

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY & NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Use Permit 19-0005
T-Mobile West LLC

November 5, 2019

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY &
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
WITH
References and Documentation

Prepared by
SHASTA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
PLANNING DIVISION
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103
Redding, California 96001

**SHASTA COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
INITIAL STUDY & NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

- 1. Project Title:**
Use Permit 19-0005 (T-Mobile West, LLC)
- 2. Lead agency name and address:**
Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103
Redding, CA 96001-1759
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**
Tara Petti, Assistant Planner (530) 225-5532
- 4. Project Location:**
The site is located in the vicinity of the northern terminus of Chapman Lane in Lakehead on property owned by Pacific Gas & Electric (S.B.E 135-45-48F-182). The site is 0.40 miles north of the intersection of Chapman Lane and Northwoods Drive, 0.35 miles west of Interstate 5 northbound lanes, and 0.25 miles east of Interstate 5 southbound lanes. Shasta Lake is approximately 0.40 miles to the east. (Assessor Parcel Number: None).
- 5. Applicant Name and Address:**
T-Mobile West, LLC
1755 Creekside Oaks Dr. #130
Sacramento, CA 95833
- 6. General Plan Designation:**
Public Lands (PUB)
- 7. Zoning:**
National Recreation Area-Shasta Unit (NRA-S)
- 8. Description of Project:**
The project is a use permit application for the relocation, construction and operation of an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility. T-Mobile has an existing facility located at the subject property, with the antennas located on an existing PG&E utility pole, and the appurtenant equipment located within an existing 30-foot by 30-foot lease area. Three existing antennas will be removed from PG&E's utility pole and installed on a newly constructed 100-foot tall, steel, brown monopole, along with three new antennas. The proposed monopole will be located approximately 50 feet west of the PG&E utility pole within a new 15-by-15 foot lease area. One existing equipment cabinet will be replaced and a new battery cabinet will be installed within the existing lease area. The site of the new monopole will be enclosed by a 6-foot tall chain link fence. Grading and footings will be necessary for construction of the tower. Construction equipment will include a concrete mixer, grading equipment a crane to install the monopole, and common equipment used for building construction.
- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
The project site is located on property owned by Pacific Gas & Electric between the north and southbound lanes of Interstate 5. The property is developed by PG&E with electric power transmission utilities. There is an access road running through the property to the site from the north, and a short access road to the site from Chapman Lane. PG&E actively manages vegetative cover on the property for safety; however, the surrounding land to the east and west is heavily forested. The elevation of the proposed tower is 1,812-feet above mean sea level (AMSL), just below the ridgeline (1,816-feet AMSL). The elevation of the existing equipment area is 1,798-feet AMSL. The proposed tower location is on an east, southeast facing slope. There are existing PG&E utility poles in the immediate vicinity, and there are multiple conifers averaging 90-feet tall framing the site to the north, west and south. The site is

surrounded by National Recreation Area Shasta Unit zoning on all sides. It is bound by U.S. Forest Service land to the east and west, Southern Pacific Railroad property to the north, and residential property to the south. The nearest residential land use is approximately 840 feet southeast, and is separated from the project site by forestland.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):**
Federal Communications Commission

11. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1, the Wintu Tribe of Northern California (Tribe) filed and Shasta County received a request for formal notification of proposed projects within an area of Shasta County that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Tribe. Pursuant to PRC §21080.3.1, the Department of Resource Management sent a certified letter on September 20, 2019 to notify the Tribe that the project was under review and to provide the Tribe 30 days from the receipt of the letter to request consultation on the project in writing. To date, no response has been received.

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		Agricultural Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Energy
	Geology / Soils		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous
	Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources
	Noise		Population / Housing		Public Services
	Recreation		Transportation		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Utilities / Service Systems		Wildfire		Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of the 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.


Copies of the Initial Study and related materials and documentation may be obtained at the Planning Division of the Department of Resource Management, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001. Contact Tara Petti, Assistant Planner at (530) 225-5532.



Tara Petti
Assistant Planner

11/4/19

Date



Paul A. Hellman
Director of Resource Management

11/4/19

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if all the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less-than-significant with mitigation, or less-than-significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more, “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less-than-significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-than-significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures: For effects that are “Less-than-significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. General Plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify the following:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less-than-significant.

I. AESTHETICS: Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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?			✓	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?			✓	
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publically accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			✓	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The visual character of the proposed monopole tower is consistent with the visual character of existing utility poles and transmission lines in the immediate vicinity of the project site, as shown by the photo simulations (prepared by *AdvanceSim*) from four viewpoints along Interstate 5. The structure is set back approximately 1,200 feet from Interstate 5 southbound lanes, and approximately 2,000 feet from Interstate 5 northbound lanes, which effectively reduces visibility from Interstate 5. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista due to the distance of the proposed tower from vantage points along Interstate 5, and its proximity to existing utility structures.
- b) The Interstate 5 corridor in the Lakehead area is not a designated scenic highway, but is noted in the Shasta County General Plan as a highway segment that is both located in an area where the natural environment is dominant and considered eligible for scenic designation. The project site is located on property owned by PG&E that is maintained devoid of over-story vegetation for safety and access. The proposed monopole would be constructed in the vicinity of existing utility poles; as a result, no over-story vegetation will be removed during construction.
- c) The site is currently developed with power utility transmission lines that run the length of the subject PG&E-owned property, and a ground equipment area that is enclosed by a 6-foot tall redwood fence. The proposed 100-foot tall monopole and related project improvements are consistent with the existing visual character and quality of the project site and vicinity. The addition of the proposed monopole structure to the existing cluster of power poles would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.
- d) The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in a non-urbanized area. There is no lighting currently on site, or lighting proposed as part of this project. Therefore, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

II. <u>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES:</u> 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	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or 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?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The subject property is not identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance on the map titled Shasta County Important Farmland 2016.
- b) Neither the subject property nor the surrounding properties are zoned for agricultural use nor are they in a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) The project would not 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) The project site is on property owned by PG&E that is maintained devoid of overstory vegetation for safety purposes. The project is limited to construction of the 100-foot tall monopole. No tree removal is expected as part of the project. The project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- e) The site is not located in an area of significant agricultural soils.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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 the applicable air quality plan?				✓
b) 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?				✓
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				✓
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				✓

Discussion: Based on related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) A standby generator is not proposed as a component of the wireless telecommunications facility. In addition, the number of equipment hours necessary to complete the project is not expected to be significant. As a result, construction related emissions is not expected to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2018 Attainment Plan for northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin as adopted by Shasta County.
- b) The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, specifically ozone, the pollutant for which the project region (Shasta County) is in non-attainment under the applicable State ambient air quality standard. Activities related to the construction of the monopole tower and installation of the equipment would generate dust and exhaust. However, due to the limited scope of construction, the number of equipment hours necessary to complete the project is not expected to be significant. As a result, construction related emissions will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of ozone, the criteria pollutant for which Shasta County is in non-attainment.
- c) As a condition of approval, all construction equipment and vehicles will be required to meet Shasta County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) emission standards. In addition, the Shasta County General Plan requires Standard Mitigation Measures on all discretionary land use applications as recommended by the AQMD in order to mitigate both direct and indirect emissions of non-attainment pollutants.

The project will not significantly violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation increase in any criteria pollutant, including ozone, ozone pre-cursors or PM10 (particulate matter), and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the NSVPA Air Quality Attainment Plan (2018) as adopted by Shasta County, or any other applicable air quality plan.

The nearest residential use is approximately 840 feet to the southeast, and additional low density residential uses are located approximately 1,100 feet to 1,500 feet to the southwest. Substantial pollutant concentrations are not anticipated due to the limited scope and duration of construction. As a result, no sensitive receptors would be exposed to substantial pollution concentrations.

- d) Equipment used to construct the proposed improvements could produce emissions that some may find objectionable; however, construction on-site will be limited in duration. The project does not involve the establishment of any uses that would generate substantial pollution concentrations. Therefore, nearby sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollution concentrations nor would a substantial number of people be exposed to objectionable odors.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial 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?				✓
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or Federally protected wetlands (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?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The 2018 California Natural Diversity Database data was reviewed. No candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are located on the project site. CDFW commented that bald eagles are known to nest within one mile of the proposed project location, and the project applicant will need to maintain compliance with Fish and Game Code sections 3503 and 3503.5 regarding the taking of listed species, as well as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. CDFW stated that if a bald eagle nests on the monopole, and the project applicant wants it removed, they will need to obtain a permit from the USFWS and will need to consult with CDFW.

The site is currently developed with PG&E electric utility transmission lines, a 30-foot by 30-foot area that contains existing ground equipment for wireless telecommunications, a PG&E power pole and associated equipment, and a 20-foot wide access road. The project is limited to construction of the 100-foot tall monopole. The project would not involve significant habitat modification.

- b) The project site is within property owned by PG&E and would not require conversion of any undisturbed land. No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities would be disturbed by the project.
- c) No vernal pools or wetlands were identified on the subject property based on the Vernal Pools, Wetlands, and Waterways Map of Shasta County prepared by the Geographic Information Center, California State University, Chico, on August 24, 1996.
- d) There are no stream corridors in the project vicinity. Proposed fencing is limited to the proposed 15-foot by 15-foot project lease area. All other project components would be located in the existing equipment area. Therefore, the project would not interfere with any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- e) The project site is within property owned by PG&E and would not require conversion of any undisturbed land. The project would

not conflict with any ordinances or policies which protect biological resources.

- f) There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans for the project site or project area.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – 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 pursuant to §15064.5?				✓
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				✓
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. No known historical resources are located at the project site.
- b) The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. No known archaeological resources are located at the project site.
- c) The project site is not on or adjacent to any known cemetery or burial area. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would disturb any human remains.

Information about the project was sent to the Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, which reviewed the project and provided no comments on the project.

Although there is no evidence to suggest that the project would result in any significant effect to historical, archeological, paleontological, or unique geologic resource, or human remains, there is always the possibility that such resources or remains could be encountered. Therefore, a condition of approval will require that if, in the course of development, any archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources are uncovered, discovered or otherwise detected or observed, mineral exploration activities in the affected area shall cease and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to review the site and advise the County of the site's significance. If the findings are deemed significant by the Environmental Review Officer, appropriate mitigation shall be required.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

VI. ENERGY – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?				✓
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project, as proposed, will utilize the existing ground equipment facility for the majority of the project components, therefore

limiting the scope and duration of construction, and the number of equipment hours necessary to complete the project. As a result, the project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation.

b) The project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Publications 42. 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 direct or indirect risks to life or property?			✓	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				✓
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault;

According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps for Shasta County, there is no known earthquake fault on the project site.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking;

According to the Shasta County General Plan Section 5.1, Shasta County has a low level of historic seismic activity. The entire Initial Study – UP19-0005-T-Mobile West LLC

County is in Seismic Design Category D. According to the Seismic Hazards Assessment for the City of Redding, California, prepared by Woodward Clyde, dated July 6, 1995, the most significant earthquake at the project site may be a background (random) North American crustal event up to 6.5 on the Richter scale at distances of 10 to 20 km.

All structures shall be constructed according to the seismic requirements of the currently adopted Building Code.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;

All structures shall be constructed according to the seismic requirements of the currently adopted Building Code. A geotechnical report is required to be submitted with building plans in accordance with uniform building code. The report would address any geotechnical deficiencies.

iv) Landslides.

The project site is located just below the ridgeline, within a PG&E easement, where the slope averages 12-30%. The easement is approximately 168-feet wide, and slopes toward heavily forested land to the east, southeast. The project site is currently disturbed and there is no evidence of landslides. Risk of on-site landslides is less-than-significant.

A geotechnical report is required to be submitted with building plans in accordance with currently adopted Building Code. The report would address any geotechnical deficiencies. In addition, a grading permit is required prior to any grading activities. The grading permit includes requirements for sediment and erosion control.

b) The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey identified the soils in the project site in the medium runoff class. The soil has a K factor range of 0.24-0.32 which signifies moderate susceptibility to soil detachment (USDA Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation Version 2 Handbook, March 2001).

A grading permit is required prior to any grading activities. The grading permit includes requirements for erosion and sediment control, including retention of topsoil.

c) The project would not 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.

The existing condition of the project site is disturbed, and there is no evidence of significant soil movement or landslides. The USDA NRCS web soil survey identified the soils in the project site as Holland, deep Marpa families complex, with a 0.50 rating for shrink-swell potential, a 1.00 rating for slope and a 0.79 rating for depth to hard bedrock. The numeric ratings collectively indicate the soil is limited for construction. The numeric rating for slope is the primary factor for the limited rating of the soil. However, construction of the tower is limited to a 15-foot by 15-foot area, and the site will be graded prior to construction. A geotechnical report is required to be submitted with building plans in accordance with uniform building code. The report would address any geotechnical deficiencies. In addition, a grading permit is required prior to any grading activities.

d) The soil at the construction site has an A-4 AASHTO rating, according to the USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey, which signifies a moderate level of soil plasticity. A geotechnical report is required to be submitted with building plans in accordance with uniform building code. The report would address any geotechnical deficiencies, and ensure construction of the tower would not cause substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.

e) No wastewater treatment is required for this project.

f) There are no known unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features in the project vicinity.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: 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?			✓	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				✓

Discussion: Based on these comments, the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a, b) In 2005, the Governor of California signed Executive Order S-3-05, establishing that it is the State of California's goal to reduce statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emission levels. Subsequently, in 2006, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act. In part, AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board to develop and adopt regulations to achieve a reduction in the State's GHG emissions to year 1990 levels by year 2020.

California Senate Bill 97 established that an individual project's effect on GHG emission levels and global warming must be assessed under CEQA. SB 97 further directed that the State Office of Planning and Research (QPR) develop guidelines for the assessment of a project's GHG emissions. Those guidelines for GHG emissions were subsequently included as amendments to the CEQA Guidelines. The guidelines did not establish thresholds of significance and there are currently no state, regional, county, or city guidelines or thresholds with which to direct project-level CEQA review. As a result, Shasta County reserves the right to use a qualitative and/or quantitative threshold of significance until a specific quantitative threshold is adopted by the state or regional air district.

The City of Redding currently utilizes a quantitative non-zero project-specific threshold based on a methodology recommended by the California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA) and accepted by the California Air Resources Board. According to CAPCOA's Threshold 2.3, CARB Reporting Threshold, 10,000 metric tons of carbon-dioxide equivalents per year (mtCO₂eq/yr) is recommended as a quantitative non-zero threshold. This threshold would be the operational equivalent of 550 dwelling units, 400,000 square feet of office use, 120,000 square feet of retail, or 70,000 square feet of supermarket use. This approach is estimated to capture over half the future residential and commercial development projects in the State of California and is designed to support the goals of AB 32 and not hinder it. The use of this quantitative non-zero project-specific threshold by Shasta County, as lead agency, would be consistent with certain practices of other lead agencies in the County and throughout the State of California.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identifies four primary constituents that are most representative of the GHG emissions. They are:

- Carbon Dioxide (CO₂): Emitted primarily through the burning of fossil fuels. Other sources include the burning of solid waste and wood and/or wood products and cement manufacturing.
- Methane (CH₄): Emissions occur during the production and transport of fuels, such as coal and natural gas. Additional emissions are generated by livestock and agricultural land uses, as well as the decomposition of solid waste.
- Nitrous Oxide (N₂O): The principal emitters include agricultural and industrial land uses and fossil fuel and waste combustion.
- Fluorinated Gases: These can be emitted during some industrial activities. Also, many of these gases are substitutes for ozone-depleting substances, such as CFC's, which have been used historically as refrigerants. Collectively, these gases are often referred to as "high global-warming potential" gases.

The primary generators of GHG emissions in the United States are electricity generation and transportation. The EPA estimates that nearly 85 percent of the nation's GHG emissions are comprised of carbon dioxide (CO₂). The majority of CO₂ is generated by petroleum consumption associated with transportation and coal consumption associated with electricity generation. The remaining emissions are predominately the result of natural-gas consumption associated with a variety of uses.

Activities related to the construction of the monopole and installation of the equipment would generate exhaust. However, due to the limited scope of construction, the number of equipment hours necessary to complete the project is not expected to be significant. As a result, construction related emissions will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: 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?				✓
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				✓

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✓
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?				✓

Discussion: Based on these comments, the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project would not require routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials and, therefore, would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- b) The following hazardous materials are expected to be used during construction of the tower and equipment shelter: concrete and curing compounds, fuel for heavy equipment, and gases for welding. Use and handling of such materials would be in compliance with applicable regulations. Shasta County Environmental Health Division commented on the project stating the applicant shall prepare and submit an updated Hazardous Materials Business Plan, if and when applicable, to Shasta County Environmental Health Division (SCEHD) if reportable quantities of hazardous materials are stored in the proposed project areas onsite. A hazardous substance is reportable if stored at or above 55 gallons for liquids; 200 cubic feet for compressed gas; or 500 pounds for solids.
- c) The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- d) The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f) A review of the project and the Shasta County and City of Anderson Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan indicates that the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There is no emergency response plan for the project site area.
- g) The Shasta County Fire Department has indicated that the project is located in an area which is designated a "VERY HIGH" fire hazard severity zone. All roadways, driveways and buildings for the proposed project be required to be constructed in accordance with the Shasta County Fire Safety Standards. These standards also require the clearing of combustible vegetation around all structures for a distance of not less than 30 on each side or to the property line. California Public Resources Code Section 4291 includes a "Defensible Space" requirement of clearing 100 feet around all buildings or to the property line, whichever is less.

The project site is located within property owned by PG&E that is maintained devoid of over story vegetation for safety purposes. There is an existing 20-foot wide access road to the project site from Chapman Lane. The project will not substantially increase the exposure of people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: 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 or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			✓	

X. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.				✓
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; (iii) 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; or (iv) impede or redirect flows?			✓	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				✓
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management plan?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Through adherence to construction standards, including erosion and sediment control measures, water quality and waste discharge standards will not be violated. Grading will be needed for this project and a grading permit will be required. The provisions of the grading permit will address erosion and siltation containment on- and off-site.

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board commented on the project, stating construction activity resulting in a land disturbance of one acre or more must obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (CGP). The Regional Board requires the project to be conditioned such that storm water pollution control measures during construction and post-construction will be implemented if the disturbance area is one or more acres. The project, as proposed, will disturb less than one acre, however, if construction will take place between October 1st and May 15th, storm water pollution control measures will be required as a condition of approval for the building permit.

- b) The project does not propose any new well(s). The project would not significantly increase impervious surface area within the project site to the extent that it would cause interference with groundwater recharge. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- c) Soil disturbance is limited to the 15-foot by 15-foot lease area upon which the monopole would be constructed. Construction is limited to excavation of footings for the monopole. The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or add impervious surfaces, in a manner which would (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; (iii) 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; and or (iv) impede or redirect flows.
- d) The project is not in a flood hazard area and, therefore, would not risk release of pollutants in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones due to project inundation.
- e) Through adherence to construction standards, and the provisions of the required grading permit, including erosion and sediment control measures, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management plan.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XI. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				✓
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project would not physically divide an established community. The project does not include the creation of any road, ditch, wall, or other feature which would physically divide an established community.
- b) The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

The project is consistent with the Public Lands (PUB) General Plan land use designation and the National Recreation Area-Shasta Unit (NRA-S) zone district. The project is consistent with Chapter 17.88.282-Wireless Telecommunication Facilities.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XII. <u>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?				✓
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?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) There are no known mineral resources of regional value located on or near the project site. The project would not 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) The project would not 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 project site is not identified in the General Plan Minerals Element as containing a locally-important mineral resource. There is no other land use plan which addresses minerals.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XIII. <u>NOISE</u> – Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			✓	
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels			✓	

XIII. <u>NOISE</u> – Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) There is no standby generator proposed as part of this project. There will be increased noise levels during construction. The nearest residential land use is approximately 840 feet to the southeast, separated from the project site by forestland. Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7am to 7pm and prohibited on Sundays and holidays. Due to the short duration of construction, the temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project would be less than significant.
- b) The project would not result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The project is limited in scope to the construction of the monopole. Any groundborne vibration or noise levels as a result of excavation of footings for the monopole would be less than significant.
- c) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XIV. <u>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 unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project does not include the development of new homes or businesses, nor does it include the extension of any permanent roads or other infrastructure. It would not create any new jobs. Therefore, the project is not expected to induce substantial growth in the area.
- b) The project would not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project does not include destruction of any existing housing.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XV. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES:</u> 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire Protection?				✓
Police Protection?				✓

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Schools?				✓
Parks?				✓
Other public facilities?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

The project would not 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:

Fire Protection:

The project is located in a "VERY HIGH" fire hazard severity zone. However, the site is currently developed, and as a result, no significant additional level of fire protection is necessary.

Police Protection:

The County has a total of 147 sworn and 119 non-sworn County peace officers (Sheriff's deputies) for the County population of 67,274 (California, Department of Finance 2015) persons in the unincorporated area of the County. That is a ratio of one officer per 267 persons. The project will not result in additional residences. The project lease area will be surrounded by a 6-foot tall fence. The ground equipment area is currently enclosed by a 6-foot tall fence and gate. The project is not expected to require any significant additional level of police protection.

Schools:

School fees would not be applied to this project.

Parks:

The County does not have a neighborhood parks system.

Other public facilities:

No other public facilities serve the project site, or will be affected by the project.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XVI. RECREATION:	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?				✓
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?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project would not 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. The County does not have a neighborhood or regional parks system or other recreational facilities.
- b) The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XVII. <u>TRANSPORTATION</u> : Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?				✓
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				✓
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				✓
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project is an unmanned facility, and therefore would not conflict with a program, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
- b) The project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level-of-service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highway.

There is no County congestion management agency, and no level-of-service established by such an agency.
- c) The project does not propose any new roads. The proposed use is consistent with the existing use of the property. The project, therefore, would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.
- d) The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Emergency access to the project site is provided by Chapman Lane, a private road. The existing access road to the site and the proposed access to the tower shall comply with the Shasta County Fire Safety Standards.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as there is no evidence of historical resources at the site that are listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources; or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.

Information about the project was sent to the Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, which reviewed the project and did not provide comments. The project would require limited surface and subsurface excavation for the construction of foundations and slabs. The project site is disturbed by recent human activity and is currently used for power utility transmission equipment and lines. The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal resource.

Although there is no evidence to suggest that the project would result in any significant effect to tribal cultural resources, there is always the possibility that such resources could be encountered. A standard condition of approval will require that if in the course of development, any tribal cultural resources are uncovered, discovered or otherwise detected or observed, development activities in the affected area shall cease and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to review the site and advise the County of the site's significance. If the findings are deemed significant by the Environmental Review Officer, appropriate mitigation shall be required.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocations of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>				✓

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				✓
c) 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?				✓
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				✓
e) Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The proposed project is for a new wireless telecommunications facility. It would not require or result in the relocation or construction of any new or expanded water or, wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocations of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- b) Water service is not necessary for this project.
- c) Wastewater treatment is not necessary for this project.
- d) Solid waste disposal service is not necessary for this project.
- e) The project would comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

Discussion:

- a) The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- b) The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.
- c) The project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
- d) The project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XIX. <u>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 substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below the self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially 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 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?				✓

Discussion:

- a) Based on the discussion and findings in Section IV. Biological Resources, there is no evidence to support a finding that the project would have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below the self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

Based on the discussion and findings in Section V. Cultural Resources, there is no evidence to support a finding that the project would have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

- b) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.
- c) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is no evidence to support a finding that the project would have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

INITIAL STUDY COMMENTS

PROJECT NUMBER UP19-0005 T-Mobile West, LLC

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Special Studies: The following project-specific studies have been completed for the proposal and will be considered as part of the record of decision for the Negative Declaration. These studies are available for review through the Shasta County Planning Division.

- * Photosimulations prepared by AdvanceSim, October 29, 2018

Agency Referrals: Prior to an environmental recommendation, referrals for this project were sent to agencies thought to have responsible agency or reviewing agency authority. The responses to those referrals (attached), where appropriate, have been incorporated into this document and will be considered as part of the record of decision for the Negative Declaration. Copies of all referral comments may be reviewed through the Shasta County Planning Division. To date, referral comments have been received from the following State agencies or any other agencies which have identified CEQA concerns:

- * California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- * Shasta County Environmental Health Division
- * Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- * USDA-United States Forest Service

Conclusion/Summary: Based on a field review by the Planning Division and other agency staff, early consultation review comments from other agencies, information provided by the applicant, and existing information available to the Planning Division, the project is not anticipated to result in any significant environmental impacts.

SOURCES OF DOCUMENTATION FOR INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All headings of this source document correspond to the headings of the initial study checklist. In addition to the resources listed below, initial study analysis may also be based on field observations by the staff person responsible for completing the initial study. Most resource materials are on file in the office of the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001, Phone: (530) 225-5532.

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING

1. Shasta County General Plan and land use designation maps.
2. Applicable community plans, airport plans and specific plans.
3. Shasta County Zoning Ordinance (Shasta County Code Title 17) and zone district maps.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.8 Scenic Highways, and Section 7.6 Design Review.
2. Zoning Standards per Shasta County Code, Title 17.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.1 Agricultural Lands.
2. Shasta County Important Farmland 2016 Map, California Department of Conservation.
3. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.2 Timber Lands.
4. Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974.

III. AIR QUALITY

1. Shasta County General Plan Section, 6.5 Air Quality.
2. Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin, 2018 Air Quality Attainment Plan.
3. Records of, or consultation with, the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Air Quality Management District.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.2 Timberlands, and Section 6.7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat.
2. Designated Endangered, Threatened, or Rare Plants and Candidates with Official Listing Dates, published by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
3. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
4. Federal Listing of Rare and Endangered Species.
5. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat.
6. State and Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Animals of California, published by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
7. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.10 Heritage Resources.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. The Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Chico.
 - b. State Office of Historic Preservation.
 - c. Local Native American representatives.
 - d. Shasta Historical Society.

VI. ENERGY

1. California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32)
2. California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6 – California Energy Code
3. California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11 – California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen)

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.1 Seismic and Geologic Hazards, Section 6.1 Agricultural Lands, and Section 6.3 Minerals.
2. County of Shasta, Erosion and Sediment Control Standards, Design Manual
3. Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974.
4. Alquist - Priolo, Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

1. Shasta Regional Climate Action Plan
2. California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (White Paper) CEQA & Climate Change, Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.4 Fire Safety and Sheriff Protection, and Section 5.6 Hazardous Materials.
2. County of Shasta Multi-Hazard Functional Plan
3. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division.
 - b. Shasta County Fire Prevention Officer.
 - c. Shasta County Sheriff's Department, Office of Emergency Services.
 - d. Shasta County Department of Public Works.
 - e. California Environmental Protection Agency, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.2 Flood Protection, Section 5.3 Dam Failure Inundation, and Section 6.6 Water Resources and Water Quality.
2. Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Shasta County prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, as revised to date.
3. Records of, or consultation with, the Shasta County Department of Public Works acting as the Flood Control Agency and Community Water Systems manager.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Shasta County General Plan land use designation maps and zone district maps.
2. Shasta County Assessor's Office land use data.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

3. Shasta County General Plan Section 6.3 Minerals.

XIII. NOISE

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.5 Noise and Technical Appendix B.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.1 Community Organization and Development Patterns.
2. Census data from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
3. Census data from the California Department of Finance.
4. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.3 Housing Element.
5. Shasta County Department of Housing and Community Action Programs.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.5 Public Facilities.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Shasta County Fire Prevention Officer.
 - b. Shasta County Sheriff's Department.
 - c. Shasta County Office of Education.
 - d. Shasta County Department of Public Works.

XVI. RECREATION

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.9 Open Space and Recreation.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.4 Circulation.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Shasta County Department of Public Works.
 - b. Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.
 - c. Shasta County Congestion Management Plan/Transit Development Plan.
3. Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Rates.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Tribal Consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Pacific Gas and Electric Company.
 - b. Pacific Power and Light Company.
 - c. Pacific Bell Telephone Company.
 - d. Citizens Utilities Company.
 - e. T.C.I.
 - f. Marks Cablevision.
 - g. Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division.
 - h. Shasta County Department of Public Works.

XX. WILDFIRE

1. Office of the State Fire Marshall-CALFIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

None

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM (MMP)

FOR XX PERMIT # & NAME

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)