Appendix A -- No. 7

PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Site name: Fairfield ILA

Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission

Prepared by
Level 3 Communications, LLC

Table of Contents

Tables, Figures, Photo Plates, and Attachment are located at the back of this report

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Attachment

Attachment A Methodologies, Algorithms, and Assumptions Used in the Air and Noise Analysis.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Facility Title:
Level 3 Long-Haul Network, Fairfield ILA

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
California Public Utilities Commission
Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 703-2782

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
Bill Vander Lyn, Level 3 Communications, LLC
6689 Owens Drive, Suite A, Pleasanton, CA 94588
(925) 398-3040

4. Facility Location:
The project site, 106 Railroad Avenue, is located in the City of Suisun City, County of Solano. The parcel measures 125-feet wide by 235-feet deep (0.68 acre) and is entirely developed, containing a prefabricated, six bay concrete building that encompasses 15,750 square feet. A concrete driveway with 22 parking spaces occupies the west side of the site. Access to the parcel is limited by a wood fence along the northern property boundary, chain-link fencing along the west boundary, and a gated access to the south. A concrete block structure is located in the parking lot along the west side of the building and contains bulk refuse receptacles (See Figure 1, Regional Map; Figure 2, Vicinity Map; Figure 3, Parcel Map; Figure 4, U.S.G.S. Quad Map; Figure 5, Surrounding Land Use Map; and Figure 6, Photo Key Map and referenced photos).

5. Proponent's Name and Address:
Level 3 Communications, LLC ("Level 3")
1450 Infinite Drive, Louisville, CO 80027
(303) 926-3000

6. General Plan Designation: Planned Unit Development (PUD)

7. Zoning: Commercial Service District (CS)

8. Description of Facility:
This checklist evaluates the design, construction, and operation of the Fairfield ILA. This facility, which will support the long-haul network, will be located outside utility corridors.

The Fairfield ILA will be constructed within an existing building located on a developed 0.68-acre site at 106 Railroad Avenue. The facility encompasses approximately 15,750 square feet of the parcel and requires demolition of five existing partition walls. The existing shell will remain intact with the new electronics installed within. A separate generator structure will be constructed at the northwest corner of the property utilizing another engineered portion of the existing concrete pad.

An In-line light Amplification station is required to receive signals and amplify the light power that comes into it before transmitting the signal along the fiber optic cable. Signal amplification capabilities are required approximately every 60 miles or less along the network.

The proposed ILA station will be engineered for the utilization of the available square footage. No prefabricated ILA huts will be used at this location.

All structures will arrive pre-assembled. No additional buildings will be constructed. Control and maintenance functions will occur within the proposed facilities. Parking space and a driveway providing access from Railroad Avenue exists to support site maintenance activities. Fencing around the ILA facility will be of chain link construction and will be eight feet tall. A locked gate will restrict access to the site.

The Fairfield ILA will require electricity and telephone. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are present. Normal electrical power will be provided, consisting of 400-amp, 480-volt, three-phase service. No water or sewer hookups are required because the site will be unmanned. Site grading is not anticipated nor will there be any net change in impervious surfaces. Thus, no changes in storm water drainage characteristics are anticipated. Fire protection equipment will be installed per local codes.

Figure 7 is a conceptual plot plan of the Fairfield ILA site showing required setbacks and locations of utility and vehicle access. The area bounded by the setbacks is the "development window" within which the ILA facility will be situated. The precise location of the ILA interior electronics will be determined during the engineering design phase of the project.

There will be no site development including no grading for placement of the generator shelter or for access and parking. Upgrading of the generator foundation will be engineered and completed prior to delivery of prefabricated components (i.e., shelter placement), placement of the fiber optic cable line, and installation of utility connections. Erection of any additional perimeter fencing will occur prior to all improvements. The fiber optic cable feed to the ILA will be from the railroad right-of-way along the north side of the site. The connection to the ILA facility will be installed at a depth of approximately 42 inches either by plowing in the conduit (which does not require a trench) or by digging a trench, laying the conduit, and back-filling. The five existing partition walls will be demolished. Walls from the building and some additional concrete removed for pad upgrade will require disposal. The estimated volume of demolition debris requiring disposal is 265 cubic yards. During construction, no off-site areas will be required for mobilization or parking of construction or worker vehicles.

One 300-kilowatt (kW), 449-horsepower (hp) diesel-powered generator will provide emergency power to the set of four ILA huts. The pre-cast concrete generator housing or shelter will be approximately 12 feet wide, 24 feet long (288 square feet) and 10 feet high. It will arrive assembled and be installed on a concrete foundation. Insulation will be provided as needed for noise abatement.

The generator will be mounted on a 1,000-gallon, double-walled, aboveground storage tank that is 13 feet long by 8 feet wide by 1 foot 9 inches high. The tank system design incorporates a high fuel alarm (local) and a tank rupture alarm (remote). The double-walled storage tank on which generator is mounted is designed to support the weight of the generator. This mounting is a common design for emergency generators (Rice, 1999).

During operation at 100-percent load, the 449-hp generator consumes approximately 22 gallons of diesel fuel per hour (gph). At 75 percent load, fuel consumption rate is 16.5 gph. During most of the 30 minutes of testing and maintenance run time each week, the generators will run at 50-percent load. However, for the purpose of this "worst-case" calculation, Level 3 assumes a 75-percent load and 30 hours of run time each year (i.e., 1/2-hour/week times 52 weeks, plus four hours contingency). Therefore, 30 hours per year multiplied by 16.5 gph equals 495 gallons of diesel fuel consumption per year for testing and maintenance. Testing of the emergency generator will be controlled remotely, and will not be part of site maintenance activities.

Level 3 will equip each generator with a spill tray beneath the filling port and a spill emergency response kit. The kit will consist of a 55-gallon drum containing oil-absorbing booms and pads, tarps, duct tape, and shovels. These materials will be placed near the filling port for immediate access should a release occur. A laminated placard listing the number of an emergency response contractor and appropriate spill-reporting procedures will be contained in the drum and will also be displayed near

the filling port. Should a release occur that Level 3 personnel could not manage, the emergency response contractor will be called.

In line with its commitment to environmental compliance, Level 3 will train technical staff regarding safety and spill-response procedures that should be implemented during diesel fuel deliveries. These written procedures will define the necessary steps for use and disposal of spill containment equipment located at the site. A Level 3 technician will accompany any third party contractor delivering fuel. Because the facilities are kept locked, the Level 3 technician will unlock/lock the security gate during ingress and egress. The technician will advise the contractor as to the location of the filling port for the fuel tank, describe the site safety requirements, observe the fueling process, and listen for the high fuel alarm. Should a release occur, the Level 3 technician will immediately initiate containment and cleanup procedures.

The ILA site will not be permanently staffed. The site will be visited approximately once a week or routine maintenance, data downloading, and fuel tank filling (assumed for analysis purposes to be 60 trips per year).

Current and potential cumulative projects in the vicinity of the proposed Fairfield ILA site are provided in Table 1. Criteria for inclusion of a project in Table 1 are as follows:

- Projects are within two miles of the site. In some cases these projects are in more than one jurisdiction;
- Projects are scheduled for construction from one year before to one year after the "construction window" for the Level 3 facilities, or between March 1999 to March 2003;
- Current projects include those which have been approved by the lead agency and have had their environmental document signed, approved, and/or certified; and
- Potential projects are those that have been formally submitted to the lead agency and which are defined well enough to discern where they are, what they are (type of land use), and how big they are (acres, dwelling units, square footage, etc.). Although these submitted, but not approved projects are considered "speculative" under CEQA, they give an indication of potential future development around the facility site.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The Southern Pacific Railroad borders the subject parcel to the north and Railroad Avenue provides access from the south. The parcel to the west in this commercial development is vacant while the parcel to the east is occupied by a prefabricated concrete building that abuts the building on the subject parcel. South of the subject parcel across Railroad Avenue is a single-family home development known as California Tapestry. Utility services occur in easements along Railroad Avenue.

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The site is located within the jurisdiction of Suisun City. It is also located within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).

A Use Permit will be required. Following application for the permit, the City determines if it should be processed administratively or should go to the Planning Commission. If processed administratively, the public is notified and can comment but a public hearing is not held. If processed through the Planning Commission, a public hearing is held. For both procedures, design review by the City planners is required before project approval. After approval of the project and prior to commencement of construction, a building permit/certificate of occupancy is issued and construction may commence.

Specific local policies relevant to each of the sixteen environmental impact issue areas are provided in Table 2. When there are no relevant and applicable policies, this fact is stated with an explanation. Sources for the policies are provided at the end of the listing.

PROPONENT'S DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial assessment, the proposed facility would not have a significant effect on the environment because the Environmental Commitments described below would be incorporated into the design and construction of the facility. A Negative Declaration would apply to this facility.

Environmental Commitments
The proposed facility is an element of the project addressed in an Application for Modification of an existing Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) (Decision No. 98-03-066). That CPCN was supported by a Mitigated Negative Declaration that included mitigation measures to be implemented in the design, construction, and operation of the previously approved telecommunications facilities within existing utility rights-of-way. Level 3 has incorporated all mitigation measures outlined in the previous Decision into its design of the project addressed in this Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA). Therefore, the actions previously imposed as mitigation measures in the CPCN Decision are now Environmental Commitments for the facility addressed herein. In summary, these Environmental Commitments include:

- Measures to mitigate potential impacts to various resources;
- Commitment to obtain all required local, regional, state, and federal approvals and permits required for construction and operation of the project;
- Coordination with local and resource management agencies;
- Notifications of adjacent property owners;
- Coordination with other utility projects in the area; and
- Documentation and reporting of compliance.

A complete list of mitigation measures from the previous Negative Declaration is provided in Appendix B of the PEA.

Mitigation Measures
No Mitigation Measures are recommended for the Fairfield ILA site. All potential impacts can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of Level 3's Environmental Commitments.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

Setting

The site is within an existing commercial area on one side of Railroad Avenue. The visual character is typical of a commercial office complex, with buildings made of standard materials and similar to other nearby structures. A housing development is located across Railroad Avenue from the site. This residential area is surrounded by a 15-foot-high concrete wall that shields most of the residences from views of the commercial structures on Railroad Avenue.

The ILA will be established within a 15,750-square-foot building. Parking for 22 vehicles is provided along one side of the building.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would be located within an existing building that is adjacent to commercial businesses. As a result, it would not have any effect on a scenic vista.

b)	Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Because the project will be located within an existing building, it will not damage any scenic resources.

c)	Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Because the project will be located within an existing building, it will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

d)	Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project will be located within an existing building in an established commercial area. The outside light to be provided would be a small porch light at each structure entrance. This would not be a new source of substantial light or glare and would not adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The site consists of an existing warehouse building and a parking area. The site is not in an area currently used for farming and the area has not been used for farming in the recent past. The site is not in an area designated as prime or unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. The site is not designated by the local jurisdiction for agriculture, and it is not in a special agricultural preservation district. Land use at the site is designated as PUD Commercial and the site is zoned CS: Commercial Service District (Suisun City, 1992).

Evaluation

a)	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Use of the site for an ILA would not convert any farmland to non-agricultural uses.

b)	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The construction of an ILA would not result in growth-inducing effects or other off-site changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

c)	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The construction of an ILA would not result in growth-inducing effects or other off-site changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

III. AIR QUALITY

Throughout California, the fiber optic cable line will be installed along existing utility corridors in support of the Long-Haul network. In the City of Suisun, an ILA station referred to as the Fairfield ILA will be constructed outside of a utility corridor in support of the Long-Haul network. To minimize potential environmental impacts, the ILA facility will be constructed in an existing 15,750 square foot building at a previously developed site. The ILA facility is the subject of this air quality checklist analysis. The ILA facility will tie into the fiber optic line along the ROW.

The Fairfield ILA Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately

0.7 acre. Project activities include site preparation to construct the generator pad, construction of the ILA equipment supports in the existing building, installation of equipment, trenching for the installation of the innerduct, automated testing of the emergency generators, and approximately weekly vehicular trips to the site for maintenance and data logging. Site development will not be required as this site will have the equipment installed within an existing building (except for the emergency generator) and utilize existing parking areas.

Table 3 provides relevant information on construction and operation activities contributing to emissions of pollutants at the Fairfield ILA. Additional technical information used in the air quality analysis is provided in Attachment A. Included in Table 3 are the following construction-related items:

- Estimate of one-way commuting distance (miles) that members of the construction crews will travel to the construction site and numbers of such trips;
- Equipment (e.g., graders, dump trucks, excavators, and water trucks) that will be used at the site. Included are the size and number of units of each type of equipment, and the numbers of hours per day and days that each piece of equipment will operate;
- Material delivery vehicles (e.g., concrete trucks) are represented in terms of number of trips per day, total number of trips, and number of one-way miles traveled; and
- The amount of material (soil) that will be disturbed during trenching operations at the proposed site as well as during installation of the innerduct between the ROW and the site.

A key assumption implicit in the estimation of fugitive dust and emissions construction equipment is that only one piece of equipment will operate at any one time. Off-site emissions due to workers commuting to and from the site, equipment delivery, and other on-road vehicles will occur simultaneously (e.g., during the same day) with emissions from on-site construction equipment. Therefore, maximum daily emissions are determined by the summation of emissions from the highest emitting piece of construction equipment and on-road emissions that occur on the same day as that piece of construction equipment is operating.

Operational parameters specified in Table 3 include specification of the 300 kW size of the emergency standby generator, approximate 30-minute duration of its weekly test (conservatively estimated as 30 hours/year for emissions estimation), and parameters for the weekly vehicular trip to the ILA site associated with site maintenance and data logging. Normal operation will generate at most one vehicle trip to and from the site on a weekly basis (conservatively estimated as 60 trips/year for emissions estimation). The testing of the emergency generator will be triggered automatically. Operating equipment at the site will be powered by electricity from the utility power grid.

Table 3 shows the emission factors and other parameters used to calculate exhaust and fugitive PM_{10} emissions for mobile equipment (U.S. EPA, 1996). Construction and operation emission thresholds for NO_x, VOC, PM_{10}, SO_x, and CO are listed in Table 3, as provided by the BAAQMD. This agency is responsible for management of air emissions in the San Francisco Bay Area where the Fairfield ILA site resides. In addition to the Fairfield ILA, one other PEA facility, the Emeryville ILA D-Node, is located in the San Francisco Bay Area and is under the jurisdiction of the BAAQMD.

Setting

The project site is located in the City of Suisun in Solano County. The county is within the San Francisco Bay Air Basin and is currently designated as a nonattainment area for state and national one-hour average ozone standards and for state respirable particulate matter ("PM_{10}") standards (California EPA, 1998). There are residences near the site and a number of commercial establishments located adjacent to the site (Figure 8). The distance to the closest sensitive receptor from the nearest boundary of the site is approximately 115 feet.

Based on monitoring data collected within Solano County during the three-year period from 1995-1997, maximum ozone concentrations exceeded the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone (0.12 parts

per million for one hour) on an average of approximately 1 day per year. The same maximum concentrations exceeded the more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standard (0.09 parts per million for one hour) on an average of approximately 10 days per year (California EPA, 1996 - 1998). The ozone problem in the Western Solano County portion of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is primarily due to mobile sources (motor vehicles) and occasionally from transport of pollutants from the Sacramento metropolitan area.

Ambient PM_{10} concentrations in Solano County did not exceed the 24-hour-average National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 150 micrograms per cubic meter for the years 1995 - 1997. However, the measured concentrations exceeded the more stringent 24-hour-average California Ambient Air Quality Standard of 50 micrograms per cubic meter roughly 3 percent of the time (California EPA, 1996 - 1998). The PM_{10} problem in the Western Solano County portion of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is primarily due to road dust and farming/construction activities (BAAQMD, 1996). The urbanized portion of the Bay Area is also designated as a "maintenance" area for the national carbon monoxide standard (California EPA, 1998), which indicates that it had once been designated as a nonattainment area for that standard.

The Federal Clean Air Act and California Clean Air Act require plans to be developed for areas designated as nonattainment of the national and state ozone standards, including strategies for attaining the standards. No plans are required for areas designated as nonattainment of state PM_{10} standards. Three air quality plans apply to the project vicinity, two related to ozone and one related to the national carbon monoxide standard. These plans are the *Ozone Maintenance Plan* (BAAQMD, 1994a), which was developed to ensure continued attainment of the national ozone standard; the Bay Area *'97 Clean Air Plan* (BAAQMD, 1997), which was developed to meet planning requirements related to the state ozone standard; and the *Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan* (BAAQMD, 1994b), which was developed to ensure continued attainment of the national carbon monoxide standard. The *Ozone Maintenance Plan* is currently undergoing revision in response to United States Environmental Protection Agency's decision to reinstate the Bay Area's previous nonattainment designation for the national ozone standard.

The regional agency responsible for developing these plans is the BAAQMD. BAAQMD is also the agency with permit authority over most types of stationary sources in San Francisco Bay Area. BAAQMD exercises permit authority through its *Rules and Regulations*. Both federal and state ozone plans rely heavily upon stationary source control measures set forth in BAAQMD's *Rules and Regulations*. The overall stationary source control program that is embodied by the BAAQMD *Rules and Regulations* has been developed such that new stationary sources can be allowed to operate in the Bay Area without obstructing the goals of the regional air quality plans. To accomplish this objective, many new stationary sources are required to install Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and to provide offsets at a greater than 1:1 ratio in order to secure a permit to operate from the BAAQMD. Other stationary sources have been deemed too minor to require a permit, BACT, or offsets. For example, and as applicable to the Fairfield ILA site, BAAQMD Regulation 1, Rule 1-110.2, excludes emergency generators used solely as an emergency standby source of power from all BAAQMD regulations, including the requirement to secure a permit to operate.

In contrast to the ozone plans, the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan relies heavily on mobile source control measures. Since the project, once constructed, would not generate any significant mobile source emissions, it would have no effect on continued attainment of the national carbon monoxide standard.

General Conformity requirements (40 CFR Part 93, July 1998) do not apply to this project since it does not involve a federal action such as the use of federal land or the need to acquire a federal permit for the site.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

Site construction parameters affecting emissions from mobile sources and the emergency generator, and the resulting emissions are estimated in Table 3. These resulting emissions are well-within regulatory thresholds (discussed further in Section III(b) below). These emissions are, therefore, in compliance with the applicable air quality plan.

Since the site will use an existing building and associated paved access roads and driveways, grading activities and travel of heavy equipment over temporary roads will not be necessary; as such, fugitive dust will not be generated in a significant amount during the construction phase (Table 3). The only expected construction activity at this site is the preparation of a 300 square foot area for the emergency generator enclosure. Fugitive dust generated will vary in amount from day to day, depending on the level and type of activity (e.g., trenching, grading, and vehicular traffic bringing materials to the site), the silt content of the soil (during trenching activities), and the weather. Fugitive dust generated will be controlled in a manner consistent with the applicable air quality plans by implementing effective dust control measures throughout the construction phase. Long-term fugitive dust emissions associated with facility operation will be negligible.

The project will include use of existing on-site paved roads and driveways to provide access directly to the building and equipment.

Generator testing and the visiting technician vehicle will contribute operational air emissions as shown in Table 3. Normal use of the standby engine would include weekly tests of approximately 30 minutes in duration. Under Regulation 1, Rule 1-110.2, this engine would not require Level 3 to secure a BAAQMD permit for its use. This exclusion applies to emergency generators not used in connection with any utility voluntary electricity demand reduction program.

Normal operations at the site will generate approximately one vehicle trip to and from the site each week by a technician. The project will generate so little traffic on a long-term basis that none of the measures included in the *Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan* will apply.

Site Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3 will notify the BAAQMD prior to project construction that an emergency generator would be located at the project site and would not be used in connection with any utility voluntary electricity demand reduction program.

As described under III(b) below, Level 3 will also implement fugitive dust control measures to control PM_{10} emissions during construction work.

b)	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

As discussed above, the Fairfield ILA Site lies in an area designated as nonattainment of the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and the State standard for PM_{10}.

Estimates of construction-related engine emissions are shown in Table 3. These emissions are small, and are less than significant because the BAAQMD has no thresholds of significance for construction emissions.

Fugitive dust emissions during site construction activities are also shown in Table 3. There are no numerical thresholds for fugitive dust (PM_{10}) from construction activities. Instead, for construction-phase impacts, BAAQMD recommends that significance should be based on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented (BAAQMD, 1996). Level 3 will implement a comprehensive series of dust control measures to manage fugitive dust during construction.

Mobile source emissions associated with the facility operation would be negligible because the site would be unmanned and routine motor vehicle activity would result only from weekly site visits to check on the computers, download information, and test-run the emergency generator. Since the project would generate essentially no traffic, vehicular emissions would not approach the 550 pounds per day screening threshold recommended by BAAQMD and therefore the project would not be a significant effect on local carbon monoxide concentrations.

Operational emissions from the 449 hp 300 kw emergency standby engine are exempt from emission thresholds by BAAQMD Regulation 9, Rule 8, which exempts emergency stand by generators.

The weekly test of the standby engine would last approximately one-half hour. Emissions on a given day when the engine would undergo such a test are shown in Table 3. These emissions estimates were made using published emission factors for diesel industrial engines (U.S. EPA, 1996). The emergency standby engine would operate under the permit exemption provisions of BAAQMD Regulation 1 Rule 110.2 and Regulation 9 Rule 8.

Site Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3 will implement a construction-phase dust abatement program based *CEQA Guidelines, Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans* (BAAQMD, 1996) which will include the following:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites;
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites; and
- Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

c)	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal and state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

The Fairfield ILA site is one of two PEA sites in the San Francisco Bay Air Basin under the jurisdiction of the BAAQMD (the other being the Emeryville ILA D-Node). Potential project total construction emissions were analyzed for the possibility of simultaneous construction at both of these sites. The same thresholds apply to assessment of total project emissions as were used to evaluate emissions from individual project sites. These emissions estimates are shown in Table 4. As was also the case for the analysis of emis-

sions from the Fairfield ILA, the key assumption is made that no more than one piece of heavy equipment will operate at any one time at a site. Maximum total daily emissions are, therefore, those associated with use of the most polluting piece of equipment at each of the sites.

Simultaneous construction at both sites will not exceed the annual or daily numerical thresholds (Table 4), as BAAQMD does not have thresholds of significance for construction emissions. These emissions will be well below the recommended BAAQMD screening significance threshold for vehicular emissions. Therefore, the potential cumulative impacts of the two sites on air quality in the San Francisco Bay Air Basin will not be significant.

Because project construction will affect an area of less than the total area of the 0.7-acre site, surrounding uses will be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "Conceptual Plot Plan"). This buffer will help minimize the possibility that the project will cause a cumulatively significant short-term PM_{10} impact from simultaneous and unrelated construction projects taking place within the same general area.

Total emissions from testing and maintaining the emergency generators at both PEA sites in the BAAQMD jurisdiction are exempt from offset requirements because the emissions from each generator are exempt. Emissions that are exempt from regulatory requirements are considered to have impacts that are less than significant.

Ozone impacts are the result of the cumulative emissions from all sources in the county and transport from outside. The project's small incremental contribution to the total emissions on the regional ozone and PM_{10} concentrations will not be cumulatively considerable. The emissions from construction operations of the Fairfield ILA would be so small compared to the emissions in the San Francisco Air Basin as to assure that there will be no cumulative considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. All but the largest individual sources emit ROCs and NO_x in amounts too small to make a measurable effect on ambient ozone concentrations.

d)	Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities that house children, elderly, and ill members of the population, such as schools, day-care centers, hospitals, retirement homes, hospices, and residences. The nearest existing sensitive receptor to the proposed ILA site is a house located approximately 115 feet from the site boundary (Figure 8).

Project construction would affect an area much smaller than the 0.7-acre site; therefore, receptors associated with surrounding uses would be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "Conceptual Plot Plan"). This buffer, along with the low levels of construction emissions, would prevent substantial pollutant concentrations from reaching sensitive receptors. Through application of fugitive dust control measures, these emissions will be kept below a level of significance.

During construction, site access will be easy and direct. Construction vehicles will not block traffic on Railroad Avenue, Brookside Drive, or other streets in the area for any significant period of time. Thus, emissions from idling vehicles in the vicinity of the sensitive receptors will be minimal.

The emergency generator will produce operation emissions during testing. Because the generator will be tested only approximately 30-minutes per week, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e)	Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The only potential odor that may be associated with site construction activities at the Fairfield ILA site will be diesel engine exhaust. The low level of construction activity would not produce enough exhaust to affect the offsite public. Similarly, testing of the emergency generator at the ILA site for no more than one half hour per week will not produce sufficient exhaust nor odor to be objectionable to a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Setting

The proposed Fairfield ILA site is located in a commercial building in Suisun City. The parcel is 125- by 235-feet or approximately 29,375 square feet. The building occupies 15,750 square feet with the remainder of the parcel covered by a parking lot with 22 spaces. Vegetation on the site includes nine Eucalyptus trees planted along the western edge of the site and various ornamental shrubs planted in the front of the building. A vacant lot abuts the property to the west. This undeveloped parcel is a disked field dominated by annual grasses and forbs including bristly ox-tounge (*Picris echioides*), soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceous*) and star thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*). There are no sensitive biological resources on or adjacent to this site.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Prior to conducting a site visit, the California Natural Diversity Database was searched for occurrence records of special status biological resources on the Fairfield North and Fairfield South quadrangle maps (California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999). Although three special status species were identified during this search, none is likely to occur at the site because of the lack of appropriate habitat (Table 5).

The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species identified in local, state or federal plans including the California Native Plant Society listings, California Fish and Game, or Endangered Species Act.

b)	Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not have any impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local, regional, state, or federal regulations. The site is completely developed and is surrounded by development on two sides. The disked field and Union Pacific Railroad ROW on the remaining two sides of the site do not support any wetlands or other waters of the United States.

c)	Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not have any adverse effects on federally protected wetlands or waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The are no wetlands or waters of the United States on or adjacent to the site (Figure 10).

d)	Would the proposal 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?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. In addition the project will not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. An 8- to 10-foot tall fence currently surrounds the site.

e)	Would the proposal conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation ordinances. No trees would be removed as a result of the project and, if removed, none of the trees would qualify as significant or heritage status under the Suisun City tree preservation policy.

f)	Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

A regional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) is currently being developed for Solano County; however, the project would not conflict with the plan in any way. The HCP will cover the service area of the Solano County Irrigation District, which includes the western portion of the County including Fairfield and Suisun Cities. No other conservation plans are applicable to the site (Beaver, 1999).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The ILA site is located in Suisun, Solano County, near the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and Laurel Creek. The parcel contains a recently built commercial/warehouse structure and the rest of the parcel is paved.

The Patwin occupied the west side of the southern Sacramento River Valley from Princeton in the north to Suisun Bay in the south. Their territory included a strip on the east side of the river between Princeton and the mouth of the Feather River. South of the Feather River on the west side, their were no permanent settlements. This area was likely used by the Patwin and neighboring groups to the east, the Nisenan and the Miwok. The western boundary was on the eastern slopes of the Coast Range mountains. The Patwin spoke a Wintuan language and are also known as the Southern Wintuan. Wintuan is part of the Penutian language stock or family.

The Patwin political unit was the tribelet, which controlled access to the resources of a defined territory. There was one primary and several satellite villages in each tribelet territory. Each village had a chief who organized economic and ceremonial activities. The chief coordinated procurement of resources from the various fishing and hunting areas and tree groves within the territory. The chief determined when ceremonies should be held and which villages should be invited. Villages had residential structures, a ceremonial dance house, a sweat house, and a menstrual hut. All structures were semi-subterranean and earth-covered.

Salmon and other river resources were important foods. Salmon and sturgeon were caught in weirs and nets. Smaller fish such as perch, chub, sucker, hardhead, pike, trout, and steelhead were netted. Ducks, turtles, and freshwater mussels were also obtained from the river. Large terrestrial animals were hunted, including deer, elk, pronghorn, and bear. Seeds from sunflower, clover, bunchgrass, wild oat, and others, were collected from the plains west of the river. They were parched or dried and then ground into a meal. Acorns were an important storable food resource. Access to oak groves was controlled by the tribelet. A wide variety of bulbs, roots, and berries were collected seasonally.

Baskets were an important part of subsistence technology and were used in food collection, preparation, serving, and storage. Netting and cordage were used in hunting and fishing, rabbitskin robes were worn or used as blankets, and cured animal hides were used as bedding, clothing, and floor mats. Tools were made of bone, wood and stone. Acorns were processed with mortar and pestle. Mortars were usually made of stone, but along the river, where stone was not available, wooden mortars were used. Arrow points, drills, and spearheads were made from obsidian and chert. Tule balsa boats were used in rivers and marshes. Obsidian, shell beads, salt, and bows were obtained in trade with other groups.

After the Spanish arrived in the area in the late eighteenth century, Patwin were taken to the San Francisco Mission and San Jose Mission. Later, Mission Sonoma was built in 1823 closer to Patwin territory. Patwin population was severely reduced (up to 75 percent) as a result of a malarial epidemic in 1833 and a smallpox epidemic in 1837. Mexicans and Americans took over much of Patwin territory in the 1830s and 1840s. The few surviving Patwin in the American period after 1848 worked on ranches as laborers and became partly assimilated into Euro-American culture (Johnson, 1978).

Evaluation

a)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The protocols contained in Level 3's *Long Haul Fiber Optics Project Cultural Resources Procedures* (Par-

sons Brinckerhoff Network Services, 1999), requiring records searches and field survey, where appropriate, were followed as summarized below. A technical report, providing more information on the results of the records search and field surveys has been prepared (Mason, 1999b).

Level 3 archaeologists requested a records search for the proposed Fairfield ILA site, and the lands within a one-half mile radius, from the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park. The search had two objectives: (1) to determine whether previous archaeological investigations have been conducted in the project area, and (2) to provide information on known historic sites or culturally sensitive areas on and in the vicinity of the proposed ILA Facility. The records search was conducted by Information Center staff who also checked the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Historic Property Data File for Solano County, which includes the National Register of Historic Places (listings and eligibility determinations), California Points of Historical Interest, and California Historical Landmarks.

In addition, the Level 3 Team sent a letter dated September 3, 1999 to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requesting a search of the NAHC Sacred Lands file and identification of a contact person or persons within NAHC for follow-on contact/consultation (Mason, 1999a). The response, dated September 17, 1999, indicated that the NAHC search revealed no site-specific information on Sacred Lands (McNulty, 1999). The letter cautioned that absence of information did not necessarily indicate the absence of cultural resources. A list of Native American contacts that might serve as sources of additional information was also provided. Level 3 has followed up on this response from NAHC by sending letters to NAHC-identified Native American contacts residing in Solano County, notifying them of the Level 3 project activities and requesting information they might have on sacred lands. Any response indicating the possible presence of Sacred Lands will be followed up with a detailed, site-specific evaluation utilizing the expertise of the relevant Native American contacts. The results of this effort are fully documented, as appropriate, in the supporting technical report (Mason, 1999b).

The results of the records CHRIS search (File No. 99-572, California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Center, 1999) showed that the property had been previously surveyed for historic resources. Currently, there is no exposed ground surface on the parcel where a field survey could be undertaken. The structure on the project parcel is not eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources. It is not associated with significant historic events or important persons, does not have distinctive architectural characteristics, nor does it have the potential to yield information important in history. In addition, the structure is less than 50 years old.

b)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The records search from the Northwest Information Center showed that the property had been previously surveyed for archaeological resources. The results of the records search indicated that there are no archaeological sites recorded within one half mile of the project area. Currently, there is no exposed ground surface on the parcel where a field survey could be undertaken. The facility will be installed inside the existing building (California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Center, 1999).

c)	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

As mapped by Koenig (1963), the project site is underlain by Quaternary alluvial fan deposits (unit Qf). No fossil site is recorded in the archives of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Pa-

leontology Section or the University of California Museum of Paleontology as occurring in this rock unit at the project site or elsewhere in the Fairfield North 7.5-minute quadrangle. Moreover, no fossil vertebrate site is reported as occurring in this rock unit in the immediate project site vicinity by Jefferson (1991a, 1991b). However, previously recorded fossil sites reported by Jefferson (1991b) as occurring in the northern San Joaquin Valley and having yielded the fossilized remains of extinct late Pleistocene (Ice Age) land mammal species are in areas mapped as being underlain by alluvial fan deposits (see Rogers, 1966). These fossil occurrences indicate that there is a potential for late Pleistocene continental vertebrate fossil remains occurring at the project site.

While fossils have been recorded from the formation that underlies the vicinity of the project, the probability of finding fossils during ILA construction is low because of the nature of the construction activities (mainly shallow trenching) that will be employed at the site. Level 3's environmental commitment to performing paleontological monitoring during construction will allow for identification and recovery of any fossils that might be unearthed.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitment: Construction-related earth moving will be monitored by a qualified vertebrate paleontologist or a qualified paleontologic construction monitor to allow for the recovery of larger fossil remains at newly discovered fossil sites, and fossiliferous rock samples will be recovered and processed to allow for the recovery of smaller fossil remains. Monitoring will begin once earth moving is below any artificial fill and topsoil. All recovered fossil remains will be fully treated (prepared, identified by knowledgeable paleontologists, curated, catalogued) and, along with associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data, placed in a recognized museum repository. The paleontologist will prepare a final report of findings that includes an inventory of recovered fossil remains. These measures would be in compliance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995, 1996) guidelines for the management of paleontologic resources and for the museum acceptance of a monitoring program fossil collection.

d)	Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The CHRIS records search provided no evidence of the presence of human remains (California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Center, 1999). If suspected human remains are encountered during construction, operations will stop until the proper officials have been notified, the find evaluated, any mitigation recommendations implemented, and Level 3 has been cleared to resume construction in the area of the find. The procedures to be followed are described in detail in Level 3's *Long-Haul Fiber Optics Project Cultural Resources Procedures* (Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services, 1999:25-39), approved by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Setting

The site lies in a relatively flat area in the City of Suisan. Suisan is located in a geologically active area, with several active faults in the vicinity. The site vicinity is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone, or landslide, liquefaction, subsidence geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973, 1999). Erosion activity is moderate. The soils are highly expansive.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of 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 Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic-related groundshaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone, or landslide or liquefaction geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973, 1999). However, the project site is located in a seismically active area. The project site area can experience moderate magnitude groundshaking from nearby active fault systems (i.e., faults exhibiting displacement within the last 11,000 years) (CDMG, 1994). The major active faults in the vicinity of the project site are the Green Valley-Concord, Clayton - Marsh Creek, Hayward, and San Andreas faults (CDMG, 1994). The Green Valley-Concord fault is closest to the project site at approximately 5 miles (Blake, 1988). These faults can produce a maximum earthquake magnitude of approximately 6.9, 6.9, 6.4, and 7.8, respectively (CDMG, 1996). A 10% probability of peak ground accelerations of 40% to 50% g in 50 years is expected in the site vicinity (CDMG, 1996). As part of the Proponent's environmental commitment to this project, any potential seismic hazard would be minimized by compliance with the California seismic code standards and applicable local building and seismic codes. Because of Proponent's environmental commitment to this project and because the facility will be unmanned, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects attributable to these potential geologic hazards. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b)	Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is nearly flat and paved, and is located in an area of moderate erosion activity (CDMG, 1973). The existing building at the site would be used to house the terminal facility. Therefore, substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would not occur as a result of the project.

c).	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is relatively flat, and the geologic units and soils on the site are not unstable. The existing building at the site would be used to house the ILA facility. Therefore, the minimal plowing or trenching from the

street to the existing building for the fiber optic cable would not result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

d)	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The area in which the site is located has moderately expansive soils (CDMG, 1973). As part of the Proponent's environmental commitment to this project, the Proponent would minimize any potential impacts associated with these soils through compliance with structural and design regulations (i.e., compliance with the Uniform Building Code, and all local design, construction, and safety standards). Because of the Proponent's environmental commitment to this project and because the site is unmanned substantial risk to life or property would be created. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e)	Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Because the ILA facility would not be occupied and does not require water or sewer service, septic tanks, or alternative wastewater disposal is not required. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Setting

No indications of potential hazardous materials or storage were found in database searches (Vista Information Solutions, *California Site Assessment,* 1999) and during a site visit. There are no schools within the vicinity of the site. There are no airports in the vicinity of the site and the site is not located within any airport safety zone.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The 1,000-gallon, double-walled, aboveground storage tank containing diesel fuel would be located on site to supply an emergency generator. This tank would comply with all federal, state, and local regulations for fuel storage, including a double-walled tank, overfill protection, vapor emissions, containment and notification. Fuel deliveries would comply with spill protection and off-loading regulations. Waste generated by equipment maintenance would be disposed of off-site in accordance with all applicable regulations. The generator and storage tank would be located inside an equipment enclosure within a fenced compound that will be locked to provide security.

b)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in an aboveground double-wall storage tank, with monitoring, alarm, and leak containment features. The tank would provide hazard containment against reasonably foreseeable upset and accidents. The tank would be located inside an equipment enclosure within a fenced compound that will be locked to provide security.

c)	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

No existing school or proposed school is located within one-quarter mile of the site.

d)	Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not be located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites (Vista Information Solutions, *California Site Assessment,* 1999).

e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

g)	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Development of this site would not alter emergency response or emergency evacuation routes. Roadways would not be blocked either during construction or operation.

h)	Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The proposed structure would be located in an urbanized area zoned CS – Commercial Service District. The structure is not located in the vicinity of any wildland areas. Generators would be equipped with spark arrestors to further reduce the potential for loss, injury, or death involving fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Setting

The site is not located in an area that contributes to groundwater recharge. The site is located in a 100-year floodplain (Figure 9, Vista Information Systems, NEPA Checklist, 1999). The site is not located in an area that would be subject to inundation as a result of dam failure, tsunami, or seiche.

The Fairfield ILA site is not anticipated to significantly modify drainage of stormwater from the site. The site includes a 15,750 square foot building and the remainder of the site is paved. Construction proposed herein will not increase impermeable surface or alter existing drainage. However, any additional stormwater drainage measures that may be included in the ILA facility will be installed in accordance with applicable Solano County codes.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: The following actions will be taken to ensure that hydrology/water quality impacts are minimized during construction and operation of the Fairfield site. As appropriate, Level 3 will implement the following measures to avoid and minimize effects on any nearby aquatic environments. Appendix E identifies the documents and practices in which these measures will be specified.

- Bore under sensitive habitats when practicable;
- Implement erosion control measures during construction;
- Remove cover vegetation as close to the time of construction as practicable;
- Confine construction equipment and associated activities to the construction corridor;
- Prohibit refueling of construction equipment will take place within 100 feet of an aquatic environment;
- Comply with state, federal, and local permits;
- Perform proper sediment control;
- Prepare and implement a spill prevention and response plan;
- Remove all installation debris, construction spoils, and miscellaneous litter for proper offsite disposal; and
- Complete post-construction vegetation monitoring and supplemental revegetation where needed.

A Notification of Intent (NOI) will be submitted to the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board and the State Water Resources Control Board for construction of the Fairfield site under the *General Storm Water Permit to Discharge Storm Water Associated With Construction Activity.* A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared and will include the following: 1) Project Description; 2) Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Storm Water Pollution Prevention; 3) Inspection, Maintenance, and Record Keeping; and 4) Training.

Although the area of disturbed ground on the Fairfield site will be less than five acres, and will therefore be less than the minimum size requirement for a SWPPP, the cumulative area of the total ILA, 3R, Terminal, and Distribution Node sites associated with this project is greater than five acres. Accordingly, an NOI will be submitted, and a SWPPP will be prepared.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project violate any water qualiy standards or waste discharge requirements?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The proposed project would not discharge substances that could contaminate water. Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in a 1,000-gallon, double-walled, aboveground storage tank, with monitoring and leak containment features. The tank would provide hazard containment against reasonably foreseeable upset and accidents. Wastes generated by equipment maintenance would be disposed of off-site in accordance with all applicable regulations.

b)	Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project will not extract groundwater, therefore, groundwater supplies will not be depleted, nor will the project interfere with groundwater recharge. The primary areas of groundwater recharge in Solano County are located in the hills and mountains in the western portion of the County (Solano County Land Use and Circulation Element, 1997).

c)	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because it will be placed inside an existing building.

d)	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because it will be placed inside an existing building.

e)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not create or contribute runoff water because the facility will be placed inside and existing building. Existing site drainage will not be altered.

f)	Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

No impacts to water quality are expected as a result of this project. Because the facility will be placed in an existing building within a developed commercial area, the project would not result in polluted runoff, nor generate wastewater, nor discharge substances that could contaminate water.

g)	Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not include housing. The project is located within a 100-year floodplain (Vista Information Solutions, 1999).

h)	Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

The project is located within a 100-year floodplain (Vista Information Solutions, NEPA Checklist, 1999). The ILA will be located in an existing building; however, the design will incorporate all flood-protection measures deemed necessary for the site by Solano County, taking into consideration the type of use and risk level at this location.

i)	Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

Construction of the ILA within an existing building would not expose people to a significant risk because the site would not be occupied.

j)	Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is not located within an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (Solano County General Plan, Health and Safety Element, 1977).

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

Setting

The general plan land use designation for the project site and surrounding properties is PUD (Planned Unit Development) Commercial which provides for a full range of commercial uses. Commercial uses along Railroad Avenue are intended to cater primarily to household services including utility and repair services, mini-storage facilities, and vehicular or machinery repair.

The site and surrounding properties are zoned CS-Commercial Service District, which permits services for wholesale and retail sale, business (or similar) academies, restaurants, theaters, animal hospitals, governmental offices, business and professional offices, and other similar uses (Suisun, City of, 1992).

Evaluation

a)	Would the project physically divide an established community?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Although a residential development exists south of the site across Railroad Avenue, the project would not physically divide the established community. The ILA facility will be constructed within an existing building adjacent to commercial businesses.

b)	Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

The City of Suisun City land use designation for the site is PUD Commercial and the site is zoned Commercial Service District. Utility facilities are permitted within this land use and zoning designation with a use permit by the City of Suisun Community Development Department.

c)	Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is not located in an area designated by the state or City of Suisun City for mineral resources (Suisun, City of, 1992).

Evaluation

a)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is not located in an area with known mineral resources so construction of the ILA facility on a previously developed site would not result in impacts to mineral resources of value to the region or the residents of the state.

b)	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan other land use plan?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is not located in an area with known mineral resources so development of the site would not result in impacts to mineral resources of value to the region of the residents of the state.

XI. NOISE

Setting

The Fairfield ILA Site is located in the City of Suisun City in Solano County (Figure 2). There are residences near the site and commercial establishments are located adjacent to the site (Figure 8). The area is designated "General Commercial" in the City of Suisun City General Plan. An existing 15,750-square foot building is present on the site, and will be utilized to house the ILA facility. Approximately 50 percent of the 0.7-acre site is covered by the building. The nearest public receptor (a commercial business) is located approximately adjacent to the property (Figure 8).

The site is not located close to an airport and is not within an airport land use plan. There are no private airports near the site. Estimates of daytime and nighttime ambient noise levels (52 and 47 dBA, respectively) were derived from Schomer and Associates (1991) as typical of sites designated as "quiet commercial and industrial areas and moderate residential areas."

The Fairfield ILA Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately 0.7 acres. Project activities include site preparation to construct the generator pad outside the building, construction of the ILA pads within the building, installation of equipment, trenching for the installation of the innerduct, automated testing of the emergency generator, and a weekly trip of one vehicle to the site for

maintenance and data logging. The standard shelter for an ILA generator housing is a pre-fabricated building measuring approximately 12 feet wide, 24 feet long, and 10 feet high placed on a concrete pad.

Noise will be generated from both construction and operation of the ILA facility. Table 3 provides relevant information on construction and operation activities and equipment contributing to noise. Included is the size of each type of heavy construction equipment and the numbers of hours per day that each piece of equipment will operate. Noise from off-site construction activities, associated with personnel vehicles and material delivery and refuse dump trucks, was not included because all vehicles will travel legally on local streets and state highways and will not remain stationary for a significant period of time to create a noise disturbance. As stated in section III (Air Quality) site access is generally easy and direct, and traffic will not be blocked on local streets or highways for any significant period of time.

A key assumption implicit in the evaluation of noise impacts is that only one piece of heavy equipment will operate at any one time. Therefore, the maximum construction noise level at each site are based on the loudest piece of construction equipment. There are no restrictions placed on construction noise in the City of Suisun City General Plan (City of Suisun City, 1992). The maximum potential noise for normally-muffled diesel-powered construction equipment measured at a distance of 50 feet is 84 dBA (EPA, 1971). The noise level at the closest receptor (78 dBA) was estimated by adjusting the maximum noise level at 50 feet (84 dBA) using the inverse square of the distance between the site and the receptor (95 feet). The distance of 95 feet was determined by adding the minimum generator setback distance of 75 feet to the distance to the nearest receptor, which is assumed to be 20 feet for the adjacent commercial building. Detailed methodologies, algorithms, and assumptions associated with the noise analysis are provided as Attachment A.

City of Suisun City Municipal Code, Sec. 15.12.320 (City of Suisun City, 1989) restricts construction activities to the periods from 7:00 am to 6:00 pm weekdays and 9:00 am to 5:00 pm on Saturdays. For operational noise, Noise Policy 4 of the Noise and Safety Element City in the Suisun City General Plan limits noise from commercial and industrial land uses to CNEL 65 dBA.

Operational parameters related to noise include the size/gross hp, placement, and period of operation (30 minutes/week) of the emergency standby generator (Table 3). The generator will be automatically tested on a weekly basis. The maximum noise level (63 dBA CNEL) at the nearest receptor was estimated by adjusting the noise level for the generator at a 50 foot distance (84 dBA, EPA, 1971) using the inverse square of the distance between the site and the receptor (95 feet). Operation of the generator would not produce a noise level that would exceed the noise standard.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

The project would not generate noise in excess of local standards during construction because no numerical standards apply. Therefore, the noise impact of construction would be less than significant. Level 3 will comply with local construction-related ordinances by restricting construction activities to the periods from 7:00 am to 6:00 pm weekdays and 9:00 am to 5:00 pm on Saturdays. Because the facility will utilize pre-fabricated structures, the construction period will be less than two months, as shown in Table 3. The estimated maximum noise level at the nearest receptor (a commercial facility) is 69 dBA. The location of construction (placement of the emergency generator) will be on the opposite side of the existing building at least 75 feet from the site boundary with the adjacent receptor.

Based on the proximity of the nearest public receptor, the generator will be located at least 95 feet away.

The generator will be housed in an enclosure, which limits the noise to 84 dBA at 50 feet. The resulting noise from generator operation, estimated at 63 dBA CNEL, will not exceed the limit of 65 dBA CNEL and, hence, the potential noise impact would be less than significant.

Site Specific Environmental Commitment: Level 3 will comply with local construction-related noise ordinances by restricting construction activities to the periods from 7:00 am to 6:00 pm weekdays and 9:00 am to 5:00 pm on Saturdays.

Level 3 will comply with the local operation noise ordinance by installing the generator a sufficient distance back from the property boundary.

b)	Would the proposal result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

Neither project construction nor operations would generate excessive groundborne noise or vibration. The low level groundborne vibration and noise generated during construction will be short term in nature, and generally will not extend more than a few feet from the active work area. This work area will be set back a significant distance from the project boundary as shown in Figure 7. Since the nearest public and sensitive receptor is 95 feet distant, there will be a less than significant impact from groundborne vibrations or noise during construction.

For the operational period (approximately 30 minutes a week) the generator will cause only localized vibration intermittently. The generator is mounted on a concrete pad with rubber vibration isolators. These vibration isolators result in a reduction of groundborne vibration by more than 95 percent (Ace Mountings Company, 1999). The buried innerduct will not generate perceptible vibration or noise. Consequently, there will be no excessive groundborne vibration or noise impacts from site operations.

c)	Would the proposal result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Construction noise will be temporary, lasting less than two months. Therefore, there will be no permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the site. Noise emitted during 30 minutes each week to test the generator, and during power outages, will be temporary and below the regulatory threshold.

d)	Would the proposal result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

Temporary increases in ambient noise levels will occur during the up to two months of construction, and will comply with the local construction noise ordinance. Weekly testing for a period of approximately 30 minutes and during power outages and for maintenance activities will generate operational noise. This intermittent noise will not be a substantial increase in ambient noise levels because the increased distance from the boundary with the nearest industrial facility will create a buffer area around the generator (Figure 7) and the location and enclosure of the generator will comply with noise regulations.

e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is not located within an airport land use plan.

f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Setting

As of 1998, the Suisun City population was 26,280 and approximately 40 square miles in area (Suisun City Redevelopment Agency, 1999). The nearest housing is located across Railroad Avenue south of the site and consists of single family residences.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The proposed project would not create new housing nor extend roads or other infrastructure that would indirectly induce population growth.

b)	Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not displace any existing housing units.

c)	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not displace any people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The site is located within the city of Suisun City. Fire protection is provided by Suisun City Fire Department. Police protection is provided by Suisun City Police Department. Five parks are located within the vicinity of the site, the nearest being Heritage Park, located 0.5 mile east of the site.

Evaluation

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

The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities, nor affect response time or other performance objectives.

XIV. RECREATION

Setting

The nearest recreational facility is a small community park located approximately 0.5 mile east of the project site.

Evaluation

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?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The facility would not be occupied on a daily basis. Therefore, the project would not increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated.

b)	Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of new or existing recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Setting

The site is located on a parcel east of the intersection of Railroad Avenue and Marina Boulevard, on the north side of Railroad Avenue. Railroad Avenue is a two lane, undivided road. Site access is provided by a paved driveway from Railroad Avenue. There are sidewalks along both the north and south sides of Railroad Avenue. There are no paths, bus stops, bike lanes, or other alternative transportation facilities on or near the site.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

During construction at the site, construction workers will be commuting to the site for approximately three months. The average number of commuting workers is expected to be seven. The workers will commute during off-peak traffic hours (usually 6 a.m. and 3 p.m.) and park on the site. Occasionally, trucks will deliver equipment and materials to the site and haul construction debris from the site to recycling centers or landfills. These truck trips will be infrequent and off-peak from area traffic flows. The offsite impacts from construction are therefore expected to be less than significant. During operation of the site, one service person would visit the site approximately weekly. The project would therefore not result in a permanent increase in traffic load or daily trips because the project site would not be occupied on a daily basis.

b)	Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

There would be no permanent impact to levels of service associated with the project because the project site would not be occupied on a daily basis.

c)	Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not affect air traffic patterns.

d)	Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would use the existing entrance driveway. Sight distances for ingress and egress to the site via the existing entrance are sufficient.

e)	Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not affect emergency access routes.

f)	Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not affect parking and only require parking space for one to two vehicles during routine maintenance visits to the site. Parking for more than 22 vehicles is provided on the site.

g)	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

There are no alternative transportation facilities located at or near the site so no impact would occur.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Setting

The Fairfield ILA will require electricity and telephone. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are located overhead across Railroad Avenue running east-west. Electric power is currently available at the site. No sewer and water hook-ups will be needed, and there will be no wastewater discharge or water usage.

Waste will be generated at the Fairfield ILA during facility construction and routine operation. Solid waste generation during construction should be minimal since the facility will be constructed in an existing facility. During operation of the ILA facility, there should be no appreciable generation of solid waste since the site

will not be permanently staffed and site visits will be infrequent (one per week) and of short duration (one to several hours).

The project will utilize Portrero Hills Landfill for disposal of the small amount of solid waste generated during facility construction and routine operation. Based on personal communication with the Solano County Planning Department, Portrero Hills Landfill has an average daily capacity of 1,280 tons and a permitted daily capacity of 4,330 tons.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not increase the burden on wastewater treatment. The site would not be occupied on a daily basis. During construction, portable chemical toilets will be used on-site.

b)	Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not increase the burden on wastewater treatment. The site would not be occupied on a daily basis.

c)	Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not increase the burden on stormwater drainage facilities. Stormwater drainage facilities exist and no additional wastewater would be carried off the site.

d)	Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not require water hook-ups, because it will not be occupied on a daily basis.

e)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not require wastewater treatment because the site will not be occupied on a daily basis.

f)	Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

During operation, the project would not generate significant amounts of solid waste. Removal of interior walls from the existing building will yield about 265 cubic yards (approximately 180 tons) of demolition debris requiring disposal. Existing landfills can easily accommodate the waste generated.

g)	Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

The project would generate only minimal quantities (about 265 cubic yards) of solid waste, which can easily be accommodated within the local landfill. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste.

Analysis Team

The multidisciplinary team that provided input to this checklist included the following members:

Technical Coordination:

Gary Finni, Ph.D., Aquatic Entomology (22 years experience)
Charles Comiskey, Ph.D., Ecology (23 years experience)
BHE Environmental, Inc.
11733 Chesterdale Road, Cincinnati, OH 45246
Phone: (513) 326-1500 Fax: (513) 326-15650

Engineering:

Tom Ogg, BS, PE, MBA, Civil Engineering (10 years experience)
Kiewit Pacific Company
14203 Denver West Parkway, 1st Floor, Golden, CO 80401
Phone: (303) 215-8768 Fax: (303) 215-8296

Hydrology/Geology/Hazardous Materials:

Bob Hearn, BS, JD, Engineering, Law (25 years experience)
BHE Environmental, Inc.
11733 Chesterdale Road, Cincinnati, OH 45246
Phone: (513) 326-1500 Fax: (513) 326-15650

Chris Dennis, MS, Geology, Law (8 years experience)
Tracy Walker, MS, Geology (8 years experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
5052 Commercial Circle, Concord, CA 94520
Phone: (925) 688-1200 Fax: (925) 688-0388

Land Use/Aesthetics/Public Utilities/Transportation/Field

Christie Wilke, BS, Environmental Engineering (2 years experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
5052 Commercial Circle, Concord, CA 94520
Phone: (925) 688-1200 Fax: (925) 688-0388

Land Use/Aesthetics/Public Utilities/Transportation/Analysis

Carolyn Trindle-Smith, MA, MBA, Education/Business (23 years experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
21 Technology Drive, Irvine, CA 92618
Phone: (949) 727-7315 Fax: (949) 727-7399

Biological Resources: Field/Analysis

Joe Drennan, MS, Forestry (7 years experience)
Environmental Science Associates
225 Bush Street, Suite 1700, San Francisco, CA 94104
Phone: (415) 896-5900 Fax: (415) 896-0332

Noise/Air Quality

Deems Padgett, MS, Engineering, Geology (14 years experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
5052 Commercial Circle, Concord, CA 94520
Phone: (925) 688-1200 Fax: (925) 688-0388

Noise/Air Quality

Eric Walther, Ph.D., Atmospheric Science (32 years experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
21 Technology Drive, Irvine, CA 92618
Phone: (949) 727-7315 Fax: (949) 727-7399

Historic & Cultural Resources: Analysis:

Brant Brechbiel, BA, History, MBA (10 years experience)
Roger Mason, Ph.D., Anthropology (20 years experience)
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Paleontologic Resources: Analysis

E. Bruce Lander, Ph.D., Paleontology (25 years experience)
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Quality Control:

Gary Finni, Ph.D., Aquatic Entomology (22 years experience)
BHE Environmental, Inc.
11733 Chesterdale Road, Cincinnati, OH 45246
Phone: (513) 326-1500 Fax: (513) 326-15650

David Augustine, JD, Permitting Specialist (25 years experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
5052 Commercial Circle, Concord, CA 94520
Phone: (925) 688-1200 Fax: (925) 688-0388

Graphics:

Bill Boynton, MA, Geography (5 years experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services Network Services
505 South Main, Suite 900, Orange, CA 92868
Phone: (714) 973-4918 Fax: (714) 973-0358

Sources

40 CFR Part 93. *Determining Conformity of Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans*, July 1998.

Ace Mountings Company, Inc. Manufacturer's literature for Series 630 Spring Isolators, 1999.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). *Ozone Maintenance Plan,* 1994a.

----. *Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan,* 1994b.

----. *CEQA Guidelines, Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plan*, April 1996.

----. *Bay Area 1997 Clear Air Plan*, December 1997.

----. *Rules and Regulations, May 1999.*

Beaver, Erin, Fairfield City Planner. Personal communication with Kristie Wilkie, TRC, August 18, 1999.

Blake, T.F. P*reliminary Fault Data for EQ Fault and FRISKSP,* 1998.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). *Fairfield North and Fairfield South Quadrangles*, *California Natural Diversity Database*, September 1999.

California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG), *Urban Geology, Master Plan for California*, Bulletin 198, 1973.

----. *Fault Vicinity Map of California and Adjacent Areas*, Map No. 6, 1994.

----. *Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State of California*, Open-File Report 96-08, 1996.

----. *Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California*, Special Publication 42, 1999.

California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Center. *Records Search: Expedited Records Search Request for the Colusa, Fairfield North, Natividad, Oakland West, and Sacramento West Quads,* File No. 99-572 Information on file, Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, September 1999.

California Environmental Protection Agency (California EPA), Air Resources Board. *The California State Implementation Plan for Ozone*, November 1994.

-----. *California Air Quality Data,* 1996-1998.

-----. *Proposed Amendments to the Designation Criteria and Amendments to the Area Designations for State Ambient Air Quality Standards,* and *Proposed Maps of the Area Designations for the State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards,* August 1998.

-----. *Emission Factor Computer Program*, 1998.

-----. *Reference Air Quality Database, 1998 State Area Designations*, Accessed at http://www.arb.ca.gov, Updated February 1999.

Caterpillar Corporation. *Generator Emissions Guarantee*, 1999.

Compass Maps. *Suisun City Map*, 1999.

Jefferson, G.T. *A Catalogue of Late Quaternary Vertebrates from California: Part One, Nonmarine Lower Vertebrates and Avian Taxa*, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Technical Reports Number 5, 1991a.

-----. *A Catalogue of Late Quaternary Vertebrates from California: Part Two, Mammals,* Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Technical Reports Number 7, 1991b.

Johnson, Patti J. Patwin, In: Robert F. Heizer (Editor), *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California*, pp. 350-360, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 1978.

Koenig, J.B., Compiler. *Geologic Map of California, Santa Rosa Sheet,* California Division of Mines and Geology, 1963.

Mason, R.D., Chambers Group Inc. Written communication to Gail McNulty, Native American Heritage Commission, September 3, 1999a.

-----. *Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources Literature Review Report for Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optic Project: Fairfield ILA, in the City of Suisun City, Solano County, California,* Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, for Level 3 Project Office, Pleasanton, CA, November 1999b.

McNulty, G., Native American Heritage Commission. Written communication to David White, Level 3 Long Haul Project Team, September 17, 1999.

Muntowitch, Gary, Planner, City of Suisun City. Personal communication with Kristie Wilkie, TRC, September 1999.

Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS). *Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optics Project: Cultural Resources Procedures,* July 1999.

Rice, Tim, Caterpillar Dealer. Interviewed by David Augustine, TRC, December 27, 1999.

Rogers, T.H., Compiler. *Geologic Map of California, San Jose Sheet,* California Division of Mines and Geology, 1966.

Schomer and Associates. *Proposed Revisions to Property-Line-Noise-Source Measurement Procedures*, Report No. ILENR/RE-EA-91/10, June 1991.

Skinner, Anita, Administrative Assistant, City of Suisun City. Personal communication with Kristie Wilkie, TRC, September 1999.

Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontologic Resources: Standard Guidelines, *Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin* 163:22-27, 1995.

-----. Conditions of Receivership for Paleontologic Salvage Collections [Final Draft], *Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin* 166:31-32, 1996.

Solano, County of. *General Plan,* May 1977.

-----. *General Plan, Health and Safety Element*, 1977.

----. *General Plan*, *Land Use and Circulation Element*, December 1980 as amended through July 1997.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). *CEQA Handbook*, Table A9-8-B, 1993.

Suisun City, City of. *Municipal Code*, December 1989.

-----. *Suisun City General Plan*, May 1992.

Suisun City Redevelopment Agency. Personal communication with Kristie Wilkie, TRC, August 1999.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). *Noise for Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances*, Contract 68-04-0047, December 30, 1971.

-----. *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, AP-42,* Section 3.4, Large Stationary Diesel and All Stationary Dual-Fuel Engine, October 1996.

Vista Information Solutions, Inc. *California Site Assessment Plus Report: Suisun City,* August 19, 1999.

-----. *NEPA Checklist: Suisun City,* August 1999.

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Photo A Facing North
Photo B Facing Northwest
Photo C Facing Southeast
Photo D Facing West
Photo E Facing North
Photo F Facing Northeast

Attachment

Attachment A Methodologies, Algorithms, and Assumptions Used in the Air and Noise Analysis.