

MENDOCINO COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW GUIDELINES

DATE: March 26, 2014
CASE#: U_2013-0004
DATE FILED: 3/5/2013
OWNER: ANNE FASHAUER
APPLICANT: VERIZON WIRELESS
AGENT: AARON SALARS
PROJECT COORDINATOR: DUSTY DULEY
REQUEST: Use Permit to authorize construction and operation of a wireless communication facility consisting of an 120 foot tall lattice tower, 12 panel antennas, 1 microwave dish, auxiliary equipment as well as ground based equipment including a diesel generator with fuel storage tank and a 192 square foot equipment shelter.
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Mitigated Negative Declaration
LOCATION: 4± miles northwest of Philo town center, lying on the north side of Philo Greenwood Road (CR 132), 0.1 mile east of its intersection with Signal Ridge Road (CR 133). Located at 21600 Philo Greenwood Road, Philo; APN 026-200-35.
Environmental Checklist.
<i>"Significant effect on the environment" means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change, may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15382).</i>
<i>Accompanying this form is a list of discussion statements for <u>all</u> questions, or categories of questions, on the Environmental Checklist (See Section III). This includes explanations of "no" responses.</i>

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

An explanation for all checklist responses is included, and all answers take into account the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site; cumulative as well as project-level; indirect as well as direct; and construction as well as operational impacts. The explanation of each issue identifies (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. In the checklist the following definitions are used:

"Potentially Significant Impact" means there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" means the incorporation of one or more mitigation measures can reduce the effect from potentially significant to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact" means that the effect is less than significant and no mitigation is necessary to reduce the impact to a lesser level.

"No Impact" means that the effect does not apply to the Project, or clearly will not impact nor be impacted by the Project.

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 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 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.

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: This section assesses the potential environmental impacts which may result from the project. Questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and answers are provided based on analysis undertaken.

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

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?* **Less than Significant**

A scenic vista can be defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. The applicant is proposing to construct a new wireless communication facility (WCF) including an 120 foot tall lattice tower, with 12 panel antennas to be located level with the monopole apex (Attachment H – Elevation Plan). The WCF will be located in a 174± acres property within a small clearing surrounded by trees of approximately 30 feet to 67 feet in height. A location map is provided in Attachment A showing the subject property in relation to Philo, California State Route 128, and County maintained roads.

A visual simulation was conducted by flying a red weather balloon to simulate the height of the proposed 120 foot tall monopole. Staff was present and observed the test. Photo-simulations based on the visual test are included with this report and are concluded to be a reasonable representation of the visual impacts. Staff drove along the closest public roads including State Route 128 and Philo-Greenwood Road (CR 132) to help determine the project's visual impact to the surrounding area.

The height of the surrounding trees substantially shields the site from nearby areas. As shown in the photo simulations provided by the applicant in Attachment I, approximately the top 30 to 40 feet of the tower would be visible at a distance when traveling along Route 128. The tower will only be visible at a close distance when traveling along Philo-Greenwood Road for a brief moment (Attachment J).

There are no publicly accessible vista points in the vicinity of the project that would be impacted by the construction of the proposed facility. Further discussion found in Aesthetics Item I(c) below.

b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?* **No Impact**

State Route 128 in Mendocino County has not been identified by the California Department of Transportation as a Designated State Scenic Highway (Caltrans, 2014). The project site is only briefly visible to travelers on Route 128 due to the height of the surrounding trees and the project topography. Although limited tree removal is proposed to comply with Fire Safe Regulations, the project would not create new views or damage views from State Route 128 or other publicly accessible areas.

c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?* **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**

Visual character is descriptive and non-evaluative, which means it is based on defined subjective attributes that are neither good nor bad in and of themselves. The ability of an area to absorb visual change is dependent on its context. The site is in a rural area of the county with a few scattered homes located near the site. However it appears that the facility will be screened from the surrounding residences due to the substantial height of surrounding trees. The applicant is proposing to construct the WCF on a ridgetop. As shown in the photo simulations provided by the applicant in Attachment I, approximately the top 30 to 40 feet the lattice tower would be silhouetted against the skyline when viewed from Route 128. Given the distance away and screening effect of the surrounding forest that prevents the site from being highly visible from publicly accessible areas, it is unlikely that the proposed project would substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings, provided the project incorporates mitigation measures discussed below.

Consistent with Item (B)(2)(b) of the Guidelines for the Development of Wireless Communications Facility (Wireless Guidelines), Condition Number 1 requires that all exterior surfaces of structures and equipment associated with the facility, have subdued colors and non-reflective materials selected to blend with their surroundings. Condition Numbers 2 and 3 will further mitigate visual impacts by limiting the facility's height, and to protect/preserve existing vegetation. In the event that use of the facility should cease, Condition Numbers 4 and 5 will require that all portions of the facility above ground level be removed from the site, and the site be restored to a natural condition.

Staff wants to be clear that Condition Number 2 which limits the tower height, including antennas, to 120 feet AGL is a concealment element of the project that is being used to support the environmental

determination to adopt a mitigated negative declaration under CEQA. Any request to increase the height of the facility will be subject to further environmental review and may require additional concealment or stealth measures to mitigate potential aesthetic impacts.

Further discussion found in the staff Key Issues section of the staff report.

- d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?* **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**

The application notes that no exterior lighting is proposed. Staff assumes that the WFC will have lights inside the leased area to be used when needed for servicing the site during nighttime hours. No airplane warning lights are needed on the tower thus avoiding impacts to nighttime views. Item B(2)j of the County Wireless Guidelines states,

Outdoor lighting shall be kept to a minimum. Towers requiring FAA lighting are discouraged. Tower lighting, if approved, shall be the minimum required by FAA regulations. Towers requiring strobe lighting shall be prohibited. Other outdoor lighting shall be designed or located so that only reflected, non-glaring light is visible from beyond the immediate vicinity of the site, and shall be turned off except when in use by facility personnel.

To ensure consistency with the above County policies related to exterior lighting and ensure that lighting will not significantly impact aesthetics and nighttime views, Condition Number 6 will require that any lighting be shielded or downcast to prevent the light source from being visible from off the property and prohibiting the installation of any aircraft warning lights.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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?* **No Impact**

According to maps provided by the California Department of Conservation, the lands around the project site do not contain any important farmland or other designated farmland types (California Department of Conservation 2012a). The project site is within an existing clearing and will not convert any "Farmland".

- b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?* **No Impact**

The applicant is proposing to lease 1,600 square feet of land to support the project. The lands surrounding the project are not enrolled in the Williamson Act. Therefore, the project would not conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act lands.

- 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))?*
No Impact

The land use classification for the parcel is Timberland Production (TP 160). A wireless communication facility is categorized under the Major Impact Services and Utilities Civic Use Type. Within the TP 160 classification, Major Impact Services and Utilities are a conditional use, subject to approval of a major use permit.

The facility will be located within an existing clearing. According to the applicant no tree removal is proposed. Staff also understands that no trees will need to be removed to meet California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) fire safe regulations.

The proposed project is relatively small, 1,600 square foot lease area, in relation to the amount of forest land in the area. The project will not conflict with the property's timber production capability or cause the rezoning of its Timberland Production zoning.

- d) *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?* **Less than Significant Impact**

See discussion under Item II c) Agriculture and Forestry above.

- 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?*
Less than Significant Impact

See discussion under Item II c) Agriculture and Forestry above.

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	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?* **No Impact**

The project is located within a part of the North Coast Air Basin. The Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) is responsible for enforcing the State and Federal Clean Air Acts as well as local air quality protection regulations. The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality plan.

b) *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?* **Less than Significant Impact**

Local impacts to the area during construction would be mitigated using standard dust control measures as well as the use of weed barrier and gravel to minimize dust during ongoing operations and maintenance once construction is complete.

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)?* **Less than Significant Impact**

AQMD provided comments in a September 29, 2011 email to staff for previous Use Permit #U 5-2011 stating that,

“the District is in attainment for all Federal criteria air pollutants and is also in attainment for all State standards except Particulate Matter less than 10 microns in size (PM10).”

The most common source of this pollutant is wood smoke from home heating or brush fires, and dust generated by vehicles traveling over unpaved roads. A PM-10 attainment plan was finalized in 2005 that provides mitigation measures for construction and grading activities and unpaved roads. The proposed project has the potential to increase PM-10 in the immediate vicinity of the site during the construction period due to site grading and truck traffic to the site on the existing road. Once construction of the facility is complete traffic to the site would only occur during emergencies and regularly scheduled bi-monthly maintenance. Standard dust control measures will be applied during the construction period. After construction is completed, weed barrier and gravel would be placed over the bare ground of the leased area, minimizing dust from maintenance traffic and wind borne particles.

There would be no net increase in criteria pollutants during the lifetime of the project. No ozone precursors would be created during normal operations once construction is finished as there would be no emissions regularly created on site. All construction equipment would meet current California Air Resources Board requirements for emissions, and this equipment would not be required for regular operations once construction is completed. An onsite diesel generator would be installed in the equipment building to provide back-up power in the event of an emergency. This generator would be run intermittently during emergencies and for maintenance purposes and would not represent a significant impact to air quality for the life of the project.

The applicant may need a permit from AQMD to operate the proposed diesel generator. Condition Numbers 7 and 8 will help to ensure that the project will achieve compliance with AQMD standards.

d) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?* **Less than Significant Impact**

Sensitive receptors can include schools, parks, playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwellings. Pollutant emissions in the form of PM-10 would only occur during construction from construction equipment, and thereafter the site would not emit minimal air quality pollutants during its normal operation. A minimal amount of dust would be generated from the access road during maintenance visits, but this would not constitute a substantial pollutant concentration due to the short length of the road, the intermittent timing of the maintenance visits, and the shielding effect of the forest which will prevent dust from travelling off-site. The site is not located in an area that contains Naturally Occurring Asbestos. The nearest residential neighbor is approximately 950 feet away, and screened by trees. Exhaust from intermittent generator operations and construction would not have a significant impact on neighbors or onsite residences due to standard emission control measures.

e) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?* **No Impact**

The proposed project would not create objectionable odors during its normal operation or during construction, and is not in a location that would affect substantial numbers of people. Therefore, there would be no objectionable odors as a result of the project.

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

Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
---	--	--	--	--

- 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*
Less than Significant Impact

The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) shows nine occurrence records for Northern Spotted Owls, a federally listed “threatened species” under the Endangered Species Act, in the project vicinity with the closet known nest being approximately 0.25 miles from the project site. Staff consulted with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) staff to determine appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that the project would not impact the Northern Spotted Owl. USFWS staff, within an email to staff dated March 12, 2015, states in part,

I reviewed aerial imagery of the proposed project site and surrounding forests, and it is fairly obvious that substantial amounts of suitable nesting/roosting habitat for northern spotted owls does not occur within 0.25 mile of the proposed project site. By our noise guidance, a quarter-mile is about the maximum distance we would estimate that project noises could impact an incubating owl. Based on these factors, it seems unlikely that the proposed construction of a cell tower at this location would impact a northern spotted owl.

Based on USFWS staff determination that the area does not contain suitable Northern Spotted Owl habitat staff determined that the project will not adversely affect this species.

Disruption of the site should be limited to the construction phase of the project. Once construction is completed the unmanned facility will require only occasional visits as necessary to maintain the facility. It is not anticipated that there will be any significant impact on plants or wildlife; however the project is subject to the Department of Fish and Game Code Section 711.4 wildlife habitat loss mitigation fee. See Condition Number 30.

- b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations and or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?* **No Impact**

The project site is located in a small clearing surrounded by forest lands and would not impact riparian habitat. The forest land immediately surrounding the site is not identified in any regional plans, or subject to special policies and regulations of the local government. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service do not have any specific plans or policies that apply to this project site. The site is a small clearing within mixed conifer and hardwood forest. Residential development, a rock quarry, and State Route 128 are all within relatively close proximity to the site, indicating that the area is not composed of pristine habitat. There are no sensitive natural communities identified in any local or regional plans, or regulated by the CDFW or the USFWS. The site has already been partially developed with the construction of multiple single-family residences as well as a commercial rock quarry. Staff determined that the addition of a new wireless communication facility with a relatively small footprint will not adversely affect the surrounding natural community. There will be no impact to riparian or sensitive communities as a result of the proposed project.

- 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?* **No Impact**

Staff visited the site and did not witness any wetlands on the site. The project site is located more than half a mile from the nearest water body. Minimal grading will be required to provide a level pad for construction of the 1,600 square foot site, but would not involve the removal, filling, or hydrological

interruption of existing wetlands. Therefore, there would be no impact to federally protected wetlands as a result of the proposed project.

- 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?* **Less than Significant Impact**

The proposed project would not impact any fish species as the site is located on a hilltop more than half a mile from the nearest water body and 3 miles from Navarro River. The relatively flat site will limit erosion and the forest surrounding the site will prevent sedimentation by allowing any sediment that may be transported off site by rain or wind to settle in the forest before reaching a water course. The site, as discussed, is relatively small (1,600 square feet) and the completed tower will not prevent migratory animals from passing through the site once construction is complete. The site is in a relatively developed location given the character of the surrounding landscape, with residences, a rock quarry and Highway 128 nearby. It is unlikely that local wildlife is utilizing the site as a nursery given the existing level of development.

- e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?* **No Impact**

The proposed project would not conflict with local ordinances or policies protecting biological resources. Local policies are focused on project sites larger than 5 acres, or that involve significant changes to land zoned for timber production or as forest land. This site is located on a parcel with existing residences and a rock quarry. The project footprint is small (1,600 square feet.), and will not require tree removal although some tree trimming will be necessary to comply with defensible space ordinances for fire safety.

- 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?* **No Impact**

There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans for the site of the proposed project.

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

V. Cultural Resources a) through e) **No Impact**

Minimal earthmoving will be required to support the project with grading limited to developing the 1,600 square foot lease area and improving the existing private access road. An archaeological survey of the property, dated February 12, 2003, was completed for previous Use Permit #U 19-2003 permitting an on-site rock quarry. The survey identified three potential historical sites on the property. The survey determined that none of the sites were of significance; two of the sites – a room built into the side of a hill

and an old cook house – will not be affected by the project, and the third site – remnants of cement floors/foundations – has been previously impacted and will not be further impacted by this project. The County Archaeological Commission accepted the survey during the processing of previous Use Permit #U 19-2003 and determined that no protection measures would be required. Based on the minimal amount of earthmoving required to support the project and results of previous survey, staff determined that no additional archaeological survey is warranted.

There are no historical resources on site or in the vicinity that would be impacted by the proposed project. The project is not located in a geologic formation that commonly contains paleontological resources, nor does the site contain unique geologic features. The underlying geology is sedimentary rock from marine deposits. The site itself is an open area surrounded by forest lands, and there are no visible unique geologic features on site. There are no formal cemeteries in the vicinity of the project site, and residential development in the area has been relatively recent. It is very unlikely that human remains will be encountered at the site during construction. However, if remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code 7050.5 require that the County Coroner be contacted immediately. If the county Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission will then be contacted by the Coroner to determine appropriate treatment of the remains pursuant to Public Resource Code 5097.98.

Condition Number 9 will be required to help ensure that the project will achieve compliance with the County’s archaeological ordinance and protection of any archaeological resources that may be discovered on the site.

<u>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

disposal of waste water?				
--------------------------	--	--	--	--

- a) *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?* **No Impact**

There are no known earthquake faults in the vicinity of the proposed project identified in the Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 index map. The project will not expose people or the structure to fault rupture.

The site is located in Northern California which does have the potential to be exposed to strong earthquakes. Any project in the area could be subjected to a strong earthquake affecting the region. However the proposed tower would be built to modern construction standards and would be designed to withstand earthquakes that can be expected in the region.

The site of the proposed tower is on a relatively level site and is not on a soil type that is prone to liquefaction. There are no escarpments, bluffs, cliffs, or other formations in the area that would be subject to failure in the event of an earthquake.

The project site does not appear prone to landslides. The surrounding forests and vegetation show no indication of landslides in the vicinity, and the intact forests surrounding the site generally stabilize soils in this region. The flat character of the site indicates that a landslide would be very unlikely. The site and project itself would not destabilize the hilltop in a way that would subject surrounding land uses to increase risk from landslide.

- b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?* **Less than Significant Impact**

Minimal earthmoving will be needed to improve the 1,600 square foot lease area. Once construction is completed, the ground inside of the fenced area would be covered with weed barrier and graveled to prevent future erosion and loss of topsoil. Condition Numbers 10 and 11 will address immediate and short-term impacts from grading activities and ensure that adequate drainage is provided.

- 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?* **No Impact**

The soil on site is a Russian loam (USDA Web Soil Survey, 2014) and is not subject to lateral spreading, liquefaction, or collapse. The relatively flat site and minimal grading associated with the project indicates that the site would not become unstable as a result of the proposed project. There are no landslides visible in a review of aerial imagery in the area, and it is unlikely, given the soil type, vegetation, and topography of the site that the project would result in on- or off-site landslide as a result of the proposed project.

- 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?* **No Impact**

The soil on site is a Russian loam (USDA Web Soil Survey, 2014). This soil type is not considered to be an expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), however construction of the facility will still require engineered plans to be approved through the building permit process.

- 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?* **No Impact**

No septic or waste water disposal systems are proposed or required to accommodate the project.

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

a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?* **Less Than Significant Impact**

Construction activities, including grading the site, transporting the tower materials, and raising the tower will result in emissions from construction and transportation vehicles. Ongoing operations of the proposed tower would create emissions by using electricity from the grid, and the sporadic use of the on-site emergency generator during emergencies and routine maintenance. Emissions as a result of construction will be short term and minimized by the use of modern construction equipment and methods. Emissions as a result of regular operations will be the result of power usage and intermittent generator usage. Any diesel engines in excess of 50 horsepower are required to meet current emission standards and will require a permit from AQMD. Additional measures may be imposed by AQMD to control emissions through their permit requirements. After construction is complete, traffic to the site will consist of one or two visits per month by company representatives as necessary to maintain the facility. The proposed project will not occur at a scale or scope with potential to contribute substantially or cumulatively to the generation of GHG, either directly or indirectly.

b) *Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?* **No Impact**

There are no adopted local plans for reducing the emission of greenhouse gasses.

<u>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?* **Less Than Significant Impact**

Construction activities will require the use of standard fuels, lubricants, and other potentially hazardous materials for the proper functioning of construction equipment. All industry standard protocols for the safe handling of fluids refueling practices will be followed during the construction period. Once construction is complete the operation of the tower will not create routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The on-site diesel generator will have an associated small fuel tank and catchment on site for emergency power. The equipment building will also contain some batteries for providing electricity to the tower. These will be contained according to applicable regulations, housed inside the proposed equipment building, and monitored during regularly scheduled maintenance. Fuel and batteries will be changed as necessary following all applicable regulations and safety standards. The periodic transport of diesel fuel to the site is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

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?* **Less Than Significant Impact**

The tower will not house substantial amounts of hazardous materials on site. Batteries and some generator fuel (diesel) will be stored on site but does not pose a significant risk of release into the environment. Fuel storage on site would be limited to enough to run the generator for brief periods of time in conjunction with a small number of batteries to be stored in the equipment building. Materials such as oil and diesel fuel used for the generator are subject to a Hazardous Materials Business Plan as approved by the County Department of Environmental Health (DEH). The plan must identify actions to be taken should a fuel or oil spill occur on site, including cleanup methods and appropriate agencies to contact in an emergency situation. Utilization of a generator as a backup power source for wireless telecommunication facilities is common and staff is unaware of any fuel spill associated with any existing facilities in the County.

c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?* **No Impact**

There are no existing or proposed schools within a quarter mile of the project site. The project is not expected to have any impacts on surrounding schools.

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?* **No Impact**

There are no hazardous materials sites or other cleanups on site listed in the EnviroStor database maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (California Department of Toxic Substance Control, 2014). Development on the project site would not 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?* **No Impact**

The Boonville Airport is the closest airport which is open to the public, and is located approximately 8.25 miles southeast of the project site. The project will not result in a safety hazard to those working at or around 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?* **No Impact**

There are no private airstrips within the project vicinity. The project will not result in a safety hazard to those working at or around the project area.

- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?* **No Impact**

Mendocino County has an Emergency Operations Plan adopted in 2006. The plan outlines areas of responsibility for the County's different departments and protocols for responding to disasters, but does not designate evacuation routes or other specifics. State Route 128 is a main thoroughfare for the Anderson Valley communities, and it is likely that during an evacuation that many residents would use Highway 128 to vacate the area. However, the proposed project would not impede traffic during construction nor would there be any regular increase in traffic as a result of the proposed project that would impede an evacuation.

- 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?* **No Impact**

The project does occur where residences are intermixed with wildlands, but would not increase the number or density of residences in the wildland interface. The project would not increase the risk to people or structures from wildland fire as there would be no major increases in traffic or visitors from the proposed project that could increase the risk of a fire starting. Trees adjoining the site will be limbed to create defensible space around the tower site, and bare ground will be covered with weed barrier and gravel to prevent vegetation from overgrowing the site. Batteries and fuel will be stored inside the concrete building, reducing the risk that these materials would start a fire or exacerbate an existing fire if the site is overrun. The project will not expose people or structures to significant risk due to wildland fires.

<u>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
k) Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters considering water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g. heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
l) Have a potentially significant impact on groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
m) Impact aquatic, wetland or riparian habitat?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?* **Less than Significant Impact**

The project has the potential to impact water quality during project construction due to erosion. Condition Numbers 10 and 11 will help to prevent erosion and its potential impact to water quality. The project does not require the use of water. Similarly, the project will not generate any waste to discharge.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality b) through m) **No Impact**

The project does not require the use of water. The property is neither subject to flooding nor inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. The project is not within a dam inundation zone, and would not create an

impoundment, reservoir, or levee that could threaten surrounding residences. No streams or other water courses or water bodies are nearby or would be impacted by the proposed construction that could increase the chance of flooding on site, and therefore there is also no risk of inundation by a seiche. Because the project site is on a hill top, there is no risk of mudflows over running the site. In addition, the grading and site alterations would not increase the chance of mudflows to downslope residences because no fill would be stockpiled or stored on site after construction is completed. The project site is not subject to tsunami inundation.

Development of the applicant’s lease area and minor road improvements will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. The area surrounding the site is sloped forestland at a high elevation, well above the nearest stream bed. There would be no alteration to the course of any river or stream from the proposed construction. The site is in a rural area of the county that does not contain existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. The project would not create polluted runoff at the site, and there is no use or construction proposed on site that would substantially degrade water quality. No significant impacts to water quality are anticipated once the facility is constructed and road improvements are completed.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Physically divide an established community? **No Impact***

The project site is located in a rural area of the county where established communities are relatively spread out geographically. There are no neighborhoods in the area in the traditional sense, as residences are separated by nearly a quarter mile on average and not easily visible from one to the next. The project will not result in any physical improvements or barriers that would 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? **No Impact***

The project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

*c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? **No Impact***

The project is not located within any habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan areas.

<u>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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?*

There are no known mineral resources on the site that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state. In addition, the 1,600 square foot footprint of the project would not preclude future extraction efforts on the site.

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?*

The property does not include a mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

<u>XII. NOISE</u> Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- 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?* **Less than Significant Impact**

The County has identified noise standards within the County General Plan to ensure noise compatibility between land uses. The project is subject to the noise standards found in the County General Plan including:

- The Exterior Noise Level Standards (Table 3-J) General Plan Policy DE-100
- The Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table 3-K) General Plan Policy DE-101
- Maximum Acceptable Interior Noise Levels (Table 3-L) General Plan Policy DE-103

The applicant is proposing to install a 30-kilowatt generator to be used solely for providing emergency power during periods of energy transmission interruption and for routine testing. The only other anticipated noise to be generated by the project will result from construction activity and vehicles. The nearest off-site residence that staff is aware of is located approximately 1,200 feet south of the facility. The project is not expected to conflict with above noted noise standards, however the County Wireless Guidelines Standard B(1)I calls for generators to be equipped with mufflers and spark arresters, and to not produce noise levels exceeding 50 dBA at the nearest off site residence. See Condition Number 12.

- b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?* **No Impact**

There are no activities associated with the project that would generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

- c) *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?* **No Impact**

The project will not result in any permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- d) *A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?* **Less than Significant Impact**

An on-site generator will be used solely for emergencies during times of line power outages as well as for routine maintenance. The only other anticipated noise to be generated by the project will result from construction activity and vehicles. After construction, the project will not result in 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?* **No Impact**

There are no airports located within 2 miles of the project site.

- 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?* **No Impact**

There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site.

<u>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

XIII Population and Housing a) thru c) No Impact

The project will not induce population growth, and create a demand for new housing nor will existing residences be displaced or removed as a result of the project.

<u>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Medical Services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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? **Less than Significant Impact***

Demand for fire protection and police services are not expected to significantly increase as a result of the project. The project is within the CalFire state responsibility area. CalFire reviewed the proposed project and recommended fire safe standards pursuant to CalFire File Number 21-14. Condition Number 13 requires the applicant to complete fire safe standards to the satisfaction of Cal Fire.

By providing improved wireless telephone service, emergency communications may be facilitated, allowing more prompt response by emergency service providers in times of emergency. As communication capability is extremely important to emergency service providers, especially in remote locations, Condition Number 14 will require the facility to provide, if requested, space for any public emergency service provider to locate communication equipment on the tower, provided no interference to function will result at a minimum or no fee.

The project will not increase population or demand for schools and parks. The project will have no direct impact on public facilities.

<u>XV. RECREATION.</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XV Recreation a) and b) No Impact

(a & b) The project will not increase the use of recreational facilities. Nor will it generate demand for new or expanded recreational facilities.

<u>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate substantial additional vehicular movement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Effect existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially impact existing transportation systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Alter present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Increase traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement? Less than Significant Impact

Access to the site is provided from an existing driveway off Philo-Greenwood Road (CR 132) that solely serves the subject property. The project will generate a minor amount of additional traffic in conjunction with the construction of the facility. After construction is complete, traffic to the site will consist of one or two visits per month by company representatives as necessary to maintain the facility. The County Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the project and is requiring that the private driveway approach onto Philo-Greenwood Road be improved to meet DOT road standards in conformance with encroachment permit procedures administered by the DOT. See Condition Numbers 15 and 16.

b) Effect existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking? No Impact

Adequate parking exists on-site to accommodate workers. The project will not utilize off-site parking facilities or create a demand for additional off-site parking spaces.

c) Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems? Less than Significant Impact

See Section XVI Transportation/Traffic a) above.

d) *Alter present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?* **No Impact**

Existing transportation system provides adequate access to the property. The project will not result in a substantial increase in traffic levels that would require the County to alter present traffic patterns.

e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?* **Less than Significant Impact**

CalFire is requesting the applicant to construct private road improvements to facilitate emergency access to the facility pursuant to CalFire File Number 21-14. No aspect of the project hinders existing emergency access routes.

f) *Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians.* **Less than Significant Impact**

Access to the site is provided from an existing driveway off Philo-Greenwood Road (CR 132) that solely serves the subject property. The project will generate a minor amount of additional traffic in conjunction with the construction of the facility. After construction is complete, traffic to the site will consist of one or two visits per month by company representatives as necessary to maintain the facility. The project will not result in a significant increase in traffic along local roads or traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclist or pedestrians.

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

XVII Utilities and Service Systems a) through g) **No Impact**

The project does not require the use of water or a wastewater treatment system. There are no storm water facilities at the rural location of the site, nor are any required for the proposed development. The tower and equipment sheds will have a limited footprint. The approximately 1,600 square foot fenced area will be covered with gravel which will further limit impervious area related to site development.

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

XVIII Mandatory Findings of Significance a) through c) Less than Significant Impact

The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or substantially reduce habitat of sensitive species. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Nor will the project cause environmental effects that adversely effect human beings. The project is limited to construction and operation of an unmanned cellular tower. There are no known sensitive plants, animals or habitats within the vicinity of the project site. The project was found to comply with the FCC guidelines limiting public exposure to radio frequency. There are no impacts associated with the current project that become significant when considered in conjunction with other existing or planned facilities in the vicinity. The project poses no significant impacts related to the mandatory findings of significance.

DATE

DUSTY DULEY
PLANNER III

REFERENCES:

- California Department of Toxic Substance Control. (2014). *EnviroStor*. Retrieved from EnviroStor.dtsc.ca.gov
- Caltrans. (2014). *Scenic Highways*. Retrieved from http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/
- Google. (2014). *Google Earth*.
- Mendocino County Air Quality Management District. (n.d.). Retrieved from Particulate Matter Attainment Plan: <http://www.co.mendocino.ca.us/aqmd/AttainmentPlan.htm>
- USDA Web Soil Survey. (2014). Retrieved from <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>