U.S. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and its nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) issue water quality certifications. Each RWQCB is responsible for implementing Section 401 in compliance with the CWA and its water quality control plan (also known as a Basin Plan). Applicants for a federal license or permit to conduct activities that may result in the discharge to waters of the U.S. (including wetlands or vernal pools) must also obtain a Section 401 water quality certification to ensure that any such discharge will comply with the applicable provisions of the CWA.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

California Fish and Game Code

The California Fish and Game Code includes various statutes that protect biological resources, including the Native Plant Protection Act of 1977 (NPPA) and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). The NPPA (California Fish and Game Code Section 1900-1913) authorizes the Fish and Game Commission to designate plants as endangered or rare and prohibits take of any such plants, except as authorized in limited circumstances.

CESA (California Fish and Game Code Section 2050-2098) prohibits state agencies from approving a project that would jeopardize the continued existence of a species listed under CESA as endangered or threatened. Section 2080 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibits the take of any species that is state listed as endangered or threatened, or designated as a candidate for such listing. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) may issue an incidental take permit authorizing the take of listed and candidate species if that take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity, subject to specified conditions.

California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, 3513, and 3800 protect native and migratory birds, including their active or inactive nests and eggs, from all forms of take. In addition, Section 3511, 4700,

5050, and 5515 identify species that are fully protected from all forms of take. Section 3511 lists fully protected birds, Section 5515 lists fully protected fish, Section 4700 lists fully protected mammals, and Section 5050 lists fully protected amphibians.

Streambed Alteration Agreement

Sections 1601 to 1606 of the California Fish and Game Code require that a Streambed Alteration Application be submitted to CDFW for any activity that may substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake. As a general rule, this requirement applies to any work undertaken within the 100-year floodplain of a stream or river containing fish or wildlife resources.

California Native Plant Protection Act

The California Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code Section 1900-1913) prohibits the taking, possessing, or sale of any plants with a state designation of rare, threatened, or endangered (as defined by CDFW). The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) maintains a list of plant species native to California that has low population numbers, limited distribution, or are otherwise threatened with extinction. This information is published in the Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (CNPS 2001). Potential impacts to populations of CNPS-listed plants receive consideration under CEQA review.

Forest Practice Act

Logging on private and corporate land in California is regulated by the Z'Berg-Nejedly Forest Practices Act (FPA), which took effect January I, 1974. The act established the Forest Practice Rules (FPRs) and a politically-appointed Board of Forestry to oversee their implementation. The California Department of Forestry (CALFIRE) works under the direction of the Board of Forestry and is the lead government agency responsible for approving logging plans and for enforcing the FPRs. A Timber Harvest Plan (THP) must be prepared by a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) for timber harvest on virtually all non-federal land. The FPA also established the requirement that all non-federal forests cut in the State be regenerated with at least three hundred stems per acre on high site lands, and one hundred fifty trees per acre on low site lands.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The County General Plan also include policies that contain specific, enforceable requirements and/or restrictions and corresponding performance standards that address potential impacts on special-status plant species or create opportunities for habitat improvement. The El Dorado County General Plan designates the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) (Exhibits 5.12-14, 5.12-5 and 5.12-7, El Dorado County, 2003). Lands located within the overlay district are subject to the following provisions, given that they do not interfere with agricultural practices:

- Increased minimum parcel size;
- Higher canopy-retention standards and/or different mitigation standards/thresholds for oak woodlands;
- Lower thresholds for grading permits;

- Higher wetlands/riparian retention standards and/or more stringent mitigation requirements for wetland/riparian habitat loss;
- Increased riparian corridor and wetland setbacks;
- Greater protection for rare plants (e.g., no disturbance at all or disturbance only as recommended by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/California Department of Fish and Wildlife);
- Standards for retention of contiguous areas/large expanses of other (non-oak or non-sensitive) plant communities;
- Building permits discretionary or some other type of "site review" to ensure that canopy is retained;
- More stringent standards for lot coverage, floor area ratio (FAR), and building height; and
- No hindrances to wildlife movement (e.g., no fences that would restrict wildlife movement).

El Dorado County General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 requires all new development projects (except agricultural cultivation and actions pursuant to an approved Fire Safe Plan) adhere to tree canopy retention and replacement standards. Retention standards are based on the percent existing canopy on the parcel and the size of the parcel. The Project applicant must also replace woodland habitat removed at a 1:1 ratio.

Environmental Setting:

Potential impacts to biological and wetlands resources were evaluated in the Project's Biological Resources Evaluation (Sycamore Environmental Consultants 2017, Attachment F). The Biological Resources Evaluation report documents and evaluates the potential Project impacts to biological resources for all 10 Sites. The Biological Resources Evaluation concludes the following regarding biological resources:

- The 10 Project sites do not provide habitat for federal or state listed wildlife species.
- There is no critical habitat in the Project sites and the Project will not affect critical habitat.
- Structures on sites 1 and 8 and trees on sites 2, 3, 5, and 6 provide potential nesting habitat for MBTA and Fish and Game Code-protected birds.
- Six of the Project sites provide potential habitat for one or more special-status plant species. No rare plants were found during September 2016 site surveys. The four remaining sites do not provide potential habitat special-status plant species.
- No potential wetlands or other waters of the U.S. were observed within the 10 Project sites during the field surveys.

Lists were obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Sacramento Field Office, of federal-listed species that could potentially be affected by projects on the Greenwood, Georgetown, Tunnel Hill, Coloma, and Garden Valley USGS topographic quadrangles (quads). The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants were queried for the Greenwood, Georgetown, Tunnel Hill, Coloma, Garden Valley and 14 surrounding quads. Special-status species and natural communities from these sources were reviewed for their potential to be affected by the tower installations at the 10 Project sites.

General biological surveys were conducted at Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10 on 20 September 2016; and at Site 9 on 27 September 2016. National Wetland Inventory maps for the Greenwood, Georgetown, Tunnel

Hill, Coloma, and Garden Valley quads, topographic maps, and aerial photos were reviewed to identify potential wetlands and waters of the U.S. at the sites. The National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey Geographical Database (SSURGO) was used to determine soil series present at each Project site. Evaluation of potential impacts was commensurate with the small footprint of direct impact on each of the 10 Project sites.

The Project is located in northern El Dorado County in the vicinity of the communities of Cool, Greenwood, Georgetown, Garden Valley, Meadow Brook, and Volcanoville. A brief description of each site is provided in Section 3.1.1.

Wetlands and Waters

The National Wetlands Inventory Online Mapper does not indicate any wetlands or riparian areas in the any of the Project sites. No potential wetlands or other waters of the U.S. were observed within the 10 sites during the field surveys.

Special-Status Wildlife

One federal-listed species, the California red-legged frog (CRLF), is known to occur within one mile of Sites 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9.

Special-Status Plants

All sites were evaluated for federal-listed, state-listed and CNPS rare plants with potential to occur at each site (Table 3).

Table 3: Plant Species with Potential to Occur

Species Name	Common Name	Federal Status[a]	State Status[a] /CNPS Rank[b]	General Habitat Description	Project Sites Where Species Potentially Occurs
Arctostaphylos nissenana	Nissenan manzanita	--	--/1B.2	Perennial evergreen shrub found in open, rocky shale ridges (Baldwin et al. 2012), and closed-cone coniferous forest and chaparral at 1,475 to 3,600 ft. Blooms February to March (CNPS 2016).	3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10
Chlorogalum grandiflorum	Red Hills soaproot	--	--/1B.2	Perennial bulberiferous herb found in chaparral, cismontane woodland, and lower montane coniferous forest in serpentine, gabbroic, and other soils at 800 to 5,600 ft. Blooms May to June (CNPS 2016).	3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10
Horkelia parryi	Parry's horkelia	--	--/1B.2	Perennial herb found in chaparral and cismontane woodland in Ione and other soils at 260 to 3,510 ft. Blooms April to September (CNPS 2016).	3, 6, 8, 9, 10
Viburnum ellipticum	Oval-leaved viburnum	--	--/2B.3	Perennial deciduous shrub found generally in yellow-pine forest and chaparral on north-facing slopes (Baldwin et al. 2012), and in cismontane woodland, and lower montane coniferous forest at 700 to 4,600 ft. Blooms May to June (CNPS 2016).	3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

[a] **Status**: Endangered (E); Threatened (T); Proposed (P); Candidate (C), Delisted (D), Fully Protected (FP); Rare (R); State Species of Special Concern (SSC); Proposed Critical Habitat (PCH); Critical Habitat (CH) – Critical habitat has been designated for this species.

[b] **CNPS Rare Plant Rank**: 1A = Presumed Extinct in CA; 1B = Rare or Endangered in CA and elsewhere; 2 = Rare or Endangered in CA and more common elsewhere; 3 = More information is needed about this plant species (review list); 4 = Limited distribution (watch list).

CNPS Decimal Extensions: .1 = Seriously endangered in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat); .2 = Fairly endangered in California (20-80% occurrences threatened); .3 = Not very endangered in California (<20% of occurrences threatened or no current threats known).

Nesting Birds:

California Fish and Game Code §3503.5 protects all birds in the orders Falconiformes and Strigiformes (collectively known as birds of prey). Birds of prey include raptors, falcons, and owls. The federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711) also protects all migratory birds and their nests, including most non-migratory birds in California. Any disturbance that causes direct injury, death, nest abandonment, or forced fledging of migratory birds is restricted under the MBTA. Any removal of active nests during the breeding season or any disturbance that results in the abandonment of nestlings is considered a 'take' of the species under federal law.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.*** One federal-listed species, the California red-legged frog (CRLF), is known to occur within one mile of Sites 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9. The CNDDB records of CRLF within one mile of those sites are both within the Georgetown quad. The exact locations are not specified beyond the quad level. Both records are of occurrences in small pools/wet areas in small, ephemeral drainages. Site 3 is on the Georgetown quad. Site 4 is 0.55 mi east; Site 5 is 0.43 mi west-southwest; Site 7 is 0.5 mi south; Site 8 is 0.8 mi south; and Site 9 is 0.94 mi south of the Georgetown quad.

CRLF breeding habitat includes ponds, slow-flowing stream reaches, or deep pools within a stream with vegetation or other materials for attaching egg masses. CRLF also use adjacent upland habitats that provide shade, moisture, and cooler temperatures. Juveniles are known to disperse through suitable upland habitat that provides sheltering vegetation and scattered wetlands or streams. Juvenile CRLF are unlikely to disperse through urbanized or suburban areas, or areas with impassible barriers.

The six sites within one mile of CNDDB CRLF occurrences are located in disturbed, dry, upland habitats. The site locations are situated on hilltops and ridges, at elevations higher than surrounding areas. No natural or artificial aquatic areas were observed on site during field surveys. The six sites, as well as the remaining four, do not provide habitat for CRLF (Sycamore Environmental Consultants 2017, Attachment F).

No other state or federal-listed wildlife species are known to occur within one mile of any of the sites. All sites were evaluated for state or federal-listed wildlife species and habitats. The sites do not provide habitat for state or federal-listed wildlife species. The sites are not designated critical habitat for any federal listed wildlife species.

There is one CNDDB record of Red Hills soaproot (*Chlorogalum grandiflorum*) from 2007 and one in 2010 within one mile of Site 4. All occurrences were in Mixed Sierran Forest between approximately 0.64 and 0.96 mi to the east-southeast of the Project site. Red Hills soaproot was not observed during the September 2016 field survey at Site 4. The survey was conducted outside the plant's blooming period, but it is identifiable year-round. For example, the leaves and bulb from another *Chlorogalum* species at Site 9 were identifiable during a survey a week after the survey at Site 4. No other special-status plants are known to occur within one mile of the 10 Project site BSAs.

There were a few manzanita seedlings within the Site 9 BSA that were difficult to identify to species due to their age. However, the seedlings were not likely the CNPS-listed Rare Nissenan manzanita (*Arctostaphylos nissenii*). Unlike the Nissenan manzanita, the seedlings had glandular hairs on the bracts. There were no mature Nissenan manzanitas in the surrounding area. The closest CNDDB record of Nissenan manzanita is approximately 1.82 miles south of Site 9. Eight acres of the species were observed in 1966. Notes in the CNDDB record state that the area has since been converted to grazing land. Current species presence is classified as "possibly extirpated."

Except for Site 6, the Project BSAs are located in disturbed or unvegetated areas with limited habitat. No rare plants were found during the field surveys (Attachment F).

All sites were evaluated for state or federal-listed wildlife and plant species and habitats. The 10 sites do not provide habitat for state or federal-listed wildlife species. Six of the BSAs provide potential habitat for one or more California special-status plants. No rare plants were found during September 2016 site surveys. The 10 sites are not designated critical habitat for any federal listed species.

No bird nests were observed in the trees immediately surrounding the project sites. Structures on Sites 1 and 8 and trees on Sites 2, 3, 5, and 6 provide potential nesting habitat for Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711) and Fish and Game Code-protected birds. No nests were observed within these project sites. Active bird nests could become established prior to construction between 15 February and 31 August. BIO-1 will be implemented on Sites 2, 3, 5, and 6 to avoid impacts to birds of prey and birds listed by the MBTA.

Measure BIO-1

Under the MBTA, nests that contain eggs or unfledged young are not to be disturbed during the breeding season. Nesting or attempted nesting by migratory birds and birds-of-prey is anticipated from 15 February to 31 August. The following measures are recommended for Sites 2, 3, 5, and 6:

- *Tree and vegetation removal shall occur outside of the nesting season (February 15 through August 31 annually). All tree removal shall occur between September 1 and February 14, which is outside of nesting season for MBTA and Fish and Game Code protected birds. If work occurs outside the nesting season, there will be no need to conduct a preconstruction survey for active nests.*
- *If project work occurs during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting birds of prey and other birds protected by the MBTA and Fish and Game Code within 30 days prior to the start of construction. The survey area shall cover the Project, a 500 ft radius for nesting raptors, and a 100 ft radius for all other MBTA and Fish and Game Code protected birds. If no active nest of a bird of prey, MBTA bird, or other CDFW-protected bird is found, then no further mitigation measures are necessary.*
- *Should an active nest of a protected bird be identified, an exclusion zone of 500 feet shall be established around the nest if it is a bird of prey, and 100 feet if it is a protected bird other than a bird of prey. Buffer sizes may be adjusted at the discretion of the biologist depending on the species of bird, the location of the nest relative to the project, the existing level of disturbance, and other site-specific conditions. No work will be allowed in the exclusion zone until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or unless monitoring determines that a smaller ESA will protect the active nest. Tree and vegetation removal should occur during the non-breeding season of 1 September and 14 February. If work occurs during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for active nests within two weeks prior to the start of construction. The survey area shall cover the Project, a 500 ft radius for nesting raptors, and a 100 ft radius for all other MBTA and Fish and Game Code-protected birds.*

The County will implement the Measure above (Attachment A).

b) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The proposed Project may require trimming of trees to facilitate Project completion. No tree removal is anticipated. No riparian habitat occurs at the 10 sites. The closest riparian habitat to any of the Project sites is Coloma Canyon, which is approximately 0.16 mile away from Site 5. The other nine sites are 0.5 mile or more away from riparian areas. No sensitive natural communities would be affected by the proposed Project.

c) ***No Impact.*** The National Wetlands Inventory Online Mapper does not indicate any wetlands or riparian areas in the any of the Project sites. No potential wetlands or other waters of the U.S. were observed within the 10 sites during the field surveys conducted by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. in September 2016 (Sycamore Environmental Consultants 2017, Attachment F).

d) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Sites 1, 2, 5, and 6 are located on parcels with a County-designated Important Biological Corridor overlay (El Dorado County 2004b). Site 4 is on a parcel within the winter range, and Site 10 is on a parcel within the critical winter range, of the Pacific Migratory Deer Herd (El Dorado County 2010). Construction of the project could temporarily disrupt movement of native wildlife species that occur in or adjacent to the Project area. Daytime construction activities will result in minimal disruption of nocturnal wildlife movement. No nighttime construction is proposed. Although construction disturbance may temporarily hinder wildlife movements within the project area, the impact is less than significant due to its short-term nature. The Project proposes to install telecommunication equipment including new towers and would not significantly affect vegetation corridors designated by the IBC or conflict with the intent of the IBC overlay; nor would Project activities significantly affect the winter range or critical winter range of the Pacific Migratory Deer Herd.

e) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The proposed Project does not include tree removal, but may require trimming of trees at Site 5 to facilitate line-of-sight required for Project completion. Because the Site parcel is over an acre and has over 1% total canopy cover, El Dorado General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 stipulates that 90% of the existing canopy be retained. A maximum of two small black oak branches would be trimmed. This level of trimming will have a negligible effect on the parcel's overall tree canopy. Over 90%, and close to 100%, of the existing canopy will be retained.

f) ***No Impact.*** The 10 Project sites are not located in areas covered by a habitat or natural community conservation plan. El Dorado County is currently preparing an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan to identify important habitats in the county and establish a program for the management and preservation of these areas. The County is currently in the process of review and approval of the Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP) and Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance. These plans and the ordinance are still in process and are not anticipated to be adopted until after this Project has been completed.

FINDING: The 10 sites are not located within the USFWS Recovery Plan boundaries. No jurisdictional wetlands are present at the any of the 10 Project sites. With mitigation measures incorporated, impacts to biological resources will be less than significant.

4.2.5 Cultural Resources

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is the nation's master inventory of known historic resources. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service and includes listings of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. The criteria for listing in the NRHP include resources that:

A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history (events);
B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (persons);
C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (architecture); or
D. Have yielded or may likely yield information important in prehistory or history (information potential).

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

California Register of Historical Resources

Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 establishes the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The register lists all California properties considered to be significant historical resources. The CRHR includes all properties listed as or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including properties evaluated under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The criteria for listing are similar to those of the NRHP. Criteria for listing in the CRHR include resources that:

1. Are associated with the events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
2. Are associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

3. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic values; or
4. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The regulations set forth the criteria for eligibility as well as guidelines for assessing historical integrity and resources that have special considerations.

The California Register of National Historic Places

The California Register of Historic Places (CRHP) program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archeological and cultural significance, identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes, determines eligibility for state historic preservation grant funding and affords certain protections under the California Environmental Quality Act. The criteria for listing in the CRHP include resources that:

A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
B. Are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history.
C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.
D. Have yielded, or have the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

The State Office of Historic Preservation sponsors the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), a statewide system for managing information on the full range of historical resources identified in California. CHRIS provides an integrated database of site-specific archaeological and historical resources information. The State Office of Historic Preservation also maintains the CRHR, which identifies the State's architectural, historical, archeological and cultural resources. The CRHR includes properties listed in or formally determined eligible for the National Register and lists selected California Registered Historical Landmarks.

Public Resources Code (Section 5024.1 [B]) states that any agency proposing a project that could potentially impact a resource listed on the CRHR must first notify the State Historic Preservation Officer, and must work with the officer to ensure that the project incorporates "prudent and feasible measures that will eliminate or mitigate the adverse effects."

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that, in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission.

Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code stipulates that whenever the commission receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner pursuant to

subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, it shall immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The decedents may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within 24 hours of their notification by the Native American Heritage Commission. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

CEQA and CEQA Guidelines

Section 21083.2 of CEQA requires that the lead agency determine whether a project may have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources. A unique archaeological resource is defined in CEQA as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that there is a high probability that it:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, and there is demonstrable public interest in that information;
- Has a special or particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.
- Although not specifically inclusive of paleontological resources, these criteria may also help to define "a unique paleontological resource or site."

Measures to avoid, conserve, preserve, or mitigate significant effects on these resources are also provided under CEQA Section 21083.2.

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines notes that "a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." Substantial adverse changes include physical changes to the historic resource or to its immediate surroundings, such that the significance of the historic resource would be materially impaired. Lead agencies are expected to identify potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historic resource before they approve such projects. Historic resources are those that are:

- listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 [k]);
- included in a local register of historic resources (Public Resources Code Section 5020.1) or identified as significant in an historic resource survey meeting the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5024.l(g); or
- determined by a lead agency to be historically significant.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 also prescribes the processes and procedures found under Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.95 for addressing the existence of, or probable likelihood of, Native American human remains, as well as the unexpected discovery of any

human remains within the project site. This includes consultation with the appropriate Native American tribes.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 provides further guidance about minimizing effects to historical resources through the application of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures must be legally binding and fully enforceable.

The lead agency having jurisdiction over a project is also responsible to ensure that paleontological resources are protected in compliance with CEQA and other applicable statutes. Paleontological and historical resource management is also addressed in Public Resources Code Section 5097.5, "Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historical Sites." This statute defines as a misdemeanor any unauthorized disturbance or removal of a fossil site or remains on public land and specifies that state agencies may undertake surveys, excavations, or other operations as necessary on state lands to preserve or record paleontological resources. This statute would apply to any construction or other related project impacts that would occur on state-owned or state-managed lands. The County General Plan contains policies describing specific, enforceable measures to protect cultural resources and the treatment of resources when found.

Environmental Setting:

Solano Archaeological Services (SAS) conducted a cultural resource records search of the North Central Information Center (NCIC), a search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File, and an intensive pedestrian survey of each of the 10 proposed Project locations (SAS 2016). For each site, SAS prepared a separate 'Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit' memo. Because ground-disturbing work will occur as a result of implementing the proposed project, the proposed Project has the potential to affect historic and prehistoric cultural resources, including any historic properties within the APE. Fieldwork included a pedestrian survey of each site conducted in October 2016 (SAS 2016).

The El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) lists NRHP/CRHR Listed Properties in unincorporated El Dorado County in Table 5.13-1 (El Dorado County 2004a). The General Plan EIR references that "More than 1,300 prehistoric and historic cultural resources had been documented within the county as of 2002."

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***No Impact.*** An intensive pedestrian survey in October 2016 and records search of the NCIC were conducted for each proposed location in support of the Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit' memos. No historic resources were discovered at any of the 10 sites (SAS 2016). The purpose of the NCIC records search is to identify all previously recorded cultural resources (prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, historic buildings, structures, objects, or districts) within the area of potential effect (APE), as required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. It entails a review of all previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites located within a ½-mile radius of the project, as well as a review of all cultural resource survey/excavation reports. A summary of the records search for each site is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. NCIC Record Search Summary

Site Name	Site Address	Site Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	NCIC Records For Site and ½ Mile Radius
1	4030 Brinks Lane	073-031-09-100	No records on-site or within ½ mile
2	2040 Sliger Mine Road	061-720-01-100	No records on-site, three known cultural resources located greater than 1,000 ft from the Project site
3	5400 Reservoir Road	061-540-14-100	No records on-site, four known cultural resources located greater than 2,000 ft from the Project site
4	8140 Wild Horse Trail	062-500-33	No records on-site, seven known cultural resources located greater than 500 ft from the Project site
5	3680 Greenwood Road	060-090-24-100	No records on-site, nine known cultural resources located greater than 450 ft from the Project site
6	3550 Brumarba Heights	060-200-52-100	No records on-site, three known cultural resources located greater than 1,000 ft from the Project site
7	1030 View Ridge Lane	060-180-27-100	No records on-site, one known cultural resources located greater than 1,900 ft from the Project site
8	6060 Ambrosia Lane	060-361-48-100	No records on-site, three known cultural resources located greater than 1,200 ft from the Project site
9	4341 Raty Lane	060-430-61-100	No records on-site, one known cultural resources located greater than 2,700 ft from the Project site
10	4841 Traverse Creek Road	062-111-07-100	No records on-site, one known cultural resources located greater than 2,700 ft from the Project site

b) ***No Impact.*** An intensive pedestrian survey and records search were conducted for each proposed location in support of the Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit memos. No prehistoric materials were discovered at any of the 10 sites (SAS 2016).

c) ***No Impact.*** Paleontological resources in El Dorado County are associated with limestone cave deposits, occurrences of the Mehrten formation, and Pleistocene channel deposits (El Dorado County 2004a). Based on a review of the *Geologic Map of the Sacramento Quadrangle*, the Mehrten formation is not present at any of the 10 sites. The Project sites occur in upland areas not expected to contain Pleistocene channel deposits. The depth of excavation for installation the various Project components is expected to range from 4 inches to 4 ft.

d) ***No Impact.*** No cemeteries or burials were observed or known from the 10 Project locations (SAS 2016).

FINDING: No significant cultural resources have been identified on any of the 10 project sites. Standard conditions of approval would apply in the event of accidental discovery during project construction. This project will not have a significant impact within the Cultural Resources category.

4.2.6 Tribal Cultural Resources

VI. Tribal Cultural Resources:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*

		Incorporated		
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal laws, regulations, or policies apply to Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) and the Proposed Project.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Assembly Bill (AB) 52

AB 52, which was approved in September 2014 and effective on July 1, 2015, requires that CEQA lead agencies consult with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project, if so requested by the tribe. The bill, chaptered in CEQA Section 21084.2, also specifies that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

Defined in Section 21074(a) of the Public Resources Code, TCRs are:

1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
    a. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
    b. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
2. 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

TCRs are further defined under Section 21074 as follows:

a. A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a TCR to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape; and
b. A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a "nonunique archaeological resource" as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a TCR if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

Mitigation measures for TCRs must be developed in consultation with the affected California Native American tribe pursuant to newly chaptered Section 21080.3.2, or according to Section 21084.3. Section 21084.3 identifies mitigation measures that include avoidance and preservation of TCRs and treating TRCs with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource.

Environmental Setting:

Solano Archaeological Services (SAS) conducted preliminary coordination with Native American tribes to identify potential Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) in the Project area prior to consultation. On October 4, 2016, SAS emailed a letter and a project area of potential effect (APE) map to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requesting a search of their Sacred Lands File for the APE. A response was received on October 6, 2016, stating that the "record search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File was completed for APE with negative results." The NAHC provided a list of appropriate Native American contacts, all of whom were sent letters by SAS as follows:

- Mr. Cosme Valdez – Interim Chief – Nashville-El Dorado Miwok
- Mr. Nicholas Fonseca – Chairperson – Shingle Springs Band of Miwok
- Mr. Grayson Coney – Cultural Director – Tsi Akim Maidu
- Mr. Don Ryberg – Chairperson – Tsi Akim Maidu
- Mr. Gene Whitehouse – Chairperson – United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC)
- Mr. Darrel Cruz – Cultural Resources Department – Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California

During this coordination, no TCRs or tribal cultural resources concerns specific to the proposed Project were identified.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***No 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 Back of Miwok Indians were notified of the proposed project and given access to all project documents on April 17, 2017, via certified mail. No other tribes had requested to be notified of the proposed projects for consultation in the project area at the time. In response to a request from the UAIC, dated May 5, 2017, the Cultural Resources Search for the project was sent to the tribe via email. No other requests for further information or formal consultation were received for this project. Pursuant to the Records Search prepared by Solano Archeological Services (2016), the geographic area of the project sites are 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 defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or considered significant by a California Native American tribe. The impact would be less than significant.

FINDING: No significant TCRs are known to exist on any of the 10 project sites. As a result, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change to a TCR and there would be no impact.

4.2.7 Geology and Soils

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless 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:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act

The National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-124) and creation of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) established a long-term earthquake risk-reduction program to better understand, predict, and mitigate risks associated with seismic events. The following four federal agencies are responsible for coordinating activities under NEHRP: USGS, National Science Foundation (NSF), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Since its inception, NEHRP has shifted its focus from earthquake prediction to hazard reduction. The current program objectives (NEHRP 2009) are to:

1. Develop effective measures to reduce earthquake hazards;
2. Promote the adoption of earthquake hazard reduction activities by federal, state, and local governments; national building standards and model building code organizations; engineers; architects; building owners; and others who play a role in planning and constructing buildings, bridges, structures, and critical infrastructure or "lifelines";
3. Improve the basic understanding of earthquakes and their effects on people and infrastructure through interdisciplinary research involving engineering; natural sciences; and social, economic, and decision sciences; and
4. Develop and maintain the USGS seismic monitoring system (Advanced National Seismic System); the NSF-funded project aimed at improving materials, designs, and construction techniques

(George E. Brown Jr. Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation); and the global earthquake monitoring network (Global Seismic Network).

Implementation of NEHRP objectives is accomplished primarily through original research, publications, and recommendations and guidelines for state, regional, and local agencies in the development of plans and policies to promote safety and emergency planning.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Public Resources Code Section 2621 et seq.) was passed to reduce the risk to life and property from surface faulting in California. The Alquist-Priolo Act prohibits construction of most types of structures intended for human occupancy on the surface traces of active faults and strictly regulates construction in the corridors along active faults (earthquake fault zones). It also defines criteria for identifYing active faults, giving legal weight to terms such as "active," and establishes a process for reviewing building proposals in and adjacent to earthquake fault zones. Under the Alquist-Priolo Act, faults are zoned and construction along or across them is strictly regulated if they are "sufficiently active" and "well defined." Before a project can be permitted, cities and counties are required to have a geologic investigation conducted to demonstrate that the proposed buildings would not be constructed across active faults.

Historical seismic activity and fault and seismic hazards mapping in the project vicinity indicate that the area has relatively low potential for seismic activity (El Dorado County 2004a). No active faults have been mapped in the project area, and none of the known faults have been designated as an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

Seismic Hazards Mapping Act

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (SHMA) of 1990 (Public Resources Code Sections 2690-2699.6) establishes statewide minimum public safety standards for mitigation of earthquake hazards. While the Alquist-Priolo Act addresses surface fault rupture, the SHMA addresses other earthquake-related hazards, including strong ground shaking, liquefaction, and seismically induced landslides. Its provisions are similar in concept to those of the Alquist-Priolo Act. The state is charged with identifying and mapping areas at risk of strong ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, and other seismic hazards, and cities and counties are required to regulate development within mapped seismic hazard zones. In addition, the act addresses not only seismically induced hazards but also expansive soils, settlement, and slope stability.

Mapping and other information generated pursuant to the SHMA is to be made available to local governments for planning and development purposes. The State requires: (1) local governments to incorporate site-specific geotechnical hazard investigations and associated hazard mitigation, as part of the local construction permit approval process; and (2) the agent for a property seller or the seller if acting without an agent, must disclose to any prospective buyer if the property is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone. Under the SHMA, cities and counties may withhold the development permits for a site within seismic hazard zones until appropriate site-specific geologic and/or geotechnical investigations have been carried out and measures to reduce potential damage have been incorporated into the development plans.

California Building Standards Code

Title 24 CCR, also known as the California Building Standards Code (CBC), specifies standards for geologic and seismic hazards other than surface faulting. These codes are administered and updated by the California Building Standards Commission. CBC specifies criteria for open excavation, seismic design, and load-bearing capacity directly related to construction in California.

Environmental Setting:

Regional Geology: El Dorado County is located in the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California, east of the Great Valley province and west of the Range and Basin provinces. Steep-sided hills and narrow rocky stream channels characterize the Sierra Nevada province. This province consists of Pliocene and older deposits that have been uplifted as a result of plate tectonics, granitic intrusion, and volcanic activity. Subsequent glaciations and additional volcanic activity are factors that led to the east-west orientation of stream channels. (El Dorado County 2004a).

The southwestern foothills of El Dorado County are composed of rocks of the Mariposa Formation that include amphibolite, serpentine, and pyroxenite. The northwestern areas of the county consist of the Calaveras Formation, which includes metamorphic rock such as chert, slate, quartzite, and mica schist. The higher peaks in the County consist primarily of igneous and metamorphic rocks with granite intrusions, a main soil parent material at the higher elevations (El Dorado County 2004a). The Project sites are not located within an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) or an area "more likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos" (California Department of Conservation 2000, El Dorado County 2005).

Seismicity: Seismicity is defined as the geographic and historical distribution of earthquake activity. Seismic activity may result in geologic and seismic hazards including seismically induced fault displacement and rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides and avalanches, and structural hazards. Based on historical seismic activity and fault and seismic hazards mapping, El Dorado County is considered to have relatively low potential for seismic activity, and is located beyond the highly active fault zones of the coastal areas of California. The County's fault systems and associated seismic hazards are described below (El Dorado County 2004a).

Fault Systems: Earthquakes are associated with the fault systems in a particular area. The distribution of known faults in El Dorado County is concentrated in the western portion of the county, with several isolated faults in the central county area and the Lake Tahoe Basin. Fault systems mapped in western El Dorado County include the West Bear Mountains Fault; the East Bear Mountains Fault; the Maidu Fault Zone; the El Dorado Fault; the Melones Fault Zone of the Clark, Gillis Hill Fault; and the Calaveras–Shoo Fly Thrust. .

No active faults have been identified in El Dorado County. One fault, part of the Rescue Lineament–Bear Mountains fault zone, is classified as a well located late-Quaternary fault; therefore, it represents the only potentially active fault in the county. All other faults located in El Dorado County are classified as pre-Quaternary (inactive).

Soils: Soils on the west slope of El Dorado County consist of well-drained silt and gravelly loams divided into two physiographic regions, the Lower and Middle Foothills and the Mountainous Uplands. There are a total of eight soil associations in western El Dorado County.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***a-i-iv) No Impact.*** No active faults have been identified in western El Dorado County. Therefore, the Project will not rupture a fault mapped on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. The Project is not in a seismic hazard zone (California Department of Conservation 2016b).

No portion of El Dorado County occurs in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., regulatory zones that encompass areas prone to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides) based on the Seismic Hazards Mapping Program administered by the California Geologic Survey (CGS). Consequently, El Dorado County and the Project site are not considered to be at risk from liquefaction hazards or earthquake-induced landslides.

b) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The 10 Project sites do not include grading activities. Minimal soil disturbance would occur during installation of the concrete pads that will support the new towers and any trenching needed to provide power to the new tower. All the Project sites are located in upland areas. Cal.net will implement best management practices (BMPs) to protect water quality and minimize the potential for siltation and downstream sedimentation. Application of these requirements and measures would prevent substantial erosion or topsoil loss.

c) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The Project includes minimal soil disturbance associated with tower installation, and at Sites 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10, minor amounts of trenching (Table 1) to connect to existing power. The depth of excavation for installation the various Project components is expected to range from 18 inches for trenches to 4 ft for tower foundations/piers. All the new tower locations occur on relatively flat ground. Soils on site are not susceptible to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. No impacts are anticipated from unstable soil.

d) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The Project sites are not located in areas likely to be affected by liquefaction and/or lateral spreading, or in areas likely to contain highly expansive soils. Expansive soils are characterized by their ability to undergo significant volume change (shrink and swell) due to variation in soil moisture content. Potential impacts associated with shrink/swell cycles include unacceptable settlement or heave of structures, concrete slabs supported-on-grade, and pavements.

Generally, soils in western El Dorado County have a low to moderate shrink-swell potential. These expansive soils generally contain clays that expand when moisture is absorbed into the crystal structure. This results in a rise in the ground surface. Though expansive soils are not considered to pose a significant hazard within El Dorado County, the effects of potentially expansive soils on structures can be reduced through proper engineering design and standard corrective measures. Construction in conformance with California Building Standards Code and Uniform Building Code Standards adopted by the County will ensure that the potential for impacts related to expansive soil are reduced to a less-than-significant.

e) ***No Impact.*** The proposed Project is a telecommunications project. Septic tanks and alternative wastewater disposal systems are not part of the Project.

FINDING: A review of the soils and geologic conditions at the Project sites determined that the Project would not result in a substantial adverse effect. None of the Project sites will have grading activities. For this Geology and Soils category, impacts would be less than significant.

4.2.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

VIII.GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

At the federal level, USEPA has developed regulations to reduce GHG emissions from motor vehicles and has developed permitting requirements for large stationary emitters of GHGs. On April 1, 20 I 0, US EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) established a program to reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel economy standards for new model year 2012-2016 cars and light trucks. On August 9, 2011, USEPA and the NHTSA announced standards to reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel efficiency for heavy-duty trucks and buses.

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the *California Climate Solutions Act of 2006* (Stats. 2006, ch. 488) (Health & Safety Code, Section 38500 et seq.). AB 32 requires a statewide GHG emissions reduction to 1990 levels by the year 2020. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to implement and enforce the statewide cap. When AB 32 was signed, California's annual GHG emissions were estimated at 600 million metric tons of C02 equivalent (MMTC02e) while 1990 levels were estimated at 427 MMTC02e. Setting 427 MMTC02e as the emissions target for 2020, current (2006) GHG emissions levels must be reduced by 29%. CARB adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan in December 2008 establishing various actions the state would implement to achieve this reduction (CARB, 2008). The Scoping Plan recommends a community-wide GHG reduction goal for local governments of 15%.

In June 2008, the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) issued a Technical Advisory (OPR, 2008) providing interim guidance regarding a proposed project's GHG emissions and contribution to global climate change. In the absence of adopted local or statewide thresholds, OPR recommends the following approach for analyzing GHG emissions: Identify and quantify the project's GHG emissions, assess the significance of the impact on climate change; and if the impact is found to be significant, identify alternatives and/or Mitigation Measures that would reduce the impact to less than significant levels (CEC, 2006).

Environmental Setting:

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are recognized by wide consensus among the scientific community to contribute to global warming/climate change and associated environmental impacts. The major GHGs that are released from human activity include carbon dioxide (CO2), methane, and nitrous oxide (OPR

2008). The primary sources of GHGs are vehicles (including airplanes and trains), energy plants, and industrial and agricultural activities (such as dairies and hog farms).

Greenhouse gas emissions for transportation projects can be divided into those produced during operations and those produced during construction. The proposed Project does not increase the capacity of local roads and would not increase operational GHG levels. The discussion below therefore focuses on construction-related GHG emissions of the Project.

CEQA does not provide explicit directions on addressing climate change. It requires lead agencies identify project GHG emissions impacts and their "significance," but does not define what constitutes a "significant" impact. Not all projects emitting GHG contribute significantly to climate change. CEQA authorizes reliance on previously approved plans (i.e., a Climate Action Plan (CAP), etc.) and mitigation programs adequately analyzing and mitigating GHG emissions to a less than significant level. El Dorado County does not have an adopted CAP or similar program-level document; therefore, the project's GHG emissions must be addressed at the project-level.

The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District's (EDCAQMD) has not adopted GHG emissions significance thresholds for transportation or land use development projects. On October 23, 2014, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Board of Directors adopted recommended GHG thresholds of significance for CEQA. The SMAQMD utilized guidance published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, *CEQA & Climate Change, Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act*, and a review of local projects in developing recommended greenhouse gas emissions thresholds of significance.

The SMAQMD Thresholds Committee undertook a process to apply the Bay Area AQMD's methodology regarding a Service Population (or Per Capita) Threshold to local projects to the Sacramento region. The SMAQMD Thresholds Committee determined that a per capita threshold would hold all projects, regardless of size, to the same GHG emissions analysis and mitigation standards. SMAQMD determined this approach is not cost-effective for small projects and could impede their development. The SMAQMD Thresholds Committee sought to develop a threshold that would ensure that at least 90 percent of emissions from projects in the region would be reviewed and analyzed to determine if additional mitigation should be required, while exempting small projects from the requirement to analyze GHG emissions and mitigate.

Given the lack of locally adopted GHG emissions significance thresholds the EDCAQMD allows the use of the SMAQMD thresholds. SMAQMD GHG Emissions Significance Thresholds are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. SMAQMD 2014 Approved GHG Emissions Significance Thresholds.

Significance Determination Thresholds	
GHG Emission Source Category	**Threshold**
Stationary Sources	10,000 direct metric tons of CO2e per year (Operational impacts)
Land Development Projects	1,100 metric tons of CO2e per year [1] (Operational impacts)
All Construction Activities	1,100 metric tons of CO2e per year

[1] CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalent, a metric measure used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based upon their global warming potential (GWP).

[2] The 1,100 metric tons of CO2e per year threshold is roughly equivalent to 54 residential dwelling units, 63,000 square feet of office space, 29,000 square feet of general retail space, or 12,500 square feet of supermarket space.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The Projects operational impact would be limited to emissions as a result of infrequent maintenance vehicle trips. Construction of the proposed Project would generate short-term emissions of greenhouse gases. GHG emissions generated by Project construction would be primarily in the form of CO2. The total area disturbed by the proposed Project is approximately 0.36 ac spread out over 10 sites in northern El Dorado County. Based on the small project size, the geographic distribution of the 10 Project sites, and the limited activities involved with construction of the Project, neither construction or operational related GHG impacts will not exceed the 1,100 metric tons of CO2e per year threshold.

The project would be required to incorporate modern construction and design features that reduce energy consumption to the extent feasible. Implementation of these features would reduce potential GHG emissions resulting from the development of the proposed Project.

b) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** EDCAQMD has not yet adopted a qualified plan, policy, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, the most applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions is Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which codified the State's future GHG emissions reduction targets.

CARB adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan as a framework for achieving AB 32. The Scoping Plan outlines a series of technologically feasible and cost-effective measures to reduce statewide GHG emissions. These strategies are geared towards sectors and activities that generate significant amounts of GHGs. For example, the majority of measures address building, energy, waste and wastewater generation, goods movement, on-road transportation, water usage, and high global warming potential gases. Activities associated with the Project are not considered by the AB 32 Scoping Plan as having a high potential to emit GHGs. Implementation of the Project would not conflict with implementation of AB 32.

FINDING: The project would result in less than significant impacts to GHG emissions because of the project size and inclusion of design features to address the emissions of GHG. For this Greenhouse Gas Emissions category, there would be no significant adverse environmental effect as a result of the project.

4.2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Regulatory Setting:

Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes are subject to extensive federal, state, and local regulations to protect public health and the environment. These regulations provide definitions of hazardous materials; establish reporting requirements; set guidelines for handling, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous wastes; and require health and safety provisions for workers and the public. The major federal, state, and regional agencies enforcing these regulations are USEPA and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA); California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC); California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA); California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES); and EDCAPCD.

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, also called the Superfund Act; 42 USC Section 9601 *et seq.)* is intended to protect the public and the environment from the effects of past hazardous waste disposal activities and new hazardous material spills. Under CERCLA, USEPA has the authority to seek the parties responsible for hazardous materials releases and to ensure their cooperation in site remediation. CERCLA also provides federal funding (through the "Superfund") for the remediation of hazardous materials contamination. The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-499) amends some provisions of CERCLA and provides for a Community Right-to-Know program.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA; 42 USC Section 6901 *et seq.),* as amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, is the primary federal law for the regulation of solid waste and hazardous waste in the United States. These laws provide for the "cradle-to-grave" regulation of hazardous wastes, including generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal. Any business, institution, or other entity that generates hazardous waste is required to identify and track its hazardous waste from the point of generation until it is recycled, reused, or disposed of.

USEPA has primary responsibility for implementing RCRA, but individual states are encouraged to seek authorization to implement some or all RCRA provisions. California received authority to implement the RCRA program in August 1992. DTSC is responsible for implementing the RCRA program in addition to California's own hazardous waste laws, which are collectively known as the Hazardous Waste Control Law.

Energy Policy Act of 2005

Title XV, Subtitle B of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (the Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act of 2005) contains amendments to Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, the original legislation that created the Underground Storage Tank (UST) Program. As defined by law, a UST is "any one or combination of tanks, including pipes connected thereto, that is used for the storage of hazardous substances and that is substantially or totally beneath the surface of the ground." In cooperation with USEPA, SWRCB oversees the UST Program. The intent is to protect public health and safety and the environment from releases of petroleum and other hazardous substances from tanks. The four primary program elements include leak prevention (implemented by Certified Unified Program Agencies [CUPAs], described in more detail below), cleanup of leaking tanks, enforcement of UST requirements, and tank integrity testing.

Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Rule

USEPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Rule (40 CFR, Part 112) apply to facilities with a single above-ground storage tank (AST) with a storage capacity greater than 660 gallons, or multiple tanks with a combined capacity greater than 1,320 gallons. The rule includes requirements for oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response to prevent oil discharges to navigable waters and adjoining shorelines. The rule requires specific facilities to prepare, amend, and implement SPCC Plans.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

OSHA is responsible at the federal level for ensuring worker safety. OSHA sets federal standards for implementation of workplace training, exposure limits, and safety procedures for the handling of hazardous substances (as well as other hazards). OSHA also establishes criteria by which each state can implement its own health and safety program.

Federal Communications Commission Requirements

There is no federally mandated radio frequency (RF) exposure standard; however, pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 USC Section 224), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) established guidelines for dealing with RF exposure, as presented below. The exposure limits are specified in 47 CFR Section 1.1310 in terms of frequency, field strength, power density, and averaging time. Facilities and transmitters licensed and authorized by FCC must either comply with these limits or an applicant must file an environmental assessment with FCC to evaluate whether the proposed facilities could result in a significant environmental effect.

FCC has established two sets of RF radiation exposure limits – Occupational/Controlled and General Population/Uncontrolled. The less-restrictive Occupational/Controlled limit applies only when a person (worker) is exposed as a consequence of his or her employment and is "fully aware of the potential exposure and can exercise control over his or her exposure;" otherwise, the General Population limit applies (47 CFR Section 1.1310).

The FCC exposure limits generally apply to all FCC-licensed facilities (47 CFR Section 1.1307[b][1]). Unless exemptions apply, as a condition of obtaining a license to transmit, applicants must certify that they comply with FCC environmental rules, including those that are designed to prevent exposing persons to radiation above FCC RF limits (47 CFR Section l.1307[b]). Licensees at co-located sites (e.g., towers supporting multiple antennas, including antennas under separate ownerships) must take the necessary actions to bring the accessible areas that exceed the FCC exposure limits into compliance. This is a shared responsibility of all licensees whose transmission power density levels account for 5.0 or more percent of the applicable FCC exposure limits (47 CFR 1.1307[b][3]).

Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR Part 77)

14 CFR Part 77.9 is designed to promote air safety and the efficient use of navigable airspace. Implementation of the code is administered by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). If an organization plans to sponsor any construction or alterations that might affect navigable airspace, a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (FAA Form 7460-1) must be filed. The code provides specific guidance regarding FAA notification requirements.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986-Proposition 65

The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, more commonly known as Proposition 65, protects the state's drinking water sources from contamination with chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. Proposition 65 also requires businesses to inform the public of exposure to such chemicals in the products they purchase, in their homes or workplaces, or that are released into the environment. In accordance with Proposition 65, the California Governor's Office publishes, at least annually, a list of such chemicals. OEHHA, an agency under the California

Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), is the lead agency for implementation of the Proposition 65 program. Proposition 65 is enforced through the California Attorney General's Office; however, district and city attorneys and any individual acting in the public interest may also file a lawsuit against a business alleged to be in violation of Proposition 65 regulations.

The Unified Program

The Unified Program consolidates, coordinates, and makes consistent the administrative requirements, permits, inspections, and enforcement activities of six environmental and emergency response programs. CalEPA and other state agencies set the standards for their programs, while local governments (CUPAs) implement the standards. For each county, the CUPA regulates/oversees the following:

- Hazardous materials business plans;
- California accidental release prevention plans or federal risk management plans;
- The operation of USTs and ASTs;
- Universal waste and hazardous waste generators and handlers;
- On-site hazardous waste treatment;
- Inspections, permitting, and enforcement;
- Proposition 65 reporting; and
- Emergency response.

Hazardous Materials Business Plans

Hazardous materials business plans are required for businesses that handle hazardous materials in quantities greater than or equal to 55 gallons of a liquid, 500 pounds of a solid, or 200 cubic feet (cf) of compressed gas, or extremely hazardous substances above the threshold planning quantity (40 CFR, Part 355, Appendix A) (Cal OES, 2015). Business plans are required to include an inventory of the hazardous materials used/stored by the business, a site map, an emergency plan, and a training program for employees (Cal OES, 2015). In addition, business plan information is provided electronically to a statewide information management system, verified by the applicable CUPA, and transmitted to agencies responsible for the protection of public health and safety (i.e., local fire department, hazardous material response team, and local environmental regulatory groups) (Cal OES, 2015).

California Occupational Safety and Health Administration

Cal/OSHA assumes primary responsibility for developing and enforcing workplace safety regulations in California. Cal/OSHA regulations pertaining to the use of hazardous materials in the workplace (CCR Title 8) include requirements for safety training, availability of safety equipment, accident and illness prevention programs, warnings about exposure to hazardous substances, and preparation of emergency action and fire prevention plans.

Hazard communication program regulations that are enforced by Cal/OSHA require workplaces to maintain procedures for identifying and labeling hazardous substances, inform workers about the hazards associated with hazardous substances and their handling, and prepare health and safety plans to protect workers at hazardous waste sites. Employers must also make material safety data sheets available to employees and document employee information and training programs. In addition, Cal/OSHA has established maximum permissible RF radiation exposure limits for workers (Title 8 CCR Section

5085[b]), and requires warning signs where RF radiation might exceed the specified limits (Title 8 CCR Section 5085[c]).

California Accidental Release Prevention

The purpose of the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) program is to prevent accidental releases of substances that can cause serious harm to the public and the environment, to minimize the damage if releases do occur, and to satisfy community right-to-know laws. In accordance with this program, businesses that handle more than a threshold quantity of regulated substance are required to develop a risk management plan (RMP). This RMP must provide a detailed analysis of potential risk factors and associated mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce accident potential. CUPAs implement the CalARP program through review of RMPs, facility inspections, and public access to information that is not confidential or a trade secret.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Wildland Fire Management

The Office of the State Fire Marshal and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) administer state policies regarding wildland fire safety. Construction contractors must comply with the following requirements in the Public Resources Code during construction activities at any sites with forest-, brush-, or grass-covered land:

- Earthmoving and portable equipment with internal combustion engines must be equipped with a spark arrestor to reduce the potential for igniting a wildland fire (Public Resources Code Section 4442).
- Appropriate fire-suppression equipment must be maintained from April 1 to December 1, the highest-danger period for fires (Public Resources Code Section 4428).
- On days when a burning permit is required, flammable materials must be removed to a distance of 10 feet from any equipment that could produce a spark, fire, or flame, and the construction contractor must maintain the appropriate fire suppression equipment (Public Resources Code Section 4427).
- On days when a burning permit is required, portable tools powered by gasoline fueled internal combustion engines must not be used within 25 feet of any flammable materials (Public Resources Code Section 4431).

California Highway Patrol

CHP, along with Caltrans, enforce and monitor hazardous materials and waste transportation laws and regulations in California. These agencies determine container types used and license hazardous waste haulers for hazardous waste transportation on public roads. All motor carriers and drivers involved in transportation of hazardous materials must apply for and obtain a hazardous materials transportation license from CHP.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

A map of the fuel loading in the County (General Plan Figure HS-1) shows the fire hazard severity classifications of the State Responsibility Areas in El Dorado County, as established by CDF. The classification system provides three classes of fire hazards: Moderate, High, and Very High. Fire Hazard Ordinance (Chapter 8.08) requires defensible space as described by the State Public Resources Code,

including the incorporation and maintenance of a 30-foot fire break or vegetation fuel clearance around structures in fire hazard zones. The County's requirements on emergency access, signing and numbering, and emergency water are more stringent than those required by state law (Patton 2002). The Fire Hazard Ordinance also establishes limits on campfires, fireworks, smoking, and incinerators for all discretionary and ministerial developments.

Environmental Setting:

A regulatory agency database review for locations included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (The Cortese list) was conducted for the Project using the EnviroStor (Department of Toxic Substances Control 2016). EnviroStor is the Department of Toxic Substances Control's data management system for tracking our cleanup, permitting, enforcement and investigation efforts at hazardous waste facilities and sites with known contamination or sites where there may be reasons to investigate further. No listed hazardous materials or waste sites were reported within or near the Project sites.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Small amounts of hazardous materials would be used during construction activities (i.e., equipment maintenance, fuel, solvents). Backup batteries in the tower cabinets are absorbed glass mat (AGM) batteries. AGM batteries are similar in size, use, and retail availability as a typical car battery; however, the sulfuric acid in the battery is absorbed into fiberglass mat and immobilized between the plates inside the battery. AGM batteries therefore have a low spill hazard and improved heat and cold tolerance compared to standard car batteries.

Hazardous materials used during construction of the Project would be required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials. Use of hazardous materials in accordance with applicable standards ensures that any exposure of the public to hazard materials would have a less-than-significant impact. Spent AGM batteries will be returned to the manufacturer for disposal.

The Federal Communications Commission prohibits local governments from denying a wireless facility project based on concerns about the dangers of exposure to radio frequency or electromagnetic fields (EMF). This is due to inconclusive evidence about the health risk of exposure to radio frequency EMF.

b) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Based on a review of the EnviroStor database there are no known hazardous materials present at the 10 Project sites. Hazardous materials would only be used during construction of the Project, and any accidental release of hazardous material uses would be required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards associated with the release and handling of hazardous materials. Project impacts area less-than-significant.

Cal.net conducted an analysis of the radio frequency (RF) environment surrounding the proposed installation. The results are presented in the *El Dorado County North-Ionizing Radio Frequency Analysis* (Cal.net 2017). The report was prepared to ensure compliance with the appropriate guidelines of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) limiting human exposure levels to RF energy.

The American National Standards Institute and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) have published a standard called ANSI/IEEE C95.I-1992, which until recently set recommended maximum power density levels for radio frequency (RF) energy originating from communications sites and other sources. The FCC has also produced its own guidelines, which are more stringent and supersede the ANSI standard.

The FCC has established guidelines concerning the maximum safe human exposure limits to electromagnetic fields. Docket 93-62, effective October 15, 1997, is based on exposure limits recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP). It specifies separate occupational and general public exposure limits, with the latter being five times more restrictive. These limits are based on continuous exposures and are intended to provide a prudent margin of safety for all persons, without regard to physical characteristics. Calculation of exposure to ionizing radiation utilizes a worst-case scenario approach that presumes a location on the ground in the direction of maximum radiated energy, specifically along the centerline of the backhaul dish antenna.

Due to their mounting locations, no Cal.net antennae will be accessible to the general public, and their height above ground will prevent exposure to unsafe radiation levels for anyone in the vicinity. The highest calculated level in publicly accessible areas is much less than the prevailing standards allow for exposures of unlimited duration and no mitigation measures are necessary to comply with the FCC public exposure guidelines. Cal.net employees are adequately trained to take appropriate measures to avoid exposures exceeding the occupational limits, and Cal.net will ensure that its employees and contractors comply with FCC occupational exposure limits whenever working near the antennae.

c) ***No Impact.*** No existing or proposed schools occur within 0.25 mile of any of the Project sites. As noted above, the Project would potentially involve the short-term handling of hazardous materials during construction. Handling and storage of hazardous materials during construction would comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards.

d) ***No Impact.*** No listed hazardous materials or waste sites occur within or near the Project sites.

e) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Site 3 is located approximately 0.65 mile southwest of the Georgetown Airport (FAA ID Q61). Sites 8 and 9 are located approximately 1.04 mile north-northeast and 0.84 mile north-northwest, respectively, from the privately-owned Dubey Airport (FAA ID 29CN). None of the remaining seven sites occur within 2 miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. Given the distance from Georgetown and Dubey Airports, the use of low power telecommunications equipment on non-FAA frequencies, and the relatively short height of the proposed towers (Sites 3 and 9: 120 ft, Site 8: 40 ft) the installation and operation of the Project will not affect operations at the Georgetown or Dubey Airports, nor will operations at the Georgetown or Dubey Airports affect construction of the proposed Project. Project impacts are less than significant.

f) ***No Impact.*** See response of item e) above.

g) ***No Impact.*** The installation and operation telecommunications equipment on private property at 10 locations will not interfere or interrupt an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan

h) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The fire hazard level for Sites 1, 2, and 9 is High. The fire hazard level for the remaining seven sites (Sites 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10) is Very High. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District (Site 1), the Georgetown Fire Protection District (Sites 2, 3, and 4), and the Garden Valley Fire Protection District (Sites 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10) have incorporated standard conditions of approval for communications facilities located within their respective service areas. The completed Project will not expose people or structures to a new or increased significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

FINDING: The project would not be anticipated to expose the area to significant hazards relating to the use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. Any proposed future use of hazardous materials would be subject to review and approval of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan issued by the Environmental Management. For this Hazards and Hazardous Materials category, impacts would be less than significant.

4.2.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:
Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) is the primary federal law that protects the quality of the nation's surface waters, including lakes, rivers, and coastal wetlands. The key sections pertaining to water quality regulation for the Proposed Project are CWA Section 303 and Section 402.

Section 303(d)- Listing of Impaired Water Bodies

Under CWA Section 303(d), states are required to identify "impaired water bodies" (those not meeting established water quality standards), identify the pollutants causing the impairment, establish priority rankings for waters on the list, and develop a schedule for the development of control plans to improve water quality. USEPA then approves the State's recommended list of impaired waters or adds and/or removes waterbodies.

Section 402-NPDES Permits for Stormwater Discharge

CWA Section 402 regulates construction-related storm water discharges to surface waters through the NPDES, which is officially administered by USEPA. In California, USEPA has delegated its authority to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), which, in turn, delegates implementation responsibility to the nine RWQCBs, as discussed below in reference to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

The NPDES program provides for both general (those that cover a number of similar or related activities) and individual (activity- or project-specific) permits. General Permit for Construction Activities: Most construction projects that disturb 1.0 or more acre of land are required to obtain coverage under SWRCB's General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ). The general permit requires that the applicant file a public notice of intent to discharge storm water and prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). SWPPP must include a site map and a description of the proposed construction activities, demonstrate compliance with relevant local ordinances and regulations, and present a list of Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and protect against discharge of sediment and other construction-related pollutants to surface waters. Permittees are further required to monitor construction activities and report compliance to ensure that BMPs are correctly implemented and are effective in controlling the discharge of construction-related pollutants.

Municipal Stormwater Permitting Program

SWRCB regulates stormwater discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) through its Municipal Storm Water Permitting Program (SWRCB 2013). Permits are issued under two phases depending on the size of the urbanized area/municipality. Phase I MS4 permits are issued for medium (population between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large (population of 250,000 or more people) municipalities, and are often issued to a group of co-permittees within a metropolitan area. Phase I

permits have been issued since 1990. Beginning in 2003, SWRCB began issuing Phase II MS4 permits for smaller municipalities (population less than 100,000).

El Dorado County is covered under two SWRCB Regional Boards. The West Slope Phase II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) NPDES Permit is administered by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) (Region Five). The Lake Tahoe Phase I MS4 NPDES Permit is administered by the Lahontan RWQCB (Region Six). The current West Slope MS4 NPDES Permit was adopted by the SWRCB on February 5, 2013. The Permit became effective on July I, 2013 for a term of five years and focuses on the enhancement of surface water quality within high priority urbanized areas. The current Lake Tahoe MS4 NPDES Permit was adopted and took effect on December 6, 2011 for a term of five years. The Permit incorporated the Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and the Lake Clarity Crediting Program (LCCP) to account for the reduction of fine sediment particles and nutrients discharged to Lake Tahoe.

On May 19, 2015, the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors formally adopted revisions to the Storm Water Quality Ordinance (Ordinance 4992). Previously applicable only to the Lake Tahoe Basin, the ordinance establishes legal authority for the entire unincorporated portion of the County. The purpose of the ordinance is to 1) protect health, safety, and general welfare, 2) enhance and protect the quality of Waters of the State by reducing pollutants in storm water discharges to the maximum extent practicable and controlling non-storm water discharges to the storm drain system, and 3) cause the use of Best Management Practices to reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on Waters of the State.

National Flood Insurance Program

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) administers the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) to provide subsidized flood insurance to communities complying with FEMA regulations that limit development in floodplains. The NFIP regulations permit development within special flood hazard zones provided that residential structures are raised above the base flood elevation of a 100-year flood event. Non-residential structures are required either to provide flood proofing construction techniques for that portion of structures below the 100-year flood elevation or to elevate above the 100-year flood elevation. The regulations also apply to substantial improvements of existing structures.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (known as the Porter-Cologne Act), passed in 1969, dovetails with the CWA (see discussion of the CWA above). It established the SWRCB and divided the state into nine regions, each overseen by an RWQCB. SWRCB is the primary State agency responsible for protecting the quality of the state's surface water and groundwater supplies; however, much of the SWRCB's daily implementation authority is delegated to the nine RWQCBs, which are responsible for implementing CWA Sections 401,402, and 303[d]. In general, SWRCB manages water rights and regulates statewide water quality, whereas RWQCBs focus on water quality within their respective regions.

The Porter-Cologne Act requires RWQCBs to develop water quality control plans (also known as basin plans) that designate beneficial uses of California's major surface-water bodies and groundwater basins and establish specific narrative and numerical water quality objectives for those waters. Beneficial uses

represent the services and qualities of a waterbody (i.e., the reasons that the waterbody is considered valuable). Water quality objectives reflect the standards necessary to protect and support those beneficial uses. Basin plan standards are primarily implemented by regulating waste discharges so that water quality objectives are met. Under the Porter-Cologne Act, basin plans must be updated every 3 years.

Environmental Setting:

The FEMA/FIRM panels for the 10 new tower sites were reviewed to determine if any of the sites are located in a designated Flood Hazard Zone. The 10 sites occur on the following FEMA/FIRM panels:

- 06017C0200E: Sites 1 and 2
- 06017C0475E: Site 5
- 06017C0225E: Site 3
- 06017C0500E: Sites 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10
- 06017C0250E: Site 4

All sites are located in Zone X (area of minimal flood hazard) except Site 4. Site 4 is located in Zone D (area of undetermined flood hazard). None of the Project sites are located in a designated flood hazard zone.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The Project includes the installation of telecommunications equipment including new tower structures. The Project would disturb a combined maximum area of approximately 0.36 ac for all 10 sites. As a standard contract requirement, the County would require the contractor to comply with the County's Grading Ordinance and Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County, which requires preparation of a site-specific storm water pollution prevention plan or water pollution control plan. BMPs will be implemented during construction activities to minimize discharge of pollutants from construction activities. The Project will comply with the County's Grading Ordinance and Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County. Project impacts are less than significant.

b) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not involve any withdrawals from an aquifer or groundwater table.

c) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The Project will result in a minor increase of new impervious surface at each site. At eight of the Project sites, a 12 x 12 ft area will be excavated to a 4 ft depth and filled with 10 x 10 x 1.5 ft of concrete for the foundation pad. On top of the pad, a 5.5 x 5.5 x 3.5 ft pier will be constructed for the tower base. The pier will extend up to 18 inches above grade. The foundation pad and pier will be reinforced with rebar. The excavated area will be backfilled and compacted after the concrete cures. The tower pier will add approximately 30 ft^2 of new impervious surface at each of the 8 sites. Site 1 and 7will have smaller, cylindrical concrete tower piers measuring 2.5 ft in diameter, for a total new impervious surface area of approximately 5 ft^2 at each of the two sites. Other minor ground disturbance associated with the Project include security fence installation and trenching to connect to existing power. The small amount of soil disturbance at each Project site will not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns or alter the course of a stream or river.

d) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** See response to item c) above.

e) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The Project would not provide additional sources of runoff compared with the existing conditions. The minor increase of impervious surface area resulting from construction of the tower pads is not expected to contribute to a substantial increase in water runoff from the Project sites.

f) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** No additional impacts other than those discussed above are anticipated.

g) ***No Impact.*** None of the Project sites are located in a designated flood hazard zone.

h) ***No Impact.*** See response to item g) above.

i) ***No Impact.*** The Project will not expose people to higher levels of risk involving flooding. General Plan Policy 6.4.2.2 protects the life and property of County residents below dams by not allowing new critical or high occupancy structures (e.g., schools, hospitals) to be located within the inundation area resulting from failure of dams.

j) ***No Impact.*** The Project is not in an area subject to seiche or tsunami.

FINDING: The proposed project would require a site improvement and grading permit through the Development Services Division, Building Services that would address any potentially applicable erosion and sediment control. No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the development of the Project either directly or indirectly. For this hydrology category, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

4.2.11 Land Use and Planning

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

California State law requires that each City and County adopt a general plan "for the physical development of the City and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning." Typically, a general plan is designed to address the issues facing the City or County for the next 15-20 years. The general plan expresses the community's development goals and incorporates public policies relative to the distribution of future public and private land uses. The El Dorado County General Plan was adopted in 2004. The 2013-2021 Housing Element was adopted in 2013.

Environmental Setting:

The 2004 El Dorado County General Plan is the relevant land use plan for the project area. The General Plan land use and zoning designations of the parcels in the Project area are listed in Table 1.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***No Impact.*** The Project includes installation of telecommunications equipment on privately owned parcels and would not physically divide an established community.

b) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not conflict with the goals, objectives or policies intended to mitigate environmental impacts adopted in the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan. The Project does not include any rezoning activities. The Project complies with zoning and use requirements for all 10 the sites (Table 1).

c) ***No Impact.*** The Project does not occur in an area covered by a habitat or natural community conservation plan. El Dorado County is currently preparing an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan to identify important habitats in the County and establish a program for the management and preservation.

Site 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10 Project sites are not located on parcels with an Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay designation. Sites 1, 2, 5, and 6 are located on parcels with an IBC overlay designation. This designation was developed specifically to protect biological resources in the foothill region where they are most threatened by development. The IBC overlay designation identifies core areas important for wildlife forage, cover, and migration, and areas of relatively intact native vegetation in more urbanized areas of the County. The intent of this overlay designation is to provide continuous corridors of vegetation and to provide connectivity between areas of more extensive natural vegetation or greater environmental protection. The Project proposes the installation of telecommunication equipment on privately owned, currently developed parcels would not significantly affect vegetation corridors designated by the IBC or conflict with the intent of the IBC overlay.

FINDING: The proposed use of the land would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan with the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit. There would be no significant impact to land use goals or standards resulting from the project. As conditioned, and with adherence to County Code, no significant impacts would be expected for the land use planning category.

4.2.12 Mineral Resources

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal laws, regulations, or policies apply to mineral resources and the Proposed Project.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Surface Mining and Reclamation Act

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) requires that the State Mining and Geology Board identify, map, and classify aggregate resources throughout California that contain regionally significant mineral resources. Designations of land areas are assigned by CDC and California Geological Survey following analysis of geologic reports and maps, field investigations, and using information about the locations of active sand and gravel mining operations. Local jurisdictions are required to enact planning procedures to guide mineral conservation and extraction at particular sites and to incorporate mineral resource management policies into their general plans.

The California Mineral Land Classification System represents the relationship between knowledge of mineral deposits and their economic characteristics (grade and size). The nomenclature used with the California Mineral Land Classification System is important in communicating mineral potential information in activities such as mineral land classification, and usage of these terms are incorporated into the criteria developed for assigning mineral resource zones. Lands classified MRZ-2 are areas that contain identified mineral resources. Areas classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b (referred to hereafter as MRZ-2) are considered important mineral resource areas.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

El Dorado County in general is considered a mining region capable of producing a wide variety of mineral resources. Metallic mineral deposits, including gold, are considered the most significant extractive mineral resources. Exhibit 5.9-6 shows the MRZ-2 areas within the county based on designated Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay areas. The -MR overlay areas are based on mineral resource mapping published in the mineral land classification reports referenced above. The majority of the county's important mineral resource deposits are concentrated in the western third of the county.

According to General Plan Policy 2.2.2.7, before authorizing any land uses within the -MR overlay zone that will threaten the potential to extract minerals in the affected area, the County shall prepare a statement specifying its reasons for considering approval of the proposed land use and shall provide for public and agency notice of such a statement consistent with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 2762. Furthermore, before finally approving any such proposed land use, the County shall balance the mineral values of the threatened mineral resource area against the economic, social, or other values associated with the proposed alternative land uses. Where the affected minerals are of regional significance, the County shall consider the importance of these minerals to their market region as a whole and not just their importance to the County.

Where the affected minerals are of Statewide significance, the County shall consider the importance of these minerals to the State and Nation as a whole. The County may approve the alternative land use if it determines that the benefits of such uses outweigh the potential or certain loss of the affected mineral resources in the affected regional, Statewide, or national market.

Environmental Setting:

El Dorado County is considered a mining region capable of producing a wide variety of mineral resources. Metallic mineral deposits, gold in particular, are considered the most significant extractive mineral resource. Other metallic minerals found in the county include silver, copper, nickel, chromite, zinc,

tungsten, mercury, titanium, platinum, and iron. Nonmetallic mineral resources include building stone, limestone, slate, clay, marble, soapstone, sand, and gravel (El Dorado County 2004a).

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***No Impact.*** The Project includes installation of telecommunications equipment on privately owned parcels that are not delineated as important mineral resource areas, and would not impact the availability of mineral resources that are locally important or would be of value to the state. None of the 10 Project Sites have been delineated as an Important Mineral Resource Area (El Dorado County 2004a).

b) ***No Impact.*** See response to item a).

FINDING: No impacts to energy and mineral resources with the development of the wireless telecommunications facilities are expected. For this Mineral Resources category, there would be no impact.

4.2.13 Noise

XIII.NOISE—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

No federal or state laws, regulations, or policies for construction-related noise and vibration apply to the Proposed Project. However, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Guidelines for Construction Vibration in Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment state that for evaluating daytime construction noise impacts in outdoor areas, a noise threshold of 90 dBA Leq and 100 dBA Leq should be used for residential and commercial/industrial areas, respectively (FTA 2006).

For construction vibration impacts, the FTA guidelines use an annoyance threshold of 80 VdB for infrequent events (fewer than 30 vibration events per day) and a damage threshold of 0.12 inches per second (in/sec) PPV for buildings susceptible to vibration damage (FTA 2006).

Environmental Setting:

The July 2004 El Dorado County General Plan Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element establishes policies and standards for noise exposures at noise-sensitive land uses. Noise-sensitive land uses are generally considered to include those uses that would result in noise exposure that could cause health-related risks to individuals. Residential dwellings are of primary concern because of the potential for increased and prolonged exposure of individuals to both interior and exterior noise levels. Other land uses such as parks, historic sites, cemeteries, and recreation areas are also considered sensitive to increases in exterior noise levels. School classrooms, places of assembly, hotels, libraries, and other places where low interior noise levels are essential are also considered noise-sensitive land uses.

County General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11 outlines standards for daytime construction and would apply to construction-related noise associated with the Project. General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11 notes that nighttime construction activities are allowed if it can be shown that nighttime construction activities would alleviate traffic congestion and safety hazards.

Construction activities could increase noise levels temporarily in the vicinity of the Project. Actual noise levels would depend on the type of construction equipment involved, distance to the source of the noise, time of day, and similar factors. These increases would be temporary. Operation of the new towers and antennas will not result in new or increased noise sources. The ambient condition is not expected to change as a result of the Project.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***(Construction Noise) Less Than Significant Impact.*** Daytime construction would comply with noise standards for construction activities outlined in General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11 (amended in December 2015). The closest noise-sensitive receptors (parcel residence and nearest neighbor) for each Project site are listed in Table 1. Because the Project contractor would be required to comply with applicable County construction-related noise standards, this impact considered less than significant.

(Operational Related Noise) No Impact. All 10 of the new towers are unmanned and do not have generators. Operation of the new towers and antennas will not result in new or increased noise sources. The post project noise levels in the Project vicinity will be substantially unchanged from the pre-project condition.

b) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Project construction includes activities, such as operation equipment (e.g., backhoe) which may result in the periodic, temporary generation of ground-borne vibration. Given the nature of any potential ground-borne vibration and given that any impacts would be temporary and periodic, potential impacts are less than significant.

c) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not contribute to a substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity.

d) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Construction activities (as described in Section 3.1.4) would increase noise levels temporarily in the vicinity of the Project. Actual noise levels would depend

on the type of construction equipment involved, distance to the source of the noise, weather, time of day, and other factors. However, these increases would be temporary. Daytime construction activity would comply with noise standards for construction activities outlined in General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11. Because the Project contractor would be required to comply with applicable County construction-related noise standards, this impact is considered less than significant.

e) ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Site 3 is located approximately 0.65 mile southwest of the Georgetown Airport (FAA ID Q61) on an existing residential parcel. None of the remaining nine sites occur within 2 miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. Site 3 is located outside all delineated Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contours (El Dorado County Airport Land Use Commission 2012). The proximately of the Georgetown Airport to Site 3 is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

f) ***No Impact***. Sites 8 and 9 are located approximately 1.04 mile north-northeast and 0.84 mile north-northwest, respectively, from the privately-owned Dubey Airport (FAA ID 29CN). The towers are unmanned, and therefore will not result in additional exposure to airport noise.

FINDING: As conditioned, and with adherence to County Code, no significant direct or indirect impacts to noise levels are expected with the development of the wireless telecommunications facilities. For this Noise category, impacts would be less than significant.

4.2.14 Population and Housing

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless 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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

No federal or state laws, regulations, or policies apply to population and housing and the Proposed Project.

Environmental Setting:

The Project includes installation of telecommunications equipment on privately owned parcels.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***No Impact.*** The Project will not result in substantial population growth in the area, directly or indirectly.

b) ***No Impact.*** The Project will not displace any housing.

c) ***No Impact.*** See response to item a) and b).

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

4.2.15 Public Services

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	☐	☐	☐	☒
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

California Fire Code

The California Fire Code (Title 24 CCR, Part 9) establishes minimum requirements to safeguard public health, safety, and general welfare from the hazards of fire, explosion, or dangerous conditions in new and existing buildings. Chapter 33 of CCR contains requirements for fire safety during construction and demolition.

Environmental Setting:

The El Dorado County Sheriff provides general public safety and law enforcement services. The County maintains public facilities including the project area roadways and bridges.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***No Impact.*** The Project includes installation of telecommunications equipment on privately owned parcels. No new or physically altered governmental facilities would be needed. The El Dorado County Sheriff's Department provides police protection to the 10 Project Sites through the Placerville Office and Georgetown Substation. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District provides fire protection to Site 1. The Georgetown Fire Protection District provides fire protection to Sites 2, 3, and 4. The Garden Valley Fire Protection District provides fire protection to Sites 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

FINDING: As discussed above, there would be no significant impacts to public services as a result of a wireless communication facilities.

4.2.16 Recreation

XVI. RECREATION:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

National Trails System

The National Trails System Act of 1968 authorized The National Trails System (NTS) in order to provide additional outdoor recreation opportunities and to promote the preservation of access to the outdoor areas and historic resources of the nation. The Appalachian and Pacific Crest National Scenic Trails were the first two components, and the System has grown to include 20 national trails.

The National Trails System includes four classes of trails:

1. National Scenic Trails (NST) provide outdoor recreation and the conservation and enjoyment of significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities. The Pacific Coast Trail falls under this category. The PCT passes through the Desolation Wilderness area along the western plan area boundary.
2. National Historic Trails (NHT) follow travel routes of national historic significance. The National Park Service has designated two National Historic Trail (NHT) alignments that pass through El Dorado County, the California National Historic Trail and the Pony Express National Historic Trail. The California Historic Trail is a route of approximately 5,700 miles including multiple routes and cutoffs, extending from Independence and Saint Joseph, Missouri, and Council Bluffs, Iowa, to various points in California and Oregon. The Pony Express NHT commemorates the route used to relay mail via horseback from Missouri to California before the advent of the telegraph.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The California Parklands Act

The California Parklands Act of 1980 (Public Resources Code Section 5096.141-5096.143) recognizes the public interest for the state to acquire, develop, and restore areas for recreation and to aid local governments to do the same. The California Parklands Act also identifies the necessity of local agencies to exercise vigilance to see that the parks, recreation areas, and recreational facilities they now have are not lost to other uses.

The California state legislature approved the California Recreational Trail Act of 1974 (Public Resources Code Section 2070-5077.8) requiring that the Department of Parks and Recreation prepare a comprehensive plan for California trails. The California Recreational Trails Plan is produced for all California agencies and recreation providers that manage trails. The Plan includes information on the benefits of trails, how to acquire funding, effective stewardship, and how to encourage cooperation among different trail users.

The 1975 Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) requires residential subdivision developers to help mitigate the impacts of property improvements by requiring them to set aside land, donate conservation easements, or pay fees for park improvements. The Quimby Act gave authority for passage of land dedication ordinances to cities and counties for parkland dedication or in-lieu fees paid to the local jurisdiction. Quimby exactions must be roughly proportional and closely tied (nexus) to a project's impacts as identified through traffic studies required by CEQA. The exactions only apply to the acquisition of new parkland; they do not apply to the physical development of new park facilities or associated operations and maintenance costs.

The County implements the Quimby Act through section120.12.090 of the County Code. The County Code sets standards for the acquisition of land for parks and recreational purposes, or payments of fees in lieu thereof, on any land subdivision. Other projects, such as ministerial residential or commercial development, could contribute to the demand for park and recreation facilities without providing land or funding for such facilities.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The 2004 El Dorado County General Plan Parks and Recreation Element establishes goals and policies that address needs for the provision and maintenance of parks and recreation facilities in the County, with a focus on providing recreational opportunities and facilities on a regional scale, securing adequate funding sources, and increasing tourism and recreation based businesses. The Recreation Element describes the need for 1.5 acres of regional parkland, 1.5 acres of community parkland, and 2 acres of neighborhood parkland per I ,000 residents. Another 95 acres of park land are needed to meet the General Plan guidelines.

Environmental Setting:

There are no designated recreation facilities within or immediately adjacent to the proposed project area.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not increase the use of existing parks in the area and does not include the construction of any recreational facilities.

b) ***No Impact***. See response to item a).

FINDING: As discussed above, there would be no significant impacts to recreation as a result of the construction and operation of wireless communication facilities.

4.2.17 Transportation/Traffic

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*

				Incorporated
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

No federal laws, regulations, or policies apply to transportation/traffic and the Proposed Project.

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Caltrans manages the state highway system and ramp interchange intersections. This state agency is also responsible for highway, bridge, and rail transportation planning, construction, and maintenance.

Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies

According to the transportation element of the County General Plan, Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions. Level of Service is defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council). There are some roadway segments that are excepted from these standards and are allowed to operate at LOS F, although none of these are located in the project area. According to Policy TC-Xe, "worsen" is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

A. A two percent increase in traffic during a.m., p.m. peak hour, or daily;
B. The addition of 100 or more daily trips; or
C. The addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***No Impact.*** The Project includes installation of telecommunications equipment on privately owned parcels. The Project does not include activities that will temporally or permanently impact

surface or air traffic (see Section 3.1.4). The Department of Transportation had no concerns of Project impacts to Line of Sight. Measure E, passed by El Dorado County voters in June 2016, applies only to residential development.

b) ***No Impact.*** See response to item a). The Project will not affect traffic.

c) ***No Impact.*** See response to item a). The Project will not affect air traffic.

d) ***No Impact.*** See response to item a). The Project will not affect roads.

e) ***No Impact.*** See response to item a). The Project will affect emergency access.

f) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not result in an increase in demand for parking in the vicinity of the Project.

g) ***No Impact.*** See response to item a). The Project does not conflict with alternative transportation policy, plans, or programs.

FINDING: As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected with the wireless telecommunications facilities either directly or indirectly. For this Transportation/Traffic category, there will be no significant impacts.

4.2.18 Utilities/ Service Systems

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting:

Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Energy Policy Act of 2005

The Energy Policy Act of 2005, intended to reduce reliance on fossil fuels, provides loan guarantees or tax credits for entities that develop or use fuel-efficient and/or energy efficient technologies (USEPA, 2014). The act also increases the amount of biofuel that must be mixed with gasoline sold in the United States (USEPA, 2014).

State Laws, Regulations, and Policies

California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Public Resources Code, Division 30) requires all California cities and counties to implement programs to reduce, recycle, and compost wastes by at least 50 percent by 2000 (Public Resources Code Section 41780). The state, acting through the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), determines compliance with this mandate. Per-capita disposal rates are used to determine whether a jurisdiction's efforts are meeting the intent of the act.

California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991

The California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (Public Resources Code Sections 42900-42911) requires that all development projects applying for building permits include adequate, accessible areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials.

California Integrated Energy Policy

Senate Bill 1389, passed in 2002, requires the California Energy Commission (CEC) to prepare an Integrated Energy Policy Report for the governor and legislature every 2 years (CEC 2015a). The report analyzes data and provides policy recommendations on trends and issues concerning electricity and natural gas, transportation, energy efficiency, renewable energy, and public interest energy research (CEC 2015a). The 2014 Draft Integrated Energy Policy Report Update includes policy recommendations, such as increasing investments in electric vehicle charging infrastructure at workplaces, multi-unit dwellings, and public sites (CEC 2015b).

Title 24-Building Energy Efficiency Standards

Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards of the California Building Code are intended to ensure that building construction, system design, and installation achieve energy efficiency and preserve outdoor and indoor environmental quality (CEC 2012). The standards are updated on an approximately 3-year cycle. The 2013 standards went into effect on July 1, 2014.

Urban Water Management Planning Act

California Water Code Sections 10610 *et seq.* requires that all public water systems providing water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 customers, or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet per year (AFY), prepare an urban water management plan (UWMP).

Other Standards and Guidelines

Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design

Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) is a green building certification program, operated by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) that recognizes energy efficient and/or environmentally friendly (green) components of building design (USGBC 2017). To receive LEED certification, a

building project must satisfy prerequisites and earn points related to different aspects of green building and environmental design (USGBC 2017). The four levels of LEED certification are related to the number of points a project earns: (l) certified (40-49 points), (2) silver (50-59 points), (3) gold (60-79 points), and (4) platinum (80+ points) (USGBC 2017). Points or credits may be obtained for various criteria, such as indoor and outdoor water use reduction, and construction and demolition (C&D) waste management planning. Indoor water use reduction entails reducing consumption of building fixtures and fittings by at least 20% from the calculated baseline and requires all newly installed toilets, urinals, private lavatory faucets, and showerheads that are eligible for labeling to be WaterSense labeled (USGBC 2017). Outdoor water use reduction may be achieved by showing that the landscape does not require a permanent irrigation system beyond a maximum 2.0-year establishment period, or by reducing the project's landscape water requirement by at least 30% from the calculated baseline for the site's peak watering month (USGBC 2017). C&D waste management points may be obtained by diverting at least 50% of C&D material and three material streams, or generating less than 2.5 pounds of construction waste per square foot of the building's floor area (USGBC 2017).

Environmental Setting:

The Project includes installation of telecommunications equipment on privately owned parcels. Power for the proposed new tower structures will require some mirror trenching at several of the sites. No utility relocations are proposed.

Potential Environmental Effects

a) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not produce additional wastewater and would not exceed the applicable wastewater treatment requirements.

b) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not increase the demand on existing water or wastewater treatment facilities.

c) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

d) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not require water service.

e) ***No Impact.*** The Project would not produce wastewater.

f) ***No Impact.*** Solid waste generated by the Project would be limited to construction debris generated by proposed Project. Solid waste disposal would occur in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. Disposal would occur at permitted landfills. Therefore, the Project would not generate the need for new solid waste facilities.

g) ***No Impact.*** The Project would conform to all applicable state and federal solid waste regulations.

FINDING: No significant utility and service system impacts would be expected with the wireless telecommunications facilities either directly or indirectly. For this Utilities and Service Systems category, there will be no significant impacts.

4.2.19 Mandatory Findings of Significance

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (To be filled out by Lead Agency if required)	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*

				Incorporated
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Does the project 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) ***Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.*** Through the use of Best Management Practices and the Mitigation Measure BIO-1 noted previously, and complying with established General Plan Policies and Zoning Ordinance, the Project will not degrade the quality of the environment. As conditioned, and with adherence to County permit requirements, the Project does not significantly substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) ***Less than Significant.*** The Project is consistent with the General Plan and would not result in individually limited but cumulatively significant impacts. The Project would not involve development or changes in land use that would result in an excessive increase in population growth. The total Project footprint is 0.36 acre across an area of over 50 square miles, and the individual Project sites are between 0.75 mile and 8.15 mile away from the next nearest tower (average 2.4 mile apart). Topography with rolling hills and tall trees block the view of individual towers from many locations surrounding the tower. These factors also preclude the ability to see more than one of the towers at the same time from ground level. The County issued permits for approximately eight cell towers to other providers in the Project area in 2016 (El Dorado County 2016). The cell towers are at least 0.75 mile away from the closest Project site tower. For the same reasons described above, the cell towers and the Project's broadband towers are unlikely to be seen at the same time. Cell towers have a small footprint relative to the size of northern El Dorado County. Permitted cell towers are required to adhere to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinances. Therefore, the project would not cause any additional environmental effects or significantly contribute to a cumulative impact.

c) ***Less than Significant.*** The Project would not result in substantial direct or indirect adverse effects from noise, either during project construction or operation, nor would it result in impacts to air quality, water quality or utilities and public services. Adherence to standard permit conditions would be expected to reduce potential impacts to a less than signification level. Any future project development by other carriers would require environmental review through the Special Use Permit

revision process. Therefore, with adherence to the County Code, the Project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

FINDING: Any impacts from the project would be anticipated to be less than significant due to the design of the Project, standards that would be implemented by any required Project- and site-specific conditions, and incorporated Mitigation Measure BIO-I (Attachment A). Based on the analysis in this study, it has been determined that the Project would have less than significant cumulative impacts.

5. Determination

5.1 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

This Initial Study has determined that in the absence of mitigation the proposed Project could have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with the factors checked below. Mitigation measures are identified in this Initial Study that would reduce all potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

___	Aesthetics	___	Land Use and Planning
___	Agricultural Resources	___	Mineral Resources
___	Air Quality	___	Noise
✓	Biological Resources	___	Population and Housing
___	Cultural Resources	___	Public Services
___	Tribal Cultural Resources	___	Recreation
___	Geology and Soils	___	Transportation/Traffic
___	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	___	Utilities and Service Systems
___	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	✓	Mandatory Findings of Significance
___	Hydrology and Water Quality	___	None Identified

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 the project-specific mitigation measures described in Section III have been added to the project. 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 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 on 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 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: Evan Mattes **Date:** 9/15/2017

6. Report Preparation and References

6.1 Report Preparation

El Dorado County Community Development, Planning Division

Evan Mattes	Assistant Planner
Mel Pabalinas	Acting Principal Planner

Cal.net

Mark Herr	General Manager/Operations

Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc.

Jeffery Little	Vice President, Project Manager
Jessie Quinn, Ph.D.	Senior Ecologist
Adam Forbes	Planner

Solano Archeological Services.

Jason Coleman, M.A., RPA	Principal Investigator

6.2 References

Cal.net Inc. January 2017. El Dorado County North-Ionizing Radio Frequency Analysis

California Department of Conservation. August 2000. A general location guide for ultramafic rocks in California – Areas more likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos. Division of Mines and Geology, open-file report 2000-19. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/ofr_2000-019.pdf

California Department of Conservation. Accessed December 2016 (2016a). Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. El Dorado County Important Farmland. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2014/eld14.pdf

California Department of Conservation. Accessed December 2016 (2016b). CGS Seismic Hazard Zonation Program (SHZP) Data Access Page. http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/MapProcessor.asp?Action=SHMP&Location=All&Version=5&Browser=Netscape&Platform=Win

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. Accessed December 2016. EnviroStor data management system. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2015. Officially Designated Scenic Highways. Accessed 25 May 2017: http://www.dot.ca.gov/design/lap/livability/scenic-highways/docs/OD_County_Scenic_Hwys_2015.pdf

California Energy Commission. 2006. Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004, Staff Final Report. Publication CEC-600-2006-013-SF California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes. 1970. Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.

Caterpillar, Caterpillar Performance Handbook, No. 45, January 2015. A publication by Caterpillar, Peoria, Illinois, U.S.A.

El Dorado County. 1 June 2016. Cell Tower Permits map. Project I.D.: GI0072487. Prepared for El Dorado County Board of Supervisors District IV by Frank Bruijn. Available at: Placerville, CA. http://edcapps.edcgov.us/maplibrary/html/ImageFiles/gi0072487.pdf.

El Dorado County Airport Land Use Commission. Adopted 28 June 2012. El Dorado County, airport land use compatibility plan, Cameron Airpark, Airport Georgetown, Airport Placerville Airport. Prepared by. Mead & Hunt.

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD). February 2002. Guide to air quality assessment, determining significance of air quality impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act.

El Dorado County. January 2004, Certified 19 July 2004 (2004a). El Dorado County general plan, final environmental impact report (EIR). Resolution No. 234-2004, State Clearinghouse No. 2001082030. Prepared by EDAW.

El Dorado County. Adopted 19 July 2004 (2004b). El Dorado County general plan, a plan for managed growth and open roads; a plan for quality neighborhoods and traffic relief. El Dorado County Planning Department, Placerville, CA.

El Dorado County. 2005. El Dorado County Asbestos Review Areas Western Slope, County of El Dorado. El Dorado County Surveyor/G.I.S. Division, G.I.S. Project Id: 3089a.

El Dorado County. 2010. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan – Phase 1. Final Wildlife Movement and Corridors Report. Prepared by: Sierra Ecosystem Associates. Available at: Placerville, CA. http://www.edcgov.us/Government/Planning/INRMP/Wildlife_Movement___Corridor_Report.aspx.

Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). (2008, June 19). Technical advisory: CEQA and climate change: Addressing climate change through California Environmental Quality Act Review. Available at: Sacramento, CA. http://www.opr.ca.gov/ceqalpdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf.

National Ready Mixed Concrete Association (NRMCA). July 2014. 2014 National Ready Mixed Concrete Association Fleet Benchmarking and Costs Survey.

Solano Archeological Services. Reports listed below:

20 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 3, 5400 Reservoir Road, Georgetown, El Dorado County, California

20 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 5, 3680 Greenwood Road, Greenwood, El Dorado County, California

23 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 2, 2040 Sliger Mine Road, Greenwood, El Dorado County, California

20 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 8, 6060 Ambrosia Lane, Garden Valley, El Dorado County, California

23 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 4, 8142 Wild Horse Trail, Georgetown, El Dorado County, California

23 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 10, 4841 Traverse Creek Road, Garden Valley, El Dorado County, California

20 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 1, 4030 Brinks Lane, Cool, El Dorado County, California

20 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 7, 1030 View Ridge Lane, Garden Valley, El Dorado County, California

23 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 9, 4341 Raty Lane, Garden Valley, El Dorado County, California

23 December 2016. Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit for Cal.net, Candidate Site 6, 3550 Brumarba Lane, Garden Valley, El Dorado County, California

Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. January 2017. Biological Resources Evaluation, El Dorado North CASF Wireless Broadband Grant Project for El Dorado County, CA

United States Green Building Council (USGBC). Updated April 14, 2017. LEED v4 for Building Design and Construction. Available online at: http://www.usgbc.org/sites/default/files/LEED%20v4%20BDC_04.14.17_current_0.pdf.