

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 6, Sections 15070 and 15071 of the California Code of Regulations and pursuant to the Procedures for Preparation and Processing of Environmental Documents adopted by the County of Sacramento pursuant to Sacramento County Ordinance No. SCC-116, the Environmental Coordinator of Sacramento County, State of California, does prepare, make, declare, publish, and cause to be filed with the County Clerk of Sacramento County, State of California, this Negative Declaration re: The Project described as follows:

1. Control Number: PLNP2019-00176

2. Title and Short Description of Project: KXPR Radio Tower

The proposed project consists of the following entitlement requests:

A Use Permit to allow a broadcast radio tower on a portion of 81 acres in the AG-160 (Agricultural, 160 acres) zone.

A Design Review to comply with Countywide Design Guidelines.

Capital Public Radio (CPR) is requesting a Use Permit to build a broadcast tower that will consist of the following A 338 ft tower with 3 triangular faces of approximately 42" each (open faced).

Three anchor points for the supporting cables, each equally space 120° from each other – 3 sets of multiple attached to the tower at various points and terminating in a ground anchor approximately 270 to 290 feet from the tower

An approximately 1,800 SF concrete (CMU), modular or metal building structure to house the transmitter, back up transmitter operations for the station including future expansion if another FM station is acquired and future cellular operators. The building will be on a built up pad of approximately 3,000 to 4,000 SF, with a minimum floor elevation of 1.5 feet above the floodplain. A propane fueled back up emergency power generator on the pad to allow operation in times of power interruption such as natural disasters. The generator would have a footprint of approximately 45 square feet.

A regraded and graveled road of 2,300+/- feet serving the site from the adjacent Eagle's Nest Road with a new gate at entry.

A 7 foot chain link security fence with barbed wire on top around each of the anchor points as well as the station building area, generator and tower base.

Incidental power poles to bring the main electric to station base from approximately 2,300-2,400 feet away by the entrance from Eagles Nest Road.

3. Assessor's Parcel Number: 067-0120-011

- 4. Location of Project: The project site is located at 7351 Eagles Nest Road, approximately 1,500 feet south of Florin Rd in the Vineyard Community
- 5. Project Applicant: Capital Public Radio Inc.
- 6. Said project will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

a. It will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b. It will not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.

c. It will not have impacts, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

d. It will not have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

- 7. As a result thereof, the preparation of an environmental impact report pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California) is not required.
- 8. The attached Initial Study has been prepared by the Sacramento County Office of Planning and Environmental Review in support of this Negative Declaration. Further information may be obtained by contacting the Office of Planning and Environmental Review at 827 Seventh Street, Room 225, Sacramento, California, 95814, or phone (916) 874-6141.

[Original Signature on File] Tim Hawkins Environmental Coordinator County of Sacramento, State of California

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO OFFICE OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT INFORMATION

CONTROL NUMBER: PLNP2019-00176

NAME: KXPR Radio Tower

LOCATION: The project site is located at 7351 Eagles Nest Road, approximately 1,500 feet south of Florin Rd in the Vineyard Community (Plate IS-1).

Assessor's Parcel Number: 067-0120-011

APPLICANT:

Capital Public Radio Inc. 7055 Folsom Boulevard Sacramento, CA 95826 Contact: Jun Reina

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project consists of the following entitlement requests:

- 1. A Use Permit to allow a broadcast radio tower on a portion of 81 acres in the AG-160 (Agricultural, 160 acres) zone.
- 2. A Design Review to comply with Countywide Design Guidelines.

Capital Public Radio (CPR) is requesting a Use Permit to build a broadcast tower that will consist of the following (Plate IS-2, Plate IS-3):

- 1. A 338 ft tower with 3 triangular faces of approximately 42" each (open faced).
- 2. Three anchor points for the supporting cables, each equally space 120° from each other 3 sets of multiple attached to the tower at various points and terminating in a ground anchor approximately 270 to 290 feet from the tower
- 3. An approximately 1,800 SF concrete (CMU), modular or metal building structure to house the transmitter, back up transmitter operations for the station including future expansion if another FM station is acquired and future cellular operators. The building will be on a built up pad of approximately 3,000 to 4,000 SF, with a minimum floor elevation of 1.5 feet above the floodplain. A propane fueled back

up emergency power generator on the pad to allow operation in times of power interruption such as natural disasters. The generator would have a footprint of approximately 45 square feet.

- 4. A regraded and graveled road of 2,300+/- feet serving the site from the adjacent Eagle's Nest Road with a new gate at entry.
- 5. A 7 foot chain link security fence with barbed wire on top around each of the anchor points as well as the station building area, generator and tower base.
- 6. Incidental power poles to bring the main electric to station base from approximately 2,300-2,400 feet away by the entrance from Eagles Nest Road.



Plate IS-1: Project Vicinity Map





\$



Plate IS-3: Tower Elevations



Initial Study

IS-5

PLNP2019-00176

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The site is located within an actively cultivated agricultural field. A dirt road provides access along the northern boundary of the parcel and would provide access to the site from Eagle's Nest road. An additional dirt road is oriented north/south from the property boundary to the proposed center of the tower. The property to the north of the project site is as pasture for livestock under different ownership. Beyond the pasture to north, and to east of the site is the Triangle Rock gravel operation. The nearest residence is 0.3 miles from the proposed site. There are 7 residences within 1 mile of the proposed project. About 1.45 miles southwest of the site are three KSTE radio towers of the same height.

The cropland is under an active Williamson Act Contract. The agricultural land involves regular planting, irrigation, harvesting, and tilling. The fields are used to produce various grains, such as teff, for livestock feed. No wetlands, trees, or natural plant communities are present.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Based on this guidance, Sacramento County has developed an Initial Study Checklist (located at the end of this report). The Checklist identifies a range of potential significant effects by topical area. The topical discussions that follow are provided only when additional analysis beyond the Checklist is warranted.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

• Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract.

CALIFORNIA LAND CONSERVATION ACT (WILLIAMSON ACT)

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly called the Williamson Act, has long been the mainstay of Sacramento County's agricultural land preservation program. The purpose of the Williamson Act is to preserve a maximum amount of limited supply of agricultural land; discourage premature and unnecessary conversion of agricultural land to urban uses; and keeping agricultural lands in production, which have important open space benefits in a rapidly-urbanizing society.

The Williamson Act Contract outlines the compatible uses by excluding uses other than agricultural uses and other than those compatible with agricultural uses. Typical compatible uses include gas, electric, water, communications and agricultural laborer

housing facilities to name a few. The purpose of the Williamson Act is to secure a longterm landowner commitment to maintain farmland in agricultural uses in exchange for assessment of the land based upon use rather than market value.

The Williamson Act contract is an agreement by the land owner to restrict the land listed in the contract to agricultural and open space uses only. Williamson Act contracts are 20-year contracts, which, after the first 10 years, the contract automatically renews for an additional year beyond the original 20 years, unless they are officially terminated. This means that after a notice of non-renewal is filed, it takes 10 years for the contract to expire.

The project site is located on a parcel that is under an active Williamson Act Contract (Contract 69-AP-023.3). The contract was established in 1969 and the Board of Supervisors at that time, by resolution, adopted the contract and rules governing the administration of the agricultural preserve. The rules of each agricultural preserve specify the uses allowed. Generally, commercial agricultural use will be permitted within any agricultural preserve.

Exhibit C of the Williamson Act Contract for the project parcel (69-AP-023.3) provides a list of compatible uses. Subdivision (m) of this list states that radio, television or microwave antennas and transmitters are compatible uses. The installation of the proposed radio tower would not result in a conflict with the existing active Williamson Act Contract. It should be noted that although the contract identifies uses that are compatible with agricultural uses, the Zoning Code requires the issuance of a permit for new communication facilities (such as a wireless monopole) in any land use zone.

The approval of the project would not result in a breach of the existing active Williamson Act Contract and would not result in a cancellation of the Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the proposed project does not conflict with the existing active Williamson Act Contract; impacts are *less than significant*.

AESTHETICS

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

- In non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.
- Create a new source of substantial light, glare, or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

DEGRADATION OF **V**ISUAL **C**HARACTER

METHODOLOGY

Physical changes brought about by a project can affect the nature and character of a project site. These changes can affect aesthetics when they result in a site with

physical features that are out of character with their surroundings and that adversely affect those who view the site. However, visual and aesthetic impacts are generally subjective, as sensitivity to change in the environment varies and individuals respond differently to these changes, and there are few objective or quantitative standards are available to analyze the visual quality and individual viewers respond differently to changes in the physical environment

Visual character is derived from visual pattern elements and their dominance, scale, diversity and/or continuity. Visual pattern elements include form, line, color, and texture. Although visual character and quality can be described objectively, there is no established official process that will identify all areas of high visual quality. Therefore in part, visual quality is often defined by viewer sensitivity. Viewer sensitivity is defined by the visibility of resources in the landscape, the proximity of viewers to the visual resource, the elevation of viewers relative to the visual resource, the frequency and duration of views, the number of viewers, and the types and expectations of individuals and viewer groups. The following discussion will analyze the aesthetic impacts of the Project in terms of potential change in visual character, and potential impacts to viewer sensitivity to nearby populations, from surrounding viewpoints (South, North, East, and West).

EXISTING VISUAL CHARACTER OR QUALITY OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

There is no development in the immediate vicinity of the project site besides the existing residence on the subject property. The view for travelers on Eagles Nest Rd, Florin Rd and Sunrise Blvd consists of large open agricultural lands and the Triangle Rock mining operation. Being a rural area, there are existing tower intrusions that have been erected to meet the demands of the communication and energy in the area. Southwest of the site there are four AM radio towers at a height of 338 feet, anchored with guy wires, with an equipment area at ground elevation. The existing visual setting is illustrated in Plate IS-4 and referenced in Table IS-1.

Miles (approximate)	Closest Points	Direction to:	Viewpoint in Plate IS-4		
0.2	Florin Road	North	2/3		
0.025	Eagle's Nest Road	West	1/2		
0.6	Sunrise Boulevard	East	4		
0.8	Grantline Road	Southeast	n/a		
1.05	Jackson Highway	North	n/a		
1.45	KSTE 3 Towers (338 ft tall)	Southwest	n/a		

Table 10-1. Distances Associated with visual impact Assessment	Table) IS-1:	Distances	Associated	with	Visual I	Impact.	Assessment
--	-------	---------	-----------	------------	------	----------	---------	------------



PROJECT IMPACTS TO VISUAL CHARACTER

The applicant has provided photo simulations from different directions looking at the site before and after project construction. Those photo simulations are provided in Plate IS-4 through Plate IS-8. Though visible, there are a limited number of viewer groups that would be impacted by the Project. These groups include the residents of homes in the vicinity of the project site, and people driving on the surrounding rural roads.

Based on an assessment of aerial photography, four residences would potentially be subject to the visual impacts of the tower, and the potential change in viewpoint is illustrated in Plate IS-4 through Plate IS-8. The tower, given its size, height and profile is largely not visible from a majority of the area homes when the placement is considered, and where it is visible, the viewshed is also impacted by visual intrusions such as existing power poles, power lines and agricultural facilities. Similarly, the same intrusions would be applicable to the individuals traveling on surrounding roads, although the impact of visual change for those individuals would be shorter, and temporary, given the nature of visual impact on travelers.

It is recognized that visual quality is highly subjective, and as noted the few nearby residents are likely to be more sensitive to any change, but the majority of the larger viewer group consists of travelers on surrounding rural roadways. Given the distance to the tower and the existing infrastructure, towers and power lines in the area as illustrated in the photo simulations above, the introduction of the new proposed tower will not significantly alter the visual viewshed of the project area. The impact to visual resources is considered *less than significant*.

LIGHT OR GLARE

FAA requires that the tower be painted, marked and lit, pursuant to the FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 70-7460-1L, effective September 2, 2018. Chapter 4 of the Advisory Circular outlines the various obstruction lighting system used to indentify structures that an aeronautical study has determined lighting is needed to increase visibility of the structure. Advisory Circular 150/5345-43J (effective March 11, 2019) outlines the standards on the use of light units that meet specified intensities, beam patterns, color, and flash rate.

The applicant has indicated that the tower would be lit with a low intensity red LED beacon, at the midpoint on the three tower legs, and a low profile light at the top of the tower, per FAA requirements for tower lighting. Besides the residence on the subject project property, the nearest residence is 0.3 miles west of the proposed site, and there are 7 residences within 1 mile of the proposed project. The combination of distance and low intensity LED lights will not create substantial light or glare that would adversely affect the day or nighttime views. Impacts are *less than significant*.

KXPR Radio Tower



Plate IS-5: Looking Northeast from Eagles Nest Road



Plate IS-6: Looking Southeast from Eagles Nest Road

KXPR Radio Tower













proposed tower

AIRPORTS

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

• Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft.

AIRCRAFT NAVIGATION

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), administers the provisions of United States Code (U.S.C.): Title 49. Within the code, Section 44718 (Structures Interfering with Air Commerce) and Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77 (Safe, Efficient Use, and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace) outline provisions for determining if there will be any substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities.

Title 14, part 77.17 (Obstruction Standards) states

(a) an existing object, including a mobile object, is, and a future object would be an obstruction to air navigation if it is of greater height than any of the following heights or surfaces:

(1) A height of 499 feet AGL (above ground level) at the site of the object.

(2) A height that is 200 feet AGL, or above the established airport elevation, whichever is higher, within 3 nautical miles of the established reference point of an airport, excluding heliports, with its longest runway more than 3,200 feet in actual length, and that height increases in the proportion of 100 feet for each additional nautical mile from the airport up to a maximum of 499 feet.

The applicant has received conditional approval from the FAA for development of the tower, pending other necessary approvals. FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, will be completed and returned to the issuing FAA office any time the project is abandoned or within 5 days after the construction reaches it greatest height (7460-2, Part II). The Project would be subject to all applicable FAA regulations, as well as any project conditions imposed by the FAA for project implementation. Upon compliance with existing regulations and any conditions set forth by FAA, site and safety impacts associated with air navigation are *less than significant*.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

• Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality.

WATER QUALITY

CONSTRUCTION WATER QUALITY: EROSION AND GRADING

Construction on undeveloped land exposes bare soil, which can be mobilized by rain or wind and displaced into waterways or become an air pollutant. Construction equipment can also track mud and dirt onto roadways, where rains will wash the sediment into storm drains and thence into surface waters. After construction is complete, various other pollutants generated by site use can also be washed into local waterways. These pollutants include; but are not limited to: vehicle fluids, heavy metals deposited by vehicles, and pesticides or fertilizers used in landscaping.

Sacramento County has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Permit issued by Regional Water Board. The Municipal Stormwater Permit requires the County to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable and to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges. The County complies with this permit in part by developing and enforcing ordinances and requirements to reduce the discharge of sediments and other pollutants in runoff from newly developing and redeveloping areas of the County.

The County has established a Stormwater Ordinance (Sacramento County Code 15.12). The Stormwater Ordinance prohibits the discharge of unauthorized nonstormwater to the County's stormwater conveyance system and local creeks. It applies to all private and public projects in the County, regardless of size or land use type. In addition, Sacramento County Code 16.44 (Land Grading and Erosion Control) requires private construction sites disturbing one or more acres or moving 350 cubic yards or more of earthen material to obtain a grading permit. To obtain a grading permit, project proponents must prepare and submit for approval an Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Plan describing erosion and sediment control best management practices (BMPs) that will be implemented during construction to prevent sediment from leaving the site and entering the County's storm drain system or local receiving waters. Construction projects not subject to SCC 16.44 are subject to the Stormwater Ordinance (SCC 15.12) described above.

In addition to complying with the County's ordinances and requirements, construction sites disturbing one or more acres are required to comply with the State's General Stormwater Permit for Construction Activities (CGP). CGP coverage is issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board)

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml and enforced by the Regional Water Board. Coverage is obtained by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the State Board prior to construction and verified by receiving a WDID#. The CGP requires preparation and implementation of a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that must be kept on site at all times for review by the State inspector.

Applicable projects applying for a County grading permit must show proof that a WDID # has been obtained and must submit a copy of the SWPPP. Although the County has no enforcement authority related to the CGP, the County does have the authority to ensure

sediment/pollutants are not discharged and is required by its Municipal Stormwater Permit to verify that SWPPPs include the minimum components.

The project must include an effective combination of erosion, sediment and other pollution control BMPs in compliance with the County ordinances and the State's CGP.

Erosion controls should always be the *first line of defense*, to keep soil from being mobilized in wind and water. Examples include stabilized construction entrances, tackified mulch, 3-step hydroseeding, spray-on soil stabilizers and anchored blankets. Sediment controls are the *second line of defense*; they help to filter sediment out of runoff before it reaches the storm drains and local waterways. Examples include rock bags to protect storm drain inlets, staked or weighted straw wattles/fiber rolls, and silt fences.

In addition to erosion and sediment controls, the project must have BMPs in place to keep other construction-related wastes and pollutants out of the storm drains. Such practices include, but are not limited to: filtering water from dewatering operations, providing proper washout areas for concrete trucks and stucco/paint contractors, containing wastes, managing portable toilets properly, and dry sweeping instead of washing down dirty pavement.

It is the responsibility of the project proponent to verify that the proposed BMPs for the project are appropriate for the unique site conditions, including topography, soil type and anticipated volumes of water entering and leaving the site during the construction phase. In particular, the project proponent should check for the presence of colloidal clay soils on the site. Experience has shown that these soils do not settle out with conventional sedimentation and filtration BMPs. The project proponent may wish to conduct settling column tests in addition to other soils testing on the site, to ascertain whether conventional BMPs will work for the project.

If sediment-laden or otherwise polluted runoff discharges from the construction site are found to impact the County's storm drain system and/or Waters of the State, the property owner will be subject to enforcement action and possible fines by the County and the Regional Water Board.

Project compliance with requirements outlined above, as administered by the County and the Regional Water Board will ensure that project-related erosion and pollution impacts are *less than significant*.

OPERATION: STORMWATER RUNOFF

Development and urbanization can increase pollutant loads, temperature, volume and discharge velocity of runoff over the predevelopment condition. The increased volume, increased velocity, and discharge duration of stormwater runoff from developed areas has the potential to greatly accelerate downstream erosion and impair stream habitat in natural drainage systems. Studies have demonstrated a direct correlation between the degree of imperviousness of an area and the degradation of its receiving waters. These

impacts must be mitigated by requiring appropriate runoff reduction and pollution prevention controls to minimize runoff and keep runoff clean for the life of the project.

The County requires that projects include source and/or treatment control measures on selected new development and redevelopment projects. Source control BMPs are intended to keep pollutants from contacting site runoff. Examples include "No Dumping-Drains to Creek/River" stencils/stamps on storm drain inlets to educate the public, and providing roofs over areas likely to contain pollutants, so that rainfall does not contact the pollutants. Treatment control measures are intended to remove pollutants that have already been mobilized in runoff. Examples include vegetated swales and water quality detention basins. These facilities slow water down and allow sediments and pollutants to settle out prior to discharge to receiving waters. Additionally, vegetated facilities provide filtration and pollutant uptake/adsorption. The project proponent should consider the use of "low impact development" techniques to reduce the amount of imperviousness on the site, since this will reduce the volume of runoff and therefore will reduce the size/cost of stormwater quality treatment required. Examples of low impact development and bioretention facilities.

The County requires developers to utilize the *Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento Region, 2018* (Design Manual) in selecting and designing post-construction facilities to treat runoff from the project. Regardless of project type or size, developers are required to implement the minimum source control measures (Chapter 4 of the Design Manual). Low impact development measures and Treatment Control Measures are required of all projects exceeding the impervious surface threshold defined in Table 3-2 and 3-3 of the Design Manual. Further, depending on project size and location, hydromodification control measures may be required (Chapter 5 of the Design Manual).

Updates and background on the County's requirements for post-construction stormwater quality treatment controls, along with several downloadable publications, can be found at the following websites:

http://www.waterresources.saccounty.net/stormwater/Pages/default.aspx

http://www.beriverfriendly.net/Newdevelopment/

The final selection and design of post-construction stormwater quality control measures is subject to the approval of the County Department of Water Resources; therefore, they should be contacted as early as possible in the design process for guidance. Project compliance with requirements outlined above will ensure that project-related stormwater pollution impacts are *less than significant*.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

• Have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife

population to drop below self-sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.

- Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, state or federal plan for the conservation of habitat.

SURVEYS AND METHODOLOGY

The methodologies used to determine significance rely on documents published by or endorsed by regulatory agencies. Surveys and studies performed on the Project site have been conducted by qualified professionals. The applicable documents and methods are cited and described in the impact discussions below. Significance findings have been based on the impact conclusions of applicable surveys and studies. In absence of such published documents, the analyses rely on the general definitions of significance.

SURVEYS AND STUDIES

The following technical studies were submitted and/or utilized as part of the biological resources analysis for this project:

- Biological Resources Technical Report for the CPR Broadcast Tower (Appendix A)
- South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP)

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

The likelihood of a special status species to be present on the Project site was determined using the technical studies/documents listed above, and topical literature as cited. Species considered for presence are those species with modeled habitat identified in the SSHCP and species considered to be potentially present as indicated on the official USFWS species list and CNDDB quad list. This is the basis for species outlined in Table IS-2, which reports the likelihood of species occurrence based on habitat presence either on the site or in proximity of the site, survey results (if any), and nearby recorded species occurrences. Likelihood of occurrence is rated as Not Present, Low Potential, Moderate Potential, High Potential, or Present, which are defined as:

Not Present: A survey was performed by a qualified biologist, and the species was not found and habitat is absent both on the site and in the vicinity.

Low Potential: Habitat is near-absent.

Moderate Potential: Habitat is present, but the species has not been observed within five miles of the site.

High Potential: Habitat is present and the species has been observed within five miles of the site.

Present: The CNDDB contains a recorded occurrence on the site, or the species was found during site-specific surveys.

Species which are not present or were found to have a low potential of occurrence are not discussed further in subsequent analysis sections.

٠

Species	Status ¹	Habitat ¹	Potential for Occurrence
		BIRDS	
Bank Swallow Riparia riparia	ST	Requires vertical banks and cliffs with fine-textured or sandy soils near streams, rivers, ponds, lakes, and the ocean for nesting. Feeds primarily over grassland, shrubland, savannah, and open riparian areas.	No potential. The project site does not contain appropriate nesting habitat for the species.
Burrowing Owl Athene cunicularia hypugea	CSC SSHCP	Frequents open grasslands and shrublands with perches and burrows. Nests and roosts in old burrows of small mammals and rubble piles.	Not present. The project site is actively farmed. Surveys show no indication of burrows appropriate for burrowing owl on the project site or in the vicinity.
Cooper's Hawk Accipiter cooperii	SA SSHCP	Frequents landscapes with wooded patches and groves, along with woodland edge habitats. Nests in riparian areas.	High. The Project site contains appropriate foraging habitat for the species
Ferruginous Hawk <i>Buteo regalis</i>	SA SSHCP	Frequents open grasslands, sagebrush flats, desert scrub, low foothills surrounding valleys, and fringes of pinyon-juniper habitats.	High. The Project site contains appropriate foraging habitat for the species
Golden Eagle Aquila chrysaetos	CFP, SA	Found in rolling foothills with open grasslands, scattered trees, and cliff-walled canyons. Nests on cliffs and in large trees in open areas.	Low. The species is not common in the project area. Suitable foraging habitat present, limited suitable nesting habitat within the Project area.
Great Blue Heron Ardea herodias	SA	Associated with estuaries, rivers, and oceans, the species is known to occur along major rivers in the Central Valley. A colonial nester, the species prefers tall trees beside water. The range is restricted to within 10 miles of the nesting area.	No potential. The Project site does not contain appropriate habitat for the species.
Great Egret Ardea alba	SA	Associated with estuaries, rivers, and oceans, the species is known to occur along major rivers in the Central Valley. A colonial nester, the species prefers cliffs, rugged slopes, or tall trees beside water.	No potential. The Project site does not contain appropriate habitat for the species.
Loggerhead Shrike Lanius Iudovicianus	CSC SSHCP	Listed for loss of breeding habitat, the species places nests in large shrubs or trees. Breed mainly in shrublands or open woodlands with a fair amount of grass cover and areas of bare ground.	Moderate. Although no documented occurrences nearby, the project contains suitable habitat and modeled habitat in the SSCHP.

Table IS-2: Potential for Special Status Species Occurrence

Initial Study

PLNP2019-00176

Species	Status ¹	Habitat ¹	Potential for Occurrence
Purple Martin Progne subis	CSC	The species is typically a colonial nester, and nest sites include crevices in cliffs and hollow trees, though the species is also known to use nest boxes provided by humans. The species is listed for nesting.	No potential. The Project site does not contain appropriate nesting habitat for the species.
Suisun Song Sparrow Melospiza melodia maxillaris	csc	The species' year-round range is confined to tidal salt and brackish marshes fringing the Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay east to Antioch, at the confluence of the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers.	Not Present. The species only has the potential to be present at the very southernmost tip of the County, where no development is proposed.
Swainson's Hawk Buteo swainsoni	ST SSHCP	Breeds in stands with few trees in juniper-sage flats, riparian areas, and oak savannah. Requires adjacent suitable foraging areas such as grasslands or grain fields supporting rodent populations.	High: Suitable foraging habitat present. No suitable nesting habitat is present within Project site, but may be available in the vicinity. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 2.3 miles to the southeast.
Tricolored Blackbird Agelaius tricolor	CSC SSHCP	The species is listed for breeding habitat. Known to nest near marshes in large (several hundred to several thousand birds) breeding colonies in habitat made up of blackberry thickets, bulrush (<i>Scrirpus</i> sp.) or cattails (<i>Typha</i> sp.) patches.	None: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Western Yellow- Billed Cuckoo	FE (state candidate)	Inhabits extensive deciduous riparian thickets or forests with dense, low-level or understory foliage, and which abut on slow-moving watercourses, backwaters, or seeps.	Not Present. Though historically present in Sacramento County, current California Fish and Wildlife range maps exclude the County. The California Natural Diversity Database also lists the species as extirpated from Sacramento County.
White-Tailed Kite <i>Elanus leucurus</i>	CFP, SA SSHCP	Inhabit low-elevation grasslands, wetlands dominated by grasses, oak woodlands, and agricultural and riparian areas. The species is listed for nesting.	High. Suitable foraging and nesting habitat present within Project area. The nearest CNDDB occurrence is 0.5 miles to the east of the Project area.
		MAMMALS	
American Badger <i>Taxidea taxus</i>	CSC SSHCP	Occurs in a variety of habitats, including grasslands and oak woodlands. Requires loose or easily crumbled soils for digging.	None: No suitable habitat in the Project area. No burrows of evidence of species seen during site visits.
		AMPHIBIANS	

. . . .

•

California Red- legged frog Rana draytonii	FT	Requires a permanent water source and is typically found along quiet, slow-moving streams, ponds, or marsh communities with emergent vegetation. Typically found in or within 300 feet of aquatic habitat, but may disperse up to two miles between suitable aquatic habitat. Elevational range extends from sea level to about 1,500 meters (5,000 ft.), but typically occur below 1,200 meters (3,935 ft.).	Not Present. The project site does not contain permanent water sources required for the species.
California Tiger Salamander <i>Ambystoma</i> californiense	FT ST SSHCP	Endemic to annual grasslands and valley-foothill habitats in California. Adults spend most time in subterranean refugia, particularly in ground squirrel burrows. Seasonal ponds or vernal pools are required for breeding.	Not Present. The project area is not within this species' historic range. There are no documented occurrences of this species within 10 miles of the Project area.
Western Spadefoot Toad Scaphiopus (Spea) hammondii	CSC SSHCP	Occurs primarily in grasslands but occasionally populates valley-foothill hardwood woodlands. Almost entirely terrestrial, but requires temporary rain pools that lack predators (fish, bullfrogs, crayfish) for breeding. Also needs burrows for refuge.	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
		REPTILES	
Giant Garter Snake Thamnophis gigas	FT, ST SSHCP	Endemic to valley floors of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. Prefers freshwater marsh and low gradient streams. Has adapted to rice agriculture, drainage channels, and irrigation ditches. Requires permanent water, emergent vegetation, and upland habitat for basking and cover.	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Western Pond Turtle <i>Emys marmorata</i>	CSC SSHCP	Occurs in perennial ponds, lakes, rivers, and streams with suitable basking habitat (mud banks, mats of floating vegetation, partially submerged logs) and submerged shelter. Require some slack- or slow-water aquatic habitat. Nests upland, on unshaded south-facing slopes with friable soils that have a high percentage of clay or silt.	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.

Initial Study

PLNP2019-00176

		FISH	
Central Valley Steelhead <i>Oncorhynchus</i> <i>mykiss</i>	FT	Most of Sacramento County is within the distinct population segment area for this species. Critical habitat has been designated within Sacramento County on the Sacramento River, American River, Mokelumne River, and Dry Creek (both north and south creeks). Spawning has been documented on the Cosumnes River. (NMFS 2009) The listing applies to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries.	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
		INVERTEBRATES	
California Linderiella Linderiella occidentalis	SA	A fairy shrimp which most often occupies pools that are vegetated and contain clear water. Not uncommon to observe the species in mud-bottomed pools with slightly turbid water. ²	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Conservancy Fairy Shrimp Branchinecta Iongiantenna	FE	Typical habitat has been described as large, deep, turbid, playa-type vernal pools. Requires a somewhat longer inundation period (life cycle may be 46 days). ²	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Midvalley Fairy Shrimp Branchinecta mesovallensis	SA SSHCP	Inhabit shallow vernal pools, vernal swales, and various artificial ephemeral wetland habitats in the Sacramento, Solano, Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Madera, Merced, and Fresno Counties. ²	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Ricksecker's Water Scavenger Beetle Hydrochara rickseckeri	SA SSHCP	The species is an aquatic beetle dependent upon wetland habitats. ² Based on CNDDB records, the species has been observed at Mather Field.	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Desmocerus californicus dimorphus	FT SSHCP	Associated with mature elderberry (<i>Sambucus</i> spp.) trees/shrubs found in riparian forests in the Central Valley (USFWS, 1999).	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.

- 1

,

Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp <i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	FT SSHCP	Inhabit alkaline pools, ephemeral drainages, rock outcrop pools, ditches, stream oxbows, stockponds, vernal pools, vernal swales, and other seasonal wetlands. Also found in basalt flow depression pools in unplowed grasslands. ²	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Vernal Pool Tadpole Shrimp <i>Lepidurus packardi</i>	FE SSHCP	Inhabits small to large vernal pools containing clear to highly turbid water. ²	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
		PLANTS	
Ahart's Dwarf Rush Juncus leiospermus var. ahartii	List 1B SSHCP	Valley and foothill grassland/mesic; elevation 100 – 330 ft (blooms Mar. – May)	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Boggs Lake Hedge- Hyssop Gratiola heterosepala	SE, List 1B SSHCP	Marshes and swamps, vernal pools/clay; elevation 30 – 7,790 ft (blooms Apr. – Aug.)	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Delta Mudwort <i>Limosella subulata</i>	List 2	Marshes and swamps; elevation 0 – 10 ft (blooms May – Aug.). In Sacramento County, found only in the Delta.	None: No suitable marsh habitat within Project area.
Dwarf Downingia Downingia pusilla	List 2 SSHCP	Vernal pools and mesic areas in valley and foothill grasslands; elevation 3 – 1,460 ft (blooms Mar. – May)	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Legenere <i>Legenere limosa</i>	List 1B SSHCP	Vernal pools; elevation 0 – 2,900 ft (blooms Apr. – Jun.)	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Sacramento Orcutt Grass <i>Orcuttia viscida</i>	FE, SE, List 1B SSHCP	Vernal pools; elevation 100 – 330 ft (blooms Apr. – Jul.)	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.
Sanford's Arrowhead Sagittaria sanfordii	List 1B SSHCP	Marshes and swamps; elevation 0 – 2,000 ft (blooms May – Oct.)	None: No suitable pond or marsh habitat within Project area.
Slender Orcutt Grass Orcuttia tenuis	FT, SE List 1B SSHCP	Vernal pools; elevation 115 – 5,775 ft (blooms May – Oct.)	Not present: No suitable habitat in the Project area.

Relevant species compiled from the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Data Base (2011) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Species List for Sacramento County

1. Listing status sources and, unless otherwise specified, habitat description sources (life history accounts) are:

California Species: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/list.html for the general webpage where you can use the links, or use the "search" field in the upper right-hand corner – for instance, enter "American Badger life history" – to obtain life history accounts. Most Bird Accounts are www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/ssc/birds.html, most Mammal Accounts are http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/publications/bm research/docs/86 27.pdf and http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/ssc/1998mssc.html, most Fish Accounts are http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/ssc/1998mssc.html, most Fish Accounts are http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/publications/docs/herp ssc.pdf. Last accessed May, 2018.

Federal Species: http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/ES_Species/Accounts/Home/es_species.htm Last accessed May, 2018.

California Native Plant Society: http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/ Last accessed May, 2018.

2. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, "Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon", December 2005.

FE = Federal Endangered; FT = Federal Threatened; FC = Federal Candidate

SE = State of California Endangered; ST = State of California Threatened; CSC = State of California Species of Special Concern; CFP = State of California Fully Protected; SA = Special Animal

SSHCP = Species covered by the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan

List 1B = California Native Plant Society Endangered, Threatened, or Rare in California

List 2 = California Native Plant Society Endangered, Threatened, or Rare in California but more common elsewhere

SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN (SSHCP)

The SSHCP is a regional approach to addressing development, habitat conservation, and agricultural lands within the south Sacramento County region, including the cities of Galt and Rancho Cordova. The specific geographic scope of the SSHCP includes U.S. Highway 50 to the north, the Sacramento River levee and County Road J11 (connects the towns of Walnut Grove and Thornton, it is known as the Walnut Grove-Thornton Road) to the west, the Sacramento County line with El Dorado and Amador counties to the east, and San Joaquin County to the south. The SSHCP Project area excludes the City of Sacramento, the City of Folsom, the City of Elk Grove, most of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and the Sacramento community of Rancho Murieta.

The SSHCP covers 28 different species of plants and wildlife, including 10 that are state and/or federally-listed as threatened or endangered. The SSHCP has been developed as a collaborative effort to streamline permitting and protect covered species habitat.

On May 15, 2018 the Final SSHCP and EIS/EIR was published in the federal Register for a 30 day review period. Public hearings on the proposed adoption of the final SSHCP, final EIS/EIR, final Aquatic Resources Plan (ARP), and final Implementation Agreement (IA) began in August 2018, and adoption by the County occurred on September 11, 2018. The permit was received on June 12, 2019 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, July 25, 2019 from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and August 20, 2019 from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The proposed project is in the Urban Development Area (UDA) and considered a covered activity in the SSHCP; therefore, the Project must comply with the provisions of the SSHCP and associated permits. As such, the analysis contained below addresses the applicability of the SSHCP, and mitigation has been designed to comply with the SSHCP.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN

The proposed project's design and construction must comply with all SSHCP requirements including SSHCP avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs). The SSHCP is a habitat based plan in which mitigation fees are based on impacts to habitat or land cover rather than impacts to individual species.

The baseline mapping for the SSHCP landcovers is illustrated in Plate IS-9. The landcovers outlined in the baseline map are an interpretation of habitat based on remote sensing analysis over a number years prior to adoption of the SSHCP. Therefore, these landcovers are intended to serve as a guide as to what may be present on the project site and are intended to be updated. The basemap indicates that the project site is irrigated pastureland. Site specific surveys for the project site have confirmed that the current use of the project site is irrigated pastureland, so SSHCP mitigation fees will be calculated as such. The project contains an access road along the northern edge of the property boundary. There is an existing dirt road, which would be considered a disturbed landcover and as such, no mitigation fees would be required for impacts related to the roadway alignment. Plate IS-9 highlights the generally impacted area as



Plate IS-9: SSHCP Basemap Landcovers

KXPR Radio Tower

overlaid on the SSHCP basemap. Impacts and fees will be calculated on the actual footprint of disturbance. This is estimated to be approximately 0.8 acres, and will be finalized during the permitting phase.

The analysis contained in this chapter is consistent with the protocol for covered species analysis under the SSHCP. Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure that impacts to covered species and their habitat will be less than significant. The mitigation contained in this chapter has been structured such that the required mitigation is consistent with the adopted SSHCP mitigation and monitoring protocols.

The applicant will be required to obtain a signed SSHCP authorization form from the Environmental Coordinator for potential impacts to terrestrial and aquatic habitats. The project will comply with the requirements of the SSHCP, including adherence to the Avoidance and Minimization Measures (Appendix B), as well as payment of fees to support the overall SSHCP Conservation Strategy. Thus, the project is consistent with, and aids in the goals set forth in the proposed SSHCP. Impacts with regards to consistency with the proposed SSHCP are *less than significant*.

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

SWAINSON'S HAWK (BUTEO SWAINSONI)

The Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) is listed as a Threatened species by the State and is a covered species under the SSHCP. The SSHCP identifies the project site as modeled species habitat for Swainson's hawk; therefore, specific Swainson's hawk AMMs are required. The loss of foraging habitat through the conversion of native Central Valley grasslands to certain incompatible agricultural and urban uses has caused an estimated 90% decline in their population.

Swainson's hawks feed primarily upon small mammals, birds, and insects. Their typical foraging habitat includes native grasslands, alfalfa and other hay crops that provide suitable habitat for small mammals. Certain other row crops and open habitats also provide some foraging habitat. The availability of productive foraging habitat near a Swainson's hawk's nest site is a critical requirement for nesting and fledgling success. In central California, about 85% of Swainson's hawk nests are within riparian forest or remnant riparian trees. CEQA analysis of impacts to Swainson's hawks consists of separate analyses of impacts to nesting habitat and foraging habitat.

For determining impacts to and establishing mitigation for nesting Swainson's hawks in Sacramento County, CDFW recommends implementing the measures set forth in the California Fish and Wildlife <u>Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks (*Buteo swainsoni*) in the Central Valley of California (November 1, 1994). These state that no intensive new disturbances, such as heavy equipment operation associated with construction, should be initiated within ½-mile in a rural setting between March 1 and September 15.</u>

The nearest documented recording of Swainson's hawk is located approximately 2 miles southeast of the project site. The project site is largely void of trees, but there are

scattered large trees in the vicinity of the Project that could serve as suitable nesting habitat for Swainson's hawk. The project site is situated adjacent to active industrial uses, and near an intersection with a large volume of traffic. Any raptors potentially nesting in the project vicinity would be accustomed to noise and disturbance associated with industrial uses and high traffic areas. The SSHCP includes avoidance and minimization measures to implement pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors within ½ mile of ground disturbing activities. Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure impacts to nesting Swainson's hawk *less than significant.*

WHITE-TAILED KITE (ELANUS LEUCURUS)

White-tailed kite is a state "fully protected" raptor and is also protected under the MBTA and a covered species under the SSHCP. White-tailed kites inhabit rolling foothills and valley margins with scattered oaks, and river bottomlands or marshes next to deciduous woodland. It breeds between February and October and feeds on rodents, small reptiles, and large insects in fresh emergent wetlands, annual grasslands, pastures, and ruderal vegetation. The nearest known CNDDB occurrence is approximately 0.9 miles to the northeast of the project area. The grassland habitat in the Project area provides nesting and foraging habitat for this species. The SSHCP identifies the project site as modeled species habitat for white tailed kite; therefore, specific raptor AMMs are required.

COOPER'S HAWK (ACCIPITER COOPERII)

Cooper's hawks are a covered species under the SSHCP, are well-distributed and occur in varied habitats including; deciduous, mixed, and evergreen forests and riparian woodlands. This species is tolerant of human disturbance and habitat fragmentation and has been found to increasingly breed in suburban and urban areas. This species nests in extensive forests, woodlots of 10-20 acres, and occasionally in isolated trees in more open areas. Nests are typically in more mature trees which have relatively more canopy cover than what is locally available. The nearest CNDDB occurrence of Cooper's hawk is 3.3 miles southeast of the project site. The SSHCP identifies the project site as modeled species habitat for Cooper's hawk; therefore, specific raptor AMMs are required.

FERRUGINOUS HAWK (BUTEO REGALIS)

Ferruginous hawk is a covered species under the SSHCP. According to the CDFW Life History Account for the ferruginous hawk, the species is an uncommon winter resident and migrant at lower elevations and open grasslands in the Central Valley. The species requires large, open tracts of grasslands, sparse shrub, or desert habitats with elevated structures for nesting. The species is migratory, and generally arrives in California in September and departs by mid-April. The species does not nest in Sacramento County; therefore impacts to foraging habitat are the primary concern. There is no published regulatory guidance on mitigation of foraging habitat for this species. The nearest CNDDB occurrence of ferruginous hawk is 3.5 miles northwest at a former known wintering and foraging site. The SSHCP identifies the project site as modeled species habitat for ferruginous hawk; therefore, specific raptor AMMs are required.

LOGGERHEAD SHRIKE (LANIUS LUDOVICIANUS)

Loggerhead shrike is a covered species under the SSHCP. It is a year-round resident and winter visitor in lowlands and foothills throughout California. This species is associated with open country with short vegetation and scattered trees, shrubs, fences, utility lines and/or other perches. Although they are songbirds, shrikes are predatory and forage on a variety of invertebrates and small vertebrates. Captured prey items are often impaled for storage purposes on suitable substrates, including thorns or spikes on vegetation, and barbed wire fences. The species nests in trees and large shrubs; nests are usually placed 3 -10 feet off the ground. There are no documented occurrences of species in the immediate project vicinity, but the project site contains suitable habitat for the species the SSHCP identifies the project site as modeled species habitat for loggerhead shrike; therefore, specific raptor AMMs are required.

NORTHERN HARRIER (CIRCUS CYANEUS)

Northern Harrier is a covered species under the SSHCP. According to the CDFW Life History Account for the northern harrier the species occurs in a wide range of habitat types and elevations, from grasslands in the Central Valley to alpine meadows as high as 10,000 feet. The species forages in areas where rodents are abundant, generally agricultural and grassland areas. The species is a widespread winter resident and migrant, though an uncommon nesting season resident in the Central Valley. The population has declined in California, largely due to destruction of breeding habitat. The species is mostly found in flat or hummocky open areas of tall, dense grasses, moist or dry shrubs, with edges for nesting, cover, and feeding. It is also known to nest and forage in agricultural areas as well. There are no documented occurrences in the immediate project vicinity, but the project site contains suitable habitat for the species the SSHCP identifies the project site as modeled species habitat for northern harrier; therefore, specific raptor AMMs are required.

SPECIAL STATUS RAPTOR IMPACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The project site contains grassland habitat that is suitable for foraging for special status raptors, and the project site contains modeled habitat for species covered by the SSHCP. None were observed nesting, resting, or foraging on site when field surveys were conducted. The nearest trees to the tower site are 0.22 miles away. Although these trees are unlikely to support nesting raptors, there is potential for nests to occur-prior to construction activities. Avoidance and minimization measures specific to raptor protection are included in the SSHCP. Upon compliance with the SSHCP AMMs for raptors, impacts are *less than significant*.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, which states "unless and except as permitted by regulations, it shall be unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture, or kill" a migratory bird. Section 3(18) of the Federal Endangered Species Act defines the term "take" means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Causing a bird to abandon an active nest may cause harm to egg(s) or chick(s) and is therefore considered "take."

MIGRATORY NESTING BIRDS

Large trees located in the vicinity of the Project area potentially provide suitable nesting habitat for migratory birds. To avoid potentially significant impacts related to disturbance of nesting migratory birds, mitigation has been included to require that activities either occur outside of the nesting season, or to require that nests be buffered from construction activities until the nesting season is concluded. Impacts to migratory nesting birds are therefore *less than significant*.

COMMUNICATION TOWER BIRD STRIKES

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) almost 7 million birds are lost annually, as a result of collisions with lit communication towers in the United States. The USFWS has published guidance for communication tower siting, design and operations to help minimize or avoid impacts to birds. The most recent guidance, updated April 2018, can be found at <u>https://www.fws.gov/birds/management/projectassessment-tools-and-guidance/guidance-documents/communication-towers.php</u>. There are no existing large wetland preserves or major wildlife preserves in the immediate vicinity of the project site. However, the broader area is known to contain nesting and foraging habitat for both migratory birds and raptors, so presence of birds in the project vicinity is likely. Lighting on the tower itself and the installation of guy wires for support are the primary components of the proposed project that would potentially impact birds.

TOWER LIGHTING

Lighting for towers taller than 199 feet above ground level is required by the FAA to avoid aircraft accidents, but certain types of lighting may attract birds to the towers. According to USFWS Communication Tower Guidance, research has demonstrated that eliminating non-flashing lights on towers may reduce migratory bird collisions by as much as 70 percent. The lighting and marking standards were revised per the FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 70-7460-1L, effective September 2, 2018, to reduce impacts on migratory bird populations and minimize light impacts on adjacent communities. The latest lighting and marking standards issued by FAA have taken into account design features to reduce impact on migratory bird populations. The Project proposes utilizing L-810 low intensity lights at 30 flashes per minutes (FPM) (+/- 3 FPM), which is consistent with FAA guidelines and USFWS recommendations for operations of towers.

GUY WIRE COLLISIONS

The USFWS recommends that tower design using guy wires for support which are located in areas of known raptor concentration, should have daytime visual markers on the wires to prevent collisions by diurnally active species. Mitigation has been included to require that visual markers be included on the three sets of tower guy wires.

COMMUNICATION TOWER BIRD STRIKE CONCLUSION

Recent FAA Advisor Circulars have taken in to account best design features in lighting to reduce impacts to birds, while maintaining the safety functionality of the lighting system. The Project is consistent with the latest FAA lighting standards and design recommendations from USFWS. Mitigation has also been included to include visual

markers on guy wire to reduce the potential for daytime collisions. Impacts are *less than significant*.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

• Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials.

RADIO FREQUENCY (RF) AND SAFETY STANDARDS

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulates interstate and international communications by radio, television, wire, satellite and cable in all 50 states, the District of Columbia and U.S. territories. The FCC was established by the Communications Act of 1934 and operates as an independent U.S. government agency overseen by Congress.

The FCC has strict rules regarding public exposure to any radio transmissions, and has worked with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to scientifically measure the precise emissions in a downward direction of various antennas immediately beneath and at distances from the antenna, where people have access.. For an FM station on 88.9 MHz, the FCC has set a maximum exposure at head height (two meters above ground) to be 200 microwatt per square centimeter at any uncontrolled area. An uncontrolled area is an area in which the general public could potentially be exposed. There have been no formal or conclusive studies on the impact of radio wave exposure to human tissue and there is no proof of any harmful effects. In an abundance of caution, the FCC and EPA have worked together to set the maximum limit of 200 microwatt per square centimeter.

PROJECT IMPACTS

The proposed FM transmitters for this project will operate at about 88.9 MHz or about 900 kHz. The maximum power density of the proposed antenna will be 32.3 microwatts per square centimeter at head height, some 38.6 meters from the tower base. This amounts to a maximum exposure 83.85 percent below the maximum percentage allowed under the rules (200 microwatt per square centimeter). Additionally, the antenna would not be located in a public place. By locating the facility in an active agricultural field, the public is well protected by the proposed antenna's power density emissions.

As the proposed FM radio tower will be required to comply with the FCC guidelines, radiation levels are expected to be well below the standards. Compliance with established rules and regulations for worker safety and precautions will ensure exposure to RF emissions is not harmful. The impacts of radio frequency emission exposure from this project are *less than significant*.

As the proposed FM radio tower will be required to comply with the FCC guidelines, radiation levels are expected to be well below the standards. Compliance with established rules and regulations for worker safety and precautions will ensure exposure to RF emissions is not harmful. The impacts of radio frequency emission exposure from this project are *less than significant*.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION MEASURES

Falut Ce.

Mitigation Measures A-C are critical to ensure that identified significant impacts of the project are reduced to a level of less than significant. Pursuant to Section 15074.1(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, each of these measures must be adopted exactly as written unless both of the following occur: (1) A public hearing is held on the proposed changes; (2) The hearing body adopts a written finding that the new measure is equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and that it in itself will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment.

As the applicant, or applicant's representative, for this project, I acknowledge that project development creates the potential for significant environmental impact and agree to implement the mitigation measures listed below, which are intended to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Applicant <

Date: March 12, 2020

MITIGATION MEASURE A: COMPLIANCE WITH THE SSHCP

To compensate for impacts to approximately 0.8 acres of Valley Grassland and potential impacts associated with Swainson's Hawk and nesting raptors, the applicant shall obtain authorization through the SSHCP and conform with all applicable Avoidance and Minimization Measures (Appendix B), as well as payment of fees necessary to mitigate for impacts to species and habitat prior to construction.

MITIGATION MEASURE B: MIGRATORY BIRD NEST PROTECTION

To avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds the following shall apply:

- A. If construction activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) is to commence within 50 feet of nesting habitat between February 1 and August 31, a survey for active migratory bird nests shall be conducted no more than 14 day prior to construction by a qualified biologist.
- B. If active nest(s) are found in the survey area, a non-disturbance buffer, the size of which has been determined by a qualified biologist, shall be established and maintained around the nest to prevent nest failure. All construction activities shall be avoided within this buffer area until a qualified biologist determines that nestlings have fledged, or until September 1.

MITIGATION MEASURE COMPLIANCE

Comply with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for this project as follows:

- 1. The proponent shall comply with the MMRP for this project, including the payment of a fee to cover the Office of Planning and Environmental Review staff costs incurred during implementation of the MMRP. The MMRP fee for this project is \$2,600. This fee includes administrative costs of \$900.00.
- 2. Until the MMRP has been recorded and the administrative portion of the MMRP fee has been paid, no final parcel map or final subdivision map for the subject property shall be approved. Until the balance of the MMRP fee has been paid, no encroachment, grading, building, sewer connection, water connection or occupancy permit from Sacramento County shall be approved.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Based on this guidance, Sacramento County has developed the following Initial Study Checklist. The Checklist identifies a range of potential significant effects by topical area. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to impacts as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act as follows:

1 Potentially Significant indicates there is substantial evidence that an effect MAY be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant" entries an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. Further research of a potentially significant impact may reveal that the impact is actually less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

2 Less than Significant with Mitigation applies where an impact could be significant but specific mitigation has been identified that reduces the impact to a less than significant level.

3 Less than Significant or No Impact indicates that either a project will have an impact but the impact is considered minor or that a project does not impact the particular resource.

4

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
1. LAND USE - Would the project;			al estration of the second s		
 a. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose o avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect 	f		Х		The project is consistent with environmental policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, and Sacramento County Zoning Code.
b. Physically disrupt or divide an established community?			X		The project will not create physical barriers that substantially limit movement within or through the community.
2. POPULATION/HOUSING - Would the project	1				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of infrastructure)?			х		The proposed infrastructure project is intended to service existing or planned development and will not induce substantial unplanned population growth.
 Displace substantial amounts of existing peop or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? 	le			Х	The project will not result in the removal of existing housing, and thus will not displace substantial amounts of existing housing.
3. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the	project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or areas containing prime soils to uses not conducive to agricultural production?			X		The project site is designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance on the current Sacramento County Important Farmland Map published by the California Department of Conservation. The project will convert 0.5 acres of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses. This conversion of agricultural land does not exceed the significance threshold of 50 acres established by the Sacramento County General Plan.

Initial Study

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
b. Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract?			X		There is a Williamson Act contract in effect for the project site. The contract status is Active. The project does not conflict with the provisions of the Williamson Act. Refer to the Agricultural Resources discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.
c. Introduce incompatible uses in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses?			X		Though in an area where agricultural uses occur, the project will not substantially interfere with agricultural operations because approximately 0.5 acres of the 82 acre parcel will be required to install the radio tower, and upon installation, farming activities are compatible in the vicinity of the tower.
4. AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a. Substantially alter existing viewsheds such as scenic highways, corridors or vistas?				Х	The project does not occur in the vicinity of any scenic highways, corridors, or vistas.
b. In non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?			Х		It is acknowledged that aesthetic impacts are subjective and may be perceived differently by various affected individuals. Nonetheless, given the similar parcels sizes surrounding the proposed project, it is concluded that the project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the project site or vicinity.
c. If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				Х	The project is not located in an urbanized area.
d. Create a new source of substantial light, glare, or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			Х		The project will result in a new source of light, but will not result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Refer to the Aesthetics discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.
5. AIRPORTS - Would the project:					
a. Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip?				Х	The project occurs outside of any identified public or private airport/airstrip safety zones.

•

.

KXPR Radio Tower

.

			Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
b.	Expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise levels in excess applicable standards?	of				Х	The project occurs outside of any identified public or private airport/airstrip noise zones or contours.
C.	Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace b aircraft?	ie by			Х		The project is located in the vicinity of Mather Airport. Refer to the Airports discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.
d.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	a			Х		The project does not involve or affect air traffic movement.
6.	PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:				a da ser de apro-		
a.	Have an adequate water supply for full buildo of the project?	out			Х		The project will not result in increased demand for water supply.
b.	Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project	ct?				х	The project will not require wastewater services.
c.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitte capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	ed			х		The Kiefer Landfill has capacity to accommodate solid waste until the year 2050.
d.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the construction of new water supply or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	r r				Х	The project will not require construction or expansion of new water supply, wastewater treatment, or wastewater disposal facilities.
е.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities?	S			х		Project construction would not require the addition of new stormwater drainage facilities.

	Potentially	Less Than	Less Than	No Impact	Comments
	Significant	Significant with Mitigation	Significant	No impact	
f. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of electric or natural gas service?			х		Minor extension of utility lines would be necessary to serve the proposed project. Existing utility lines are located along existing roadways and other developed areas, and the extension of lines would take place within areas already proposed for development as part of the project. No significant new impacts would result from utility extension.
g. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of emergency services?			х		The project would incrementally increase demand for emergency services, but would not cause substantial adverse physical impacts as a result of providing adequate service.
 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public school services? 				Х	The project will not require the use of public school services.
 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of park and recreation services? 				Х	The project will not require park and recreation services.
7. TRANSPORTATION - Would the project:			ana ma magana		
a. Result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips that would exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County?			X		The project will not increase vehicle trips.
b. Result in a substantial adverse impact to access and/or circulation?			Х		The project will be required to comply with applicable access and circulation requirements of the County Improvement Standards and the Uniform Fire Code. Upon compliance, impacts are less than significant.
c. Result in a substantial adverse impact to public safety on area roadways?				X	No changes to existing access and/or circulation patterns would occur as a result of the project; therefore no impacts to public safety on area roadways will result.

- 1

x

٦

a

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
d.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			х		The project does not conflict with alternative transportation policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, with the Sacramento Regional Transit Master Plan, or other adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.
8,	AIR QUALITY - Would the project;		and the second states of			
a.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X		The project does not exceed the screening thresholds established by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District and will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment.
b.	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards?				Х	There are no sensitive receptors (i.e., schools, nursing homes, hospitals, daycare centers, etc.) adjacent to the project site.
C.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	1		Х		The project will not generate objectionable odors.
9.	NOISE - Would the project:				n an	
a.	Result in generation of a temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established by the local general plan, noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			Х		The project is not in the vicinity of any uses that generate substantial noise, nor will the completed project generate substantial noise. The project will not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of applicable standards.
b.	Result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?			X		Project construction will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This impact is less than significant due to the temporary nature of the these activities, limits on the duration of noise, and evening and nighttime restrictions imposed by the County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 6.68 of the County Code).

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
 Generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. 			X		The project will not involve the use of pile driving or other methods that would produce excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels at the property boundary.
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would	the project:				
 Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge? 			X		The project will not substantially increase water demand over the existing use
b. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project area and/or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			Х		The project does not involve any modifications that would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern and or/increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would lead to flooding.
 c. Develop within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map or within a local flood hazard area? 				Х	The project is not within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, nor is the project within a local flood hazard area.
d. Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain?				X	The project site is not within a 100-year floodplain.
e. Develop in an area that is subject to 200 year urban levels of flood protection (ULOP)?				X	The project is not located in an area subject to 200-year urban levels of flood protection (ULOP).
f. Expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			Х		The project will not expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.
g. Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?			X		The project does not propose any physical changes that would affect runoff from the site.

r

,

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
h. Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?			Х		Compliance with the Stormwater Ordinance and Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapters 15.12 and 14.44 of the County Code respectively) will ensure that the project will not create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality.
11. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:					
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving 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?			Х		Sacramento County is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Although there are no known active earthquake faults in the project area, the site could be subject to some ground shaking from regional faults. The Uniform Building Code contains applicable construction regulations for earthquake safety that will ensure less than significant impacts.
b. Result in substantial soil erosion, siltation or loss of topsoil?			X		Compliance with the County's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance will reduce the amount of construction site erosion and minimize water quality degradation by providing stabilization and protection of disturbed areas, and by controlling the runoff of sediment and other pollutants during the course of construction.
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, soil expansion, liquefaction or collapse?			X		The project is not located on an unstable geologic or soil unit.
d. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available?				Х	The project would not require wastewater services

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
e. Result in a substantial loss of an important mineral resource?			Х		The project is not located within an Aggregate Resource Area as identified by the Sacramento County General Plan Land Use Diagram, nor are any important mineral resources known to be located on the project site.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			Х		No known paleontological resources (e.g. fossil remains) or sites occur at the project location.
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project	t:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self- sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community?		X			The project site contains suitable habitat for raptors and migratory birds. Mitigation is included to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Refer to the Biological Resources discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities?			Х		No sensitive natural communities occur on the project site, nor is the project expected to affect natural communities off-site.
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on streams, wetlands, or other surface waters that are protected by federal, state, or local regulations and policies?			Х		No protected surface waters are located on the project site.
 Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species? 			Х		Resident and/or migratory wildlife may be displaced by project construction; however, impacts are not anticipated to result in significant, long-term effects upon the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, and no major wildlife corridors would be affected.
e. Adversely affect or result in the removal of native or landmark trees?				X	No native and/or landmark trees occur on the project site, nor is it anticipated that any native and/or landmark trees would be affected by off-site improvement required as a result of the project.

.1

٠

1

KXPR Radio Tower

a

٠

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
f. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?			X	<u> </u>	The project is consistent with local policies/ordinances protecting biological resources.
g. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, state or federal plan for the conservation of habitat?		Х			The project is within the Urban Development Area of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP). The project will need to comply with the applicable avoidance and minimization measures outlined in the SSHCP. Refer to the Biological Resources discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:	ng ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang a				
 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource? 				Х	No historical resources would be affected by the proposed project.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource?			Х		The Northern California Information Center was contacted regarding the proposed project. A record search indicated that the project site is not considered sensitive for archaeological resources.
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			Х		The project site is located outside any area considered sensitive for the existence of undiscovered human remains.
d. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?			Х		Notification pursuant to Public Resources Code 21080.3.1(b) was provided to the tribes and request for consultation was not received. Tribal cultural resources have not identified in the project area.
14. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - 1	Nould the pr	oject:			
a. Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X		The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.
b. Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?			Х		The project involves the installation of a radio tower, and associated radio frequencies. Refer to the Hazardous Materials section above.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			Х		The project site is not located within ¼ mile of an existing /proposed school.
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, resulting in a substantial hazard to the public or the environment?			х		The project is not located on a known hazardous materials site.
 e. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan? 			Х		The project would not interfere with any known emergency response or evacuation plan.
f. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to or intermixed with urbanized areas?			X		The project is within an urbanizing area of the unincorporated County and is located within the Local Responsibility Area according to the CalFire Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map (2007). Compliance with local Fire District standards and requirements ensures impacts are less than significant.
15. ENERGY – Would the project:					
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction?			Х		The radio tower will not require significant energy use for operational purposes for the tower itself or supporting facilities.
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			Х		The project will not interfere with goals for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

- 4

.4

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments			
16	16. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:								
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			Х		The project will not have the potential to interfere with the County meeting the goals of AB 32 (reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020); therefore, the climate change impact of the project is considered less than significant.			
b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?			Х		The project is consistent with County policies adopted for the purpose or reducing the emission of greenhouse gases.			

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

LAND USE CONSISTENCY	Current Land Use Designation	Consistent	Not Consistent	Comments
General Plan	General Agriculture	Х		
Community Plan	AG-160	Х		
Land Use Zone	AG-160	Х		Consistent upon issuance of a Use Permit.

KXPR Radio Tower

INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

Environmental Coordinator: Tim Hawkins Section Manager: Chris Pahule Project Leader: Julie Newton Office Manager: Belinda Wekesa Batts Administrative Support: Justin Maulit