

Appendix A -- No. 19

**PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

Site name: Hanford ILA

**Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission**

**Prepared by
Level 3 Communications, LLC**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Environmental Checklist.....	1
Analysis Team	36
Sources.....	38

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

Tables

Table 1	Current and Potential Cumulative Projects in the Vicinity of the Hanford ILA Site.
Table 2	Specific Local Policies Applicable to Each Issue Area for the Hanford ILA Site.
Table 3	Hanford ILA - Construction and Operation Emissions Summary.
Table 4	San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD – Total Project Construction Emissions.
Table 5	Potential for Habitat at the Hanford ILA Site to Support Sensitive Species Occurring in the Vicinity.

Figures

Figure 1	Regional Map
Figure 2	Vicinity Map
Figure 3	Parcel Map
Figure 4	U.S.G.S. Quad Sheet
Figure 5	Surrounding Land Use Map
Figure 6	Photo Key Map
Figure 7	Conceptual Plot Plan
Figure 8	Noise Receptor Map
Figure 9	Floodplains Map
Figure 10	Wetlands Inventory Map

Photo Plates

Photo A	Overall View of Site
Photo B	Rear View of Site
Photo C	View of Uses to North
Photo D	View of Use to East

Attachment

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- 1. Facility Title:**
Level 3 Long-Haul Network, Hanford 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 site is located along the western edge of 10th Avenue, south of its intersection with Hanford Armona Road, in the City of Hanford, Kings County, California. The site is located on the Kings County parcel number 18-12-68. The entirely fenced site is 2.37 acres in size, with a 22,000 square foot manufacturing building and parking lot to the south and west. The site currently has water, sewer, gas, and electrical hook-ups. The site is mostly paved, with some unpaved areas with intermittent landscaping. Access to the site is currently at its south border with 10th Avenue to the east. The running line, located in the BNSF right-of-way (ROW), would be located approximately 500 feet west of the site (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:** Service Commercial
- 7. Zoning:** Service Commercial
- 8. Description of Facility:**
This checklist evaluates the design, construction, and operation of the Hanford ILA. This facility, which will support the Long-Haul network, will be located outside a utility corridor.

The Hanford In-Line Amplification Facility (ILA) will be constructed on a developed 2.37-acre site at 11090 10th Avenue. This facility will encompass approximately 5,000 square feet of the parcel. Although the current owner will remove the existing metal building from the site, analysis by Level 3 will include demolition of the building. The concrete slab forming the floor will be used for ILA component placement. Prefabricated ILA structures will be delivered and placed on an engineered portion of the concrete pad. A separate generator structure will be constructed utilizing another engineered portion of the existing building pad.

An ILA 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 include up to four prefabricated, transportable, modular amplification units (huts), each measuring 12 feet by 36 feet (432 square feet) and 10 feet 3 inches in height. The set of four huts will be installed on a 24-foot-by-72-foot (1,728 square feet or 0.04 acre) section of the former building pad, and will be attached side-by-side.

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 10 Street 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 Hanford ILA will require electricity and telephone. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are located on site. Normal electrical power will be provided, consisting of 400-amp, 480-volt, three-phase service. All on-site utility lines will be run underground per NEC and local codes. No water or sewer hookups are anticipated because the site will be unmanned. No site grading is anticipated nor will there be any net change in impervious surfaces. Thus, no change in storm water drainage characteristics is anticipated. Fire protection equipment will be installed per local codes.

Figure 7 is a conceptual plot plan of the Hanford 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 present building is situated. The precise location of the ILA facility will be determined during the engineering design phase of the project.

Site development will require no grading for placement of the generator shelter or for access and parking. Upgrading of the generator and ILA shelter foundations 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 perimeter fencing will occur prior to all improvements. The fiber optic cable feed to the ILA will be from the railroad ROW entering the east side of the property via Armona Road and 10 Street.

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 existing building will be removed and relocated by the current owner of the site. Analysis by Level 3 will include demolition of the building generating 190 cubic yards of demolition waste and only minimal construction-related waste. During construction, no offsite areas will be required for mobilization or parking of construction or worker vehicles.

One 300-kilowatt, 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 at the site preassembled 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 double-walled storage tank on which the engine/generator set and this mounting is a common design for emergency engine/generators. For engine/generator sets that are operated more frequently, the fuel tank is mounted separate from the engine/generator since greater fuel storage capability is required and the storage tank would be too large to be located beneath the engine/generator (Rice, 1999). The tank system design incorporates a high fuel alarm (local) and a tank rupture alarm (remote).

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). There-

fore, 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. Each will be visited approximately once a week for 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 Hanford 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:

Surrounding uses include: (North) five single family residences (two are adjacent to the site); (East) service commercial uses, including the Pacific Bell maintenance yard and Hanford Roofing Company; (South) open space used previously for agriculture; and (West) open space used previously for agriculture (See Figure 5, Surrounding Land Use Map).

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The site is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Hanford.

The City of Hanford Zoning Ordinance allows public utility structures within the Service Commercial zoning district subject to Site Plan Review and an approved Conditional Use Permit (17.28.050 E). The purpose of the City's Site Plan Review is to enable the community development department to de-

termine whether the proposed use is in conformity with the intent and provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, and to examine compatibility with surrounding land uses.

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 Need (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 Hanford 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 facility site is located in a community of mixed uses, including rural residential, service commercial, and agricultural uses. The site consists of a wrought-iron/barbed wire fenced lot, that is mostly paved and contains a light blue, one-story, sheet metal/brick, manufacturing building (See Photo A). The building is partially landscaped by trees and hedges where it fronts 10 1/2 Avenue and along its northern edge (unpaved), but is almost devoid of landscaping around its western and southern sides, where it is paved. The grass on-site has not been maintained recently. The site is littered with parts and equipment associated with its previous industrial use (See Photo B). There is some overhead lighting attached to the building, which shines on the parking lot to the south of the building.

There are no scenic highways located at or near the site (Caltrans, 1999). The site is not located within a redevelopment zone, and is not included in any jurisdiction’s landscape or streetscape plans (Hanford, 1994).

The following City policy related to aesthetics would apply to the project site:

- Policy 7.6: Promote the preservation of existing mature trees and encourage the planting of appropriate shade trees in new developments.

The proposed project involves the installation of up to four ILA Huts and a generator compound on the former building’s concrete pad. Full build-out will include construction on approximately 5,000 square feet of the 103,237 square foot lot. Replacement of the older existing manufacturing building with new pre-fabricated ILA structures does not represent a negative visual impact to the project site. The proposed project will preserve existing mature trees on-site and plant new landscape trees as required by City of Hanford Site Plan Review. No changes to the visual character of the surrounding area are proposed.

Evaluation

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The surrounding topography is relatively flat, with no views of mountains, landmarks, or other significant scenic resources. Open space (agricultural uses) to the west and south is partially screened to northern residents by the existing site fencing and building. The proposed project will replace an existing industrial building, leaving the existing concrete pad in place. An ILA facility would then be installed within the footprint of the former industrial building. The project would not result in additionally obstructing views through or around the site. Thus, the project would not have a substantial adverse 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located near a scenic highway. Thus, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The site is located in a mixed-use area without a consistent design or landscaping theme (See Photos C and D). The site is currently an industrial use, and would continue to be an industrial use with project implementation. The proposed project will replace an existing industrial building, leaving the existing concrete pad in place. An ILA facility would then be installed within the footprint of the former industrial building. Replacement of the existing industrial building with new pre-fabricated ILA structures would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Per Policy 7.6 of the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, any landscaping or other physical alterations required by the City would be incorporated during the City’s Site Plan Review process (Stowe, 1999).

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The outside light to be provided would be a small light at each structure entrance in addition to existing lighting, which would not be a new source of substantial light or glare adversely affecting day or nighttime views of the area.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The site is located on a mostly-paved, highly disturbed parcel, that is entirely fenced and has been previously used as a manufacturing plant. The site does not appear to have been used for agriculture in the recent past. The site is zoned “Service Commercial” (Hanford, 1997), and is not zoned for agricultural land uses. The site is designated for Prime Soils by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (California Department of Conservation, 1994). The site is not under a Williamson Act Contract (Cain, 1999). Surrounding uses to the south and west are presently tilled and may be used for farming in the future.

The following City policy related to agricultural resources found in the City of Hanford General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element may apply to the proposed project:

Objective OCR 6: Guide urban development toward vacant or under-used land within the urbanized area and direct new growth toward contiguous lands to protect agricultural lands and other open spaces used for the managed production of resources from premature urban development.

The proposed project will replace an existing industrial building for the installation of an ILA facility, thus directing development toward underused land and avoiding new urban development on agricultural land. Because the project involves the continued industrial use of a site which was previously converted from agricultural use, no other local policies for agricultural resources would apply.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---

Although the site is designated in a Prime Soils area under the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, it is currently paved, fenced, and highly disturbed. The site has also not been recently used for agricultural purposes. The site does not meet the criteria of a Prime Farmland, where the land should be accessible and available for farming or agricultural practices, because it was previously converted from agricultural use to industrial use. Thus, the project would not convert Prime Farmland to a non-agricultural use.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not zoned for agricultural use. The site is zoned "Service Commercial," as designated by the City of Hanford, and is intended primarily for establishments engaged in servicing equipment, materials, products and related uses. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Thus, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use nor a Williamson Act contract.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is currently paved, fenced, and highly disturbed. It was previously used for manufacturing. Although surrounding uses to the south and west are primarily agricultural, construction and operation of the project would not result in any impacts to these agricultural uses. Thus, the project would not involve other changes which could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY

Throughout California, the innerduct line will be installed along existing utility corridors in support of the Long-Haul network. In the City of Hanford an ILA station will be constructed outside an existing utility corridor in support of the Long-Haul Network. To minimize potential environmental impacts, the ILA facility will be constructed on an existing building pad at a previously developed site. The ILA facility is the subject of this air quality checklist analysis.

The Hanford ILA Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately 2.37-acres. Project activities include site preparation to construct the generator pad, demolition of the existing metal building, construction of the ILA pads and shelters on the existing building pad, installation of equipment, 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 on an existing building pad (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 Hanford 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 demolition and 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 on the proposed site for installation of the fiber optic line between the property line and the building.

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 automatically triggered. 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 PM₁₀ emissions for mobile equipment (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1996). Construction and operation emission thresholds for NO_x, VOC, PM₁₀, SO_x and CO are listed in Table 3, as provided by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD, 1999). This agency is responsible for management of air emissions in the San Joaquin Valley where the Hanford ILA site resides. In addition to the Hanford ILA, three other PEA facilities (Stockton, Fresno, and Bakersfield) are located in the San Joaquin Valley and are under the jurisdiction of the SJVUAPCD.

Setting

The project site is located in the City of Hanford in Kings County. The county is within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin and is currently designated as a nonattainment area for state and national one-hour average ozone standards and for state and national respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀) standards (California EPA, 1999). There are a number of commercial establishments and residences located adjacent to the site (Figure 8). The distance of the closest sensitive receptor to the nearest boundary of the site is approximately 20 feet.

Based on monitoring data collected within Kings County during the three-year period of 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 3 days 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 34 days per year (California EPA, 1996 to 1998). The ozone problem in Kings County is primarily due to stationary sources, mobile sources (motor vehicles), agricultural sources, and occasionally from transport of

pollutants from the San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento Valley Air Basins (California EPA, 1996 to 1998).

Ambient PM₁₀ concentrations in Kings County exceeded the 24-hour-average National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 150 micrograms per cubic meter on average 5 days per year. The measured concentrations exceeded the more stringent 24-hour-average California Ambient Air Quality Standard of 50 micrograms per cubic meter roughly 29 days per year (California EPA, reference database 1996 through 1998). The PM₁₀ problem in Kings County is primarily due to road dust, farming, and construction activities (SJVUAPCD, August 1998).

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 PM₁₀ standards. There are three applicable air quality plans for the project area, two related to the state and national ozone standards, and one related to the national PM₁₀ standard.

The applicable ozone air quality plans are the Federal Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan and the State Ozone Air Quality Attainment Plan (SJVUAPCD, December 1998). The state ozone plan identifies the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin as both a source and receptor of transported ozone. The applicable PM₁₀ air quality plan is the Federal PM₁₀ Attainment Demonstration Plan.

As part of the ozone and PM₁₀ attainment strategies under the applicable federal and state air quality plans, SJVUAPCD requires that there be no significant increase in emissions of NO_x, ROC, and PM₁₀ from new and modified sources. To meet these objectives, numerical thresholds are set on construction and operation related emissions of pollutants.

In addition, SJVUAPCD has adopted Regulation VIII that mandates implementation at construction sites of fugitive dust control measures contained in the federal PM₁₀ plan. Fugitive dust is defined as solid airborne particulate matter emitted from sources other than a flue, stack, or tail pipe, but in this case mainly refers to the dust created during construction. SJVUAPCD's Rule 8020, "Fugitive Dust Requirements for Control of Fine Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) from Construction, Demolition, Excavation, and Extraction Activities" describes the required dust control measures. These control measures are used in lieu of numerical thresholds to manage fugitive dust emissions from construction sites.

Rule 8060 of Regulation VIII regulates entrainment of fugitive dust (PM₁₀) emissions from roadways. Entrainment is the kicking up of fugitive dust particles when a vehicle passes over an unpaved roadway. Roads less than one-half mile long are exempt from Rule 8060.

Under SJVUAPCD Rule 2010, installation and operation of an internal combustion engine requires an authority to construct permit and a permit to operate. The construction and operation of the internal combustion engine must be in accordance with SJVUAPCD's Rule 2201 which requires Best Available Control Technology ("BACT") to minimize nitrogen oxide ("NO_x") and volatile organic compound ("VOC") emissions, precursors to ozone. By controlling NO_x and VOC emissions, the BACT requirements also indirectly reduce PM₁₀ emissions because both NO_x and VOC are also precursors to secondary formation of PM₁₀. SJVUAPCD Rule 2201 includes an offset exemption for emergency standby generators for which adequate documentation can be provided that operation does not and will not exceed 200 hours per year, and will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program. Under this exemption, emissions associated with the occasional use and testing of emergency generators are not subject to numerical thresholds.

Rule 4701-Internal Combustion Engines, specifies emission limits, and requirements for monitoring, testing, and record keeping. The requirements of this rule will not apply so long as the emergency generator/standby engine complies with SJVUAPCD Rule 2201 exemption conditions.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

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 pad 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, demolition of a metal building, installation of the prefabricated ILA huts and generator shelter, and trenching to install the fiber optic innerduct. The ILA equipment will be placed on the existing building pad. 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, as required by Regulation VIII. 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. The generator will be constructed and operated in a manner consistent with existing air quality plans by fully complying with the requirements of Rule 2010, and, in particular, meeting the BACT requirements of Rule 2201. Operation of the emergency standby generator will be in compliance with the offset requirements of Rule 2201 because it will be operated less than 200 hours per year, will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program, and will be fully documented with regard to duration of use.

Normal operations at the site will generate approximately one vehicle trip to and from the site each week. 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 take the following actions to implement Environmental Commitments in the CPCN Decision:

- Obtain an authority to construct and permit to operate the emergency standby generator under SJVUAPCD Rule 2010.
- Construct and operate the generator under BACT in accordance with SJVUAPCD's Rule 2201 to minimize NO_x and VOC emissions. Based on SJVUAPCD guidance, BACT for NO_x emissions will include a turbocharger with intercooler/aftercooler and engine timing retard by a minimum of four degrees from the manufacturer's standard timing, or a maximum emission rate of 7.2 grams of NO_x per horsepower-hour (Paul, 1999). BACT for VOC emissions will include positive crankcase ventilation

- and use of fuel satisfying reformulated diesel specification established by the Air Resources Board.
- Obtain an offset exemption for the emergency standby generator as provided by Rule 2201 and document that the generator will not and does not operate more than 200 hours per year and will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program.

As described under III(b) below, Level 3 will comply with requirements in the permit exemption for the emergency standby generators and will also implement fugitive dust control measures to control PM₁₀ 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

As discussed above, the Hanford ILA Site lies in an area designated as nonattainment of the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and PM₁₀.

SJVUAPCD recommends the use of emission threshold to regulate individual development projects (Table 3). These thresholds apply to emissions from construction equipment to be used in this project. For VOCs and NO_x, the thresholds are annual, equal to 10 tons per year (tpy). In contrast, the thresholds for PM₁₀, SO_x, and CO are expressed on a daily basis (80 lb/day, 150 lb/day and 550 lb/day, respectively).

The ILA site would be a permanent building facility occupying approximately 2.37 acres. Site development would be limited to installation of the standby generator in a new enclosure and the installation of the ILA equipment inside on an existing building pad. The access road/parking already exists and is paved. Construction activities will require up to two months to complete. Construction of the project would generate fugitive dust (including PM₁₀), and other criteria air pollutants from exhaust emissions basically limited to trenching and grading activities and material delivery (such as cement) by truck. Air quality impacts from fugitive dust emissions during construction will be temporary and intermittent.

There are no numerical thresholds for fugitive dust (PM₁₀) from construction activities. Instead, SJVUAPCD Rule 8020 requires dust control measures to be implemented during construction. As discussed under III(a) above, Level 3 will implement a comprehensive series of dust control measures to manage fugitive dust during construction.

Over the long-term, the project would result in emissions from operation of both stationary and mobile sources (Table 3). However, mobile source emissions 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. Stationary source emissions would result from operation of the emergency, diesel-powered, emergency generator during weekly routine testing and during unforeseen emergency electricity loss.

Because the emergency standby generator will operate for less than 200 hours annually, it is exempt from compliance with numerical thresholds associated with offset requirements (Table 3).

Additional operation emissions associated with weekly site visits of one vehicle will be minor (Table 3).

Site Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3 will develop and implement a construction dust abatement program as required by SJVUAPCD Rule 8020. Implementation of that program will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. Level 3 will also comply with all requirements of SJVUAPCD Rule 2201, including documentation that the generator will not be operated more than 200 hours per year and will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program. Thus, no numerical standards apply to emissions from these generators.

As described under III(a) above, Level 3 will comply with requirements in the permit exemption for the emergency standby generators.

Level 3 will fully comply with SJVUAPCD's Rule 8020 by implementing the following dust control measures during construction, as applicable:

- Dust emissions from all disturbed areas, including storage piles that are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, will be effectively stabilized using water, chemical stabilizer or suppressant or vegetative cover;
- Dust emissions from all on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads will be effectively stabilized using water or chemical stabilizer or suppressant;
- Fugitive dust emissions from all land-clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land-leveling, grading, and cut and fill, and demolition activities will be effectively controlled by watering during these activities or presoaking;
- When materials are transported off-site, all material will be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or kept below at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container;
- All operations will limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. Dry rotary brushes will not be used except when preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Blower devices will not be used; and
- Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, fugitive dust emissions from the piles will be effectively stabilized utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer or suppressant.

c) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal and state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---

The Hanford ILA site is one of four PEA sites in the San Joaquin Valley under the jurisdiction of the SJVUAPCD (the other three being Stockton, Bakersfield, and Fresno). Potential total construction emissions from all four sites were analyzed for the possibility of simultaneous construction. The same thresholds apply to assessment of total project emissions as were used to evaluate emissions from individual project sites (Table 4).

Simultaneous construction at all four sites will not exceed the annual or daily numerical thresholds (Table 4), and, therefore, the potential cumulative air quality impacts of the four sites will not be significant.

Because construction of the enclosure for the emergency generator will affect an area of 300 square feet within the 2.37-acre site, surrounding uses will be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7, Conceptual Plot Plan). This buffer will help minimize the possibility that the project will cause a cumulatively significant short-term PM₁₀ impact from simultaneous and unrelated construction projects taking place within the same general area.

Cumulative emissions from testing and maintaining the emergency generators at all four PEA sites in the San Joaquin Valley 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.

The project's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect of additional emissions sources on the regional ozone and PM₁₀ concentrations will not be cumulatively considerable because ozone impacts are the result of the cumulative emissions from numerous sources in the region and transport from outside the region. All but the largest individual sources emit VOCs 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
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 neighbors to the ILA site are adjacent residences (Figure 8) which qualify as sensitive receptors. The distance of the closest sensitive receptor to the nearest boundary of the site is 20 feet.

Project construction would affect an area of less than one acre within the larger 2.37-acre site; therefore, receptors associated with surrounding uses would be buffered from the effects of project construction. 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 outlined above, 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 10 ½ Avenue 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 and power outages. Two factors prevent these emissions from significantly affecting sensitive receptors. First, the generator will not be located in close proximity to sensitive receptors due to the establishment of buffer zones where development will be excluded. Second, generator usage will be restricted to one hour per week or less and not more than 30 hours per year. These measures will assure that sensitive receptors are not 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
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The only potential odor that may be associated with site construction activities at the Hanford 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 or odor to be objectionable to a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Setting

A warehouse (Rich Peel Garlic Company) currently occupies the proposed site. The site includes a building and parking lot surrounded by a chainlink fence. The project area is heavily disturbed. The railroad and a

disturbed field are found to the north of the site. Similar warehouse development is located to the south. A disturbed field of non-native grassland is to the west and residential development is found to the east of the site.

The site and vicinity are heavily disturbed and support no native habitat. The property includes three landscaped trees (fig and pine trees). There was no evidence of significant small mammal activity within the site boundaries; however, small mammal burrows in the immediate vicinity (the open areas to the north and west) do evidence some small mammal activity.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---

The site is heavily disturbed (22,000 square foot building and parking lot) and does not support any native habitat. Similar levels of disturbance characterize the vicinity. The adjacent open fields may provide marginal foraging opportunities for raptors. However, the trees onsite and in the vicinity do not provide sufficient nesting opportunities.

A list of sensitive species that potentially could occur on the project site was created based upon a California Natural Diversity Database search (Hanford Quadrangle, California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999) and knowledge of the site vicinity. Table 5 includes these species and their potential for occurrence onsite.

No appropriately sized burrows were observed that might provide potential nesting opportunities for burrowing owls and no burrowing owls or their sign were observed during the reconnaissance visit to the site. The surrounding fence would likely deter the species from establishing a nest within the proposed site. However, based upon past observations of burrowing owls and their utilization of disturbed areas, the adjacent fields do provide marginal habitat for the species. This marginal habitat includes areas within 300 ft. of the site (a buffer established in the avoidance measures). Therefore, owls occupying this potential habitat could be disturbed, but not significantly, by proposed construction activities.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

This site does not support any riparian vegetation or other sensitive natural habitat. No sensitive habitat has been identified by local or state agencies.

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
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed site and vicinity lacks jurisdictional waterways or vernal pool habitat.

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
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The site and vicinity are characterized by heavy development. It is unlikely that this site is located within a wildlife movement corridor or provides any significant nursery resources.

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
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The site and vicinity are characterized by heavy development. It is unlikely that this site is located within a wildlife movement corridor or provides any significant nursery resources.

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
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

There are no biological resources onsite that would likely be protected under any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The ILA property is located in the southern part of the City of Hanford in the southern San Joaquin Valley. The parcel contains a recently built commercial/warehouse structure and the rest of the parcel is paved.

The prehistory of the southern San Joaquin Valley is not well known. Few sites have been investigated and most of these date to the Late Prehistoric Period. Earlier sites are likely buried under later Holocene alluvium. The archaeological sites appear to reflect the same settlement and subsistence systems practiced by the Southern Valley Yokuts who occupied the area when the Spanish arrived in California (Wallace, 1978). The southern San Joaquin Valley was originally covered by sloughs and marshes surrounding three shallow lakes: Tulare Lake, Buena Vista Lake, and Kern Lake. The Southern Valley Yokuts obtained fish and waterfowl from the lakes and marshes. Elk and pronghorn antelope were hunted. Grass and tule seeds

were important plant foods. Since there were no oak trees on the valley floor, acorns were not an important food. The Yokuts lived in permanent villages near lakes and sloughs. They were organized in territorial tribelets of up to 350 people. Usually there was more than one village in a tribelet territory. The ILA site is located in the former territory of the Tachi tribelet which occupied the area north of Tulare Lake.

During the later nineteenth century the drier areas of the southern San Joaquin Valley were used for ranching. Agricultural use of the region did not begin until completion of the Southern Pacific Railroad through the valley in 1876 (Beck and Haase, 1974). The Santa Fe Railroad later acquired a parallel line through the valley. Towns developed along the rail lines and farms developed along the rivers and drainages. After World War II, the lakes and marshes were drained, a federally subsidized irrigation system was built, and large-scale cotton production began.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The protocols contained in Level 3's *Long Haul Fiber Optics Project Cultural Resources Procedures* (Parsons 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 survey has been prepared (Mason, 1999b).

Level 3 archaeologists requested a records search for the proposed Hanford ILA site, and the lands within a one-half mile radius, from the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center. 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 checked:

- a. the National Register of Historic Places (June 1999 update);
- b. the California Inventory of Historic Resources;
- c. California Historical Landmarks (1996); and
- d. California Points of Historical Interest.

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 Kings 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 search (No. 99-325) showed that the property has not been previously surveyed and that no historic resources are recorded on the property. The records search indicated that no historic resources have been previously recorded within one-half mile of the of the proposed facility site (California Historical Resources Information System, Southern San Joaquin Valley Center, 1999). There is no exposed

ground surface on the parcel where a field survey could be undertaken.

The building is an obviously modern commercial warehouse structure (built in 1970, see Photos A-D) and has no historical associations. 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The records search from the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center showed that the property has not been previously surveyed and that no archaeological resources are recorded on the property. The records search indicated that no archaeological resources have been previously recorded within one-half mile of the property (California Historical Resources Information System, Southern San Joaquin Valley Center, 1999). 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.

c)	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

As mapped by Matthew and Burnett (1965), the project site is underlain by the Modesto Formation (unit Qf). No fossil site is recorded in the archives of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Section or the University of California Museum of Paleontology as occurring in this rock unit at the project site or elsewhere in the Hanford 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, elsewhere in the San Joaquin Valley, previously recorded late Pleistocene continental vertebrate fossil sites are reported from areas underlain by the Modesto Formation (Jefferson, 1991b). These fossil occurrences indicate that there is a potential for Pleistocene continental vertebrate fossil remains being encountered by construction-related earth moving at the project site.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitment: Because Level 3 has committed to archaeological and paleontological monitoring as part of the project design, construction-related earth moving would 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 would be recovered and processed to allow for the recovery of smaller fossil remains. Monitoring should begin once earth moving is at 5 feet below grade or below any artificial fill and topsoil. All recovered fossil remains would 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 would 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 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The records search and field survey provided no evidence of the presence of human remains (California Historical Resources Information System, Southern San Joaquin Valley Center, 1999). If suspected human remains are encountered during construction, operations will stop until the proper official is 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 Hanford. Hanford is located in a relatively stable geologic area. The site vicinity 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 an area of subsidence. Erosion activity is low and the soils are slightly 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The project site would not be inhabited, and is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone, or landslide or liquefaction geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973, 1999). There are no active faults in the vicinity of Hanford (i.e., faults exhibiting displacement within the last 11,000 years) (CDMG, 1994). The project site area can, however, experience moderate magnitude groundshaking associated with faults that may rupture with sufficient magnitude to affect the Hanford area. A 10% probability of peak ground accelerations of 10% to 20% 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, 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The site is nearly flat, and is located in an area of low erosion activity (CDMG, 1973). The existing building's concrete pad at the site would be used to house the ILA 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The site is not within any landslide or liquefaction geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973). Although the site is within an area of subsidence due to groundwater extraction in the area, the site is relatively flat, and the geologic units and soils on the site are not unstable. The concrete pad of the existing building would be used as a foundation for 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The area in which the site is located has slightly 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, no 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

Because the ILA facility would not be occupied, it does not require water or sewer service.

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 is one school within one-quarter mile of the site. The Hanford Municipal Airport is located approximately 0.75 miles

to the southeast of the site but the site is not located within any airport safety zone or other land use planning overlay zones.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The 1,000-gallon, double-walled above-ground 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 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in an above-ground 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

The nearest school to the site is Lincoln Elementary School, located one-quarter mile north of the site along 10th Avenue. However, the facility would not emit or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste, with the exception of diesel fuel, as explained above. The diesel fuel tank would be located inside an equipment enclosure within a fenced compound and access by children would be difficult if not impossible. The equipment enclosure would be a nondescript prefabricated and secured building and would not represent an attractive nuisance.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The site is located approximately 0.75 miles from the Hanford Municipal Airport but is not within an airport land use plan or other land use planning overlay zones.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

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 proposal 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The proposed structure would be located in an urbanized area zoned "Service Commercial" (Hanford, 1997). 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 City of Hanford is located in the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Study Area as defined by the California Department of Water Resources. Domestic water in the Hanford area is provided by the City of Hanford, which draws local groundwater to meet all domestic, commercial, and industrial water demands. The City of Hanford has approximately 568 acre feet of percolation and retention basins which are located along major drainage channels within the City (City of Hanford General Plan, 1994).

The project site is not located in an area that contributes to groundwater recharge nor in a 100-year floodplain (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 Hanford ILA site is not anticipated to significantly modify drainage of stormwater. Removal of the shell

of the 22,000 square foot building to expose the concrete pad will not alter impervious surface area on the site. No grading will occur, therefore stormwater drainage will remain unaltered. However, any stormwater drainage measures that may be included in the ILA facility will be installed in accordance with applicable Kings 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 Hanford 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.
- No 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.
- 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 Hanford ILA 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 Hanford 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 quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposal would not discharge substances that could contaminate water. Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in a 1,000-gallon, double-walled, above-ground 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 pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project will not extract groundwater, therefore, groundwater supplies will not be depleted, nor will the project interfere with groundwater recharge.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because it will be placed on the concrete pad of the 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because it will be placed on the concrete pad of the 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project would not create or contribute runoff water because the facility will be placed on the concrete pad of the existing building.

f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

No impacts to water quality are expected as a result of this project. Because the facility will be placed on the concrete pad of the existing building, the project would not produce contaminated runoff, 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

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

h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

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

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

An assessment of the potential for inundation of the site from a dam or levee failure was not found in the City of Hanford General Plan, the Kings County General Plan or other sources. However, the nearest body of water with a dam is the Pine Valley Reservoir, located approximately 40 miles to the north-northeast of the site. Failure of the Pine Valley Reservoir dam would likely result in water following the Kings River bed which passes approximately 10 miles north of the site. As the water exited the dam and followed the river's course it would spread out over the flat terrain between the reservoir and the site. By the time the flow along the river's course reached its closest distance from the site (10 miles north) it should be well dispersed and have little if any impact on the site. In addition, the site is not continuously occupied, so the risk of injury or death to humans would be negligible.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

Pine Valley Reservoir could possibly produce a seiche. However its effect on the site would likely be less than the negligible effect from a failure of the Pine Valley Reservoir dam discussed in (i) above. The site is too far from the ocean to possibly be effected by a tsunami. The site is flat and surrounded for miles in every direction by flat land eliminating the possibility of impact from a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

Setting

The general plan land use designation for the site is "Service Commercial" (Hanford, 1996). This designation provides for travel oriented businesses, businesses which have both retail and service components, and other businesses which can be located in a commercial area and not create a nuisance or interfere with

normal commercial activities. The surrounding land use designations are "Service Commercial" on all sides of the site.

The site is zoned "Service Commercial" (Hanford, 1997). This zoning district is intended primarily for establishments engaged in servicing equipment, materials, products, and related sales and travel conveniences. Typical Service Commercial uses are auto sales, motels, restaurants, service stations, auto repair, building material supply, warehousing, wholesale trade, contractors, suppliers, equipment yards, business parks, and other similar uses. The surrounding properties are all within the "Service Commercial" zoning district. The City of Hanford Zoning Ordinance allows public utility structures within the Service Commercial zoning district subject to Site Plan Review and an approved Conditional Use Permit (17.28.050 E). The purpose of the City's Site Plan Review is to enable the community development department to determine whether the proposed use is in conformity with the intent and provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, and to examine compatibility with surrounding land uses.

The existing residential uses adjacent to the site are existing nonconforming uses in the Service Commercial zoning district.

The site is located in Planning Area D, which has no significant policies or land use intents compared to other planning areas. The site is not within the Hanford Municipal Airport Land Use Planning area. The site is not located within any other land use planning overlay zones.

The following applicable land use policies are identified in the general plan:

- Objective 13: Provide for sufficient area to expand a full range of Service Commercial uses within and near main highway corridors in the City.
- Policy LU 13.1: Service Commercial uses which may be incompatible with surrounding uses shall be evaluated to determine if the proposed location is appropriate because of noise, odor, traffic, hours of operation, lighting, and other similar concerns. Conditions of operation or special improvements may be required to ensure land use and environmental compatibility with surrounding uses.
- Objective 15: Ensure that all commercial uses contribute to the resolution of traffic, public transit, and parking impacts created by additional traffic demands generated by those businesses.
- Policy LU 15.1: Development proponents are required to demonstrate that adequate circulation improvements including street improvements, signalization, bridges, public transit, and parking facilities are available, or can be made available through mitigation measures to serve the proposed project.

The proposed project would comply with all applicable local policies for land use and planning and will adhere to any conditions of approval determined during the City's Site Plan Review Process.

Evaluation

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The project site is entirely fenced and would remain so with project construction and operation. There is no evidence of pedestrian access across the site. The site is between mixed land uses, including residences to the north, light industry to the east, and agricultural to the south and west. This mix of land uses is not considered an established community. Thus, the project would not physically divide an established community.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---

The project would not conflict with any policies in the Hanford Municipal Airport Land Use Plan, as it is outside its boundaries.

The project site is zoned "Service Commercial," which is compatible with the "Service Commercial" land use designation for the site (Hanford, 1994). The City will require the applicant to apply for a Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit, which is a discretionary review and permit process. The City maintains Policy LU 13.1, which requires that the City determine those uses incompatible with surrounding uses. Such uses shall be evaluated to determine if the proposed location is appropriate because of noise, odor, traffic, hours of operation, lighting, and other similar concerns. Conditions of operation or special improvements may be required as part of an approved Conditional Use Permit to ensure land use and environmental compatibility with surrounding uses. The project proponent has committed to comply with any City-imposed conditions of approval.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

There are no biological resources onsite that would likely be protected under any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

The only mineral commodities in the Hanford Planning Area are sand and gravel. There are no known significant deposits, and no active mines. There are no policies in the general plan related to mineral resources (Hanford, 1994).

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

There are no known mineral resources on-site or in the project vicinity. Thus the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

b) 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

There are no known mineral resources on-site or in the project vicinity. Thus the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated by any land use plans.

XI. NOISE

Setting

The Hanford ILA Site is located in the City of Hanford in Kings. A number of residences are located adjacent to the site (Figure 8). The area is designated "Service Commercial" in the Land Use Element of the City of Hanford General Plan (City of Hanford, May 17, 1994). The nearest public receptors are adjacent residences located approximately 20 feet to the north (Figure 8). Other commercial uses are located approximately 50 feet to the east and 600 feet to the south.

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 ambient daytime and nighttime noise levels (52 dBA 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 Hanford ILA Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately 2.37-acres. Project activities include site preparation to construct the generator pad, demolition of the existing metal building, construction of the ILA pads and shelters on the existing building pad, installation of equipment, 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 on an existing building pad (except for the emergency generator) and utilize existing parking areas. The standard shelter for an ILA generator housing is a pre-cast concrete 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, in gross horsepower (hp), of each type of heavy construction equipment and the numbers of hours per day that each piece of equipment will operate.

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 was based on the loudest piece of construction equipment. While there is no local (City or County) ordinance pertaining to construction noise or work hours, the operation of only one piece of heavy equipment at any time will serve to minimize any construction noise impacts. The maximum potential noise (at full engine power) for normally muffled diesel-powered construction equipment of up to 200 hp, measured at 50 feet, is 84 dBA (U.S. EPA, 1971).

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.

The maximum construction noise level at the closest receptor (76 dBA) was estimated by adjusting the 84 dBA using the inverse square of the distance between the site and the receptor (120 feet). The distance of 120 feet was determined by adding the minimum generator setback distance of 100 feet to the distance to the nearest receptor, which is assumed to be 20 feet for the adjacent residences. Detailed methodologies, algorithms, and assumptions associated with the noise analysis are provided as Attachment A.

The City of Hanford General Plan – Hazards Management Element (City of Hanford, May 17, 1994) restricts and limits noise near residential land uses to Leq 50 dBA during daytime (7:00 am to 10:00 pm).

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 (52.7 dBA Leq) at the nearest receptor (Table 5) was estimated by adjusting the special-enclosure noise level of 75 dBA at a 5 foot distance using the inverse square of the distance between the site and the nearest receptor (120 feet).

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---

While there is no local (City or County) ordinance pertaining to construction noise or work hours, the operation of only one piece of heavy equipment at any time will serve to minimize any construction noise impacts. Because the facility will utilize prefabricated structures, the construction period will be less than two months as shown in Table 3. The estimated maximum noise level at the nearest receptors (residences) is 76 dBA. The location of construction (placement of the emergency generator) will be set back at least 100 feet from the site boundaries with the adjacent receptors.

During operation, the potential maximum noise level at the nearest receptor from testing the emergency generator (Leq 52.7 dBA) was calculated with the emergency generator back at least 100 feet from the site boundary with the nearest adjacent receptor and using a special noise-insulating enclosure for the emer-

gency generator. Calculation of the Leq with the additional generator noise results in an increase of 0.7 dBA over ambient for the one half-hour per week that the generator will run. This increase will not be perceptible and therefore will be less than significant.

Site Specific Environmental Commitment: Level 3 will comply with the local operation noise ordinance by installing the emergency generator at a 100 foot setback from the property boundaries of the residential receptors to the north and using an enclosure rated at 75 dBA at 5 feet for the emergency generator.

b)	Would the proposal result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

The project would not 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. Since the nearest sensitive receptor is at least 120 feet distant, there will be a less than significant impact from groundborne vibrations or noise during construction.

The 300 kW generator is the only potential source of excessive groundborne noise or vibration from site operations. The generator will be mounted on rubber isolators, which will effectively reduce groundborne vibration (Ace Mountings Company, 1999). Additionally, the vibration reduces structure-borne noise by interrupting noise transmission paths caused by "sounding-board" effect. Hence, groundborne noise and vibration would be reduced to a level of insignificance. The 120-foot distance to the nearest receptor provides additional assurances that no excessive groundborne noise or vibration will be detected.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

Permanent ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the site would not increase above existing levels. 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Temporary increases in ambient noise levels will occur during the construction period of less than two months, but these would not be significant. Temporary (30 minutes) and periodic (weekly) noise will be generated during testing of the emergency generator, and during power outages and periodic maintenance. Compliance of this temporary periodic noise with the local noise ordinance is achieved by locating the emergency generator on the opposite side of the existing building at least 100 feet from the site boundaries with the adjacent receptors and using a special enclosure for the emergency generator. Therefore, this temporary periodic noise will not substantially increase ambient noise levels.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

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

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

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

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Setting

The site is located within the City of Hanford, with a population of 40,307 as of January 1999 (Cain, 1999). The nearest housing is located adjacent to the north of the site, and consists of five single family, rural residential houses. There are no local policies for population and housing that apply to the proposed project or the project site.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing industrial site for the installation of an ILA facility. The project would be unmanned, and would not induce new employment. No new housing or extension of major infrastructure would result.

b)	Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

No displacement of existing housing units would result from implementation of the proposed project. The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing industrial site for the installation of an ILA facility within the footprint of the existing industrial building.

c)	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing industrial site for the installation of an ILA facility and would not displace any people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The site is located in the City of Hanford. Fire protection is provided by the Hanford Fire Department. The nearest station is located approximately one mile northeast of the site. Police protection is provided by the Hanford Police Department. The nearest school to the site is Lincoln Elementary School, located one-quarter mile north of the site along 10th Avenue. The nearest park is Coe Neighborhood Park, approximately one-half mile north of the site. The BNSF railroad ROW is located approximately 500 feet west of the site.

Policies related to public facilities include the following:

- Objective PF 2: New development shall pay fees as necessary to meet all identified costs associated with new development;
- Policy PF 2.2: New development shall be responsible for paying a financial contribution to mitigate the effect of the development on the provision of such public services as police and fire protection, public education, water, and sewer; and
- Policy PF 2.3: Construction permits shall not be granted until the developer provides for the installation and/or financing of needed public facilities.

The project would conform with Policies PF 2.2 and PF 2.3 during the Site Plan Review process.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

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 park is Coe Neighborhood Park, located approximately one mile northeast of the site. This facility provides passive and active recreational uses. There are no local policies for recreation which apply to the proposed project or project site.

The City of Hanford General Plan Circulation Element designates 10th Avenue as a Local Street. Local Streets are defined as those which provide access to adjacent land uses only and do not provide a mobility function in the larger transportation network. The General Plan does not contain standards for local streets. The Circulation Element states that the majority of streets in the City are operating at high levels of service, with only five segments operating below level of service (LOS) "C". None of the segments operating below LOS C are located in the project area.

The following policy found in the Circulation Element of the Hanford General Plan would apply to the proposed project:

- Policy CI 3.1: Local circulation system improvements shall be consistent with the goals and objectives stated in the Kings County Regional Transportation Plan.

Applicable goals and objectives found in the Kings County Regional Transportation Plan include the following:

- Objective 29.1: Approve development only when there are adequate circulation facilities to serve it, or the installation of new facilities to handle increased demand is made a condition of approval; and,
- Policy 29j: Require all developers to pay the cost of mitigating the impacts of their developments on existing roads and highways; and to pay the cost of new roads necessary to serve their developments, and to provide the mechanism for assuring the continued maintenance of such roads.

The project would be consistent with City and County circulation policies through conditions or fees imposed during the Site Plan Review.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

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, including the demolition/removal of the existing building, 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

Traffic associated with construction would be temporary. There would be no permanent increase to levels of service associated with the project because the site would not be occupied on a daily basis. The County has not identified this local street as one with a congested level of service (Kings, 1996). Thus the project would not individually or cumulatively exceed an acceptable level of service.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located within an airport land use or safety zone. Thus, the project would not result in a change in 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The existing driveway to the site is located such that no hazardous features result. The project would utilize this driveway during construction and operation. No incompatible uses to this mixed-use area would be introduced by the project. Thus, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The nearest emergency facility is a Hanford fire station, located approximately one-mile to the northeast of the site. Construction and operation of the project would not involve blocking a street lane or substantially increasing traffic to 10th Avenue such that emergency access would be impeded. Thus, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

f) Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

Construction would not limit surrounding parking in the area. Only one or two parking spaces would be needed for the project operation, and would be provided on-site. Thus, the project would not result in inadequate parking capacity.

g) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turn-outs, bicycle racks)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

There are no proposed or existing alternative transportation facilities at or near the site. Thus, the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Setting

The site is currently wired to electricity and telephone via overhead lines along 10th Avenue. Sewer and water service is also available on-site. The solid waste service that serves the Hanford area is the Kings Waste and Recycling Authority. This service provides collection of solid and green waste, sorts recyclable materials, and disperses remaining waste to Kettleman Hills Landfill. The authority, located locally outside of Hanford, has a permitted daily capacity of 800 tons, and receives approximately 375 tons per day (Adams, 1999).

Applicable Hanford General Plan policies related to utilities and service systems are as follows:

- Objective PF 4: Provide an adequate supply of water to support the General Plan level of development;
- Policy PF 4.5: New development shall include water conservation features and drought resistant landscaping;
- Objective PF 11: Support adequate solid waste disposal capacity; and
- Policy PF 11.1: Reduce the amount of waste disposed of at the landfill by reducing 25 percent of the solid waste stream by the year 1995 and 50 percent by the year 2000 as mandated by State law.

The proposed project would comply with applicable local policies for utilities and service systems during the Site Plan Review process.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

During construction, portable chemical toilets will be used on-site. During operation the site would be unoccupied. The project site will not be occupied on a daily basis and would not generate wastewater. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

The proposed project would be unmanned and would be visited by one or two service personnel approximately twice per month for maintenance. The project site will not be occupied on a daily basis and would not generate wastewater. A small amount of water would be used for on-site landscaping. The project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The project would not result in increased uses or burdens on stormwater facilities, as the site is already paved and contains a building. On-site drainage would not be altered. Thus, the project would not result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

This project would only require enough water for landscaping, which would be implemented in conformance with Policy PF 4.5. Thus, the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing resources.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The proposed project would be unmanned and would be visited by one or two service personnel approximately twice per month for maintenance. The project site will not be occupied on a daily basis and would not generate wastewater. The project would not affect the wastewater treatment provider's existing commitments.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Kettleman Hills Landfill would serve as the project landfill, which currently receives less solid waste than its determined capacity. The Kings Waste and Recycling Authority outside of Hanford, which sorts waste from recyclables, also receives less solid waste than its determined capacity. The proposed project involves the removal of an existing industrial building for the installation of an ILA facility on the concrete pad of the existing industrial building. Demolition and construction-related solid waste would result in approximately 190 cubic yards of solid waste. The current property owner will relocate the metal building occupying the site. However analysis includes the demolition waste of the building. Level 3 will regenerate only minimal waste during construction of the ILA. The project would not be occupied and would not generate solid waste on a daily basis. The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

g) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Initial clearing of remaining equipment and debris on the site, which would result in approximately 40 cubic yards of solid waste, would be the project's largest source of solid waste contribution. This amount of disposal would be less than significant according to the Kings Waste and Recycling Authority (Adams, 1999). During project operation the site would not generate solid waste. Thus, the project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations 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 Cominsky, 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/Analysis

Susan Robbins, AICP, Director of Environmental Services
Cheryl Kuta, MURP, AICP Certified Planner
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Derek Ross, BA, Environmental Analysis and Design
Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade and Douglas
505 South Main Street, Suite 900
Orange, California 92868
(714) 973-4880

Biological Resources: Field

Chris Blandford, BS, Ecology: Systematic Biology
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Biological Resources: Field

John Cleckler, BS, Wildlife Biology
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Noise/Air Quality

Eric Walther, Ph.D., Atmospheric Science
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

Dave 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 '99, Geography, (5 years experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services
505 South Main, Suite 900, Orange, CA 92868
Phone: (714) 973-4918 Fax: (714) 973-0358

Sources

40 CFR Parts 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.

Adams, Mike, Manager, Kings Waste and Recycling Authority. Interviewed by Derek Ross, Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS), September 2, 1999.

Beck, W. A. and Y. D. Haase. *Historical Atlas of California*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 1974.

Cain, Cathy, Planner, City of Hanford Community Development Department. Interviewed by Derek Ross, Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS), August 31, 1999.

California Department of Conservation. *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*, 1994.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). *Hanford Quadrangle, California Natural Diversity Database*, September 1999.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). *California Scenic Highway Program – Officially Designated State Scenic Highways*, Accessed at <http://www.dot.ca.gov>, January 11, 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 Environmental Protection Agency (California EPA), Air Resources Board. *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.

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

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

California Historical Resources Information System, Southern San Joaquin Valley Center. *Records Search for Project #8219-003H; Hanford ILA, 11090 10th Avenue, Hanford*, File No. 99-325, Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, September 1, 1999.

Caterpillar Corporation. *Generator Emissions Guarantee*, 1999.

Hanford, City of, Community Development Department. *City of Hanford General Plan*, Adopted May 17, 1994.

----- *General Plan Land Use Map*, Amended September 3, 1996.

----- *City of Hanford Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 of Municipal Code)*, May 1997.

----- *Zone Plan*, Revised June 3, 1997.

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.

Kings, County of. *Kings County General Plan*, Amended August 27, 1996.

Mason, R.D., Chambers Group Inc., Irvine, CA. 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: Hanford ILA Facility in the City of Hanford, Kings County, California*. Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, Prepared 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.

Matthew, R.A., and J.L. Burnett, Compilers. *Geologic Map of California, Fresno Sheet*, California Division of Mines and Geology, 1965.

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

Paul, Darren, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD). Interviewed by Mark Hagmann, ESA, April 1, 1999.

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

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD). *PM₁₀ Attainment Demonstration Plan*, 1997.

----- *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts*, August 1998.

----- *California Clean Air Act Ozone Air Quality Attainment Plan*, December 1998.

----- *Rules & Regulations*, 1999.

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

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.

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

Stowe, John, Senior Planner, City of Hanford Community Development Department. Interviewed by Derek Ross, Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS), August 31, 1999.

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

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

Vista Information Solutions, Inc. *California Site Assessment Plus Report: Hanford*, August 30, 1999.

----. *NEPA Checklist: Hanford*, August 1999.

Wallace, W. J. Southern Valley Yokuts, In: Robert F. Heizer (Editor), *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California*, pp. 448-461, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 1978.

Tables

Table 1	Current and Potential Cumulative Projects in the Vicinity of the Hanford ILA Site.
Table 2	Specific Local Policies Applicable to Each Issue Area for the Hanford ILA Site.
Table 3	Hanford ILA - Construction and Operation Emissions Summary.
Table 4	San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD – Total Project Construction Emissions.
Table 5	Potential for Habitat at the Hanford ILA Site to Support Sensitive Species Occurring in the Vicinity.

Figures

- Figure 1 Regional Map
- Figure 2 Vicinity Map
- Figure 3 Parcel Map
- Figure 4 U.S.G.S. Quad Sheet
- Figure 5 Surrounding Land Use Map
- Figure 6 Photo Key Map
- Figure 7 Conceptual Plot Plan
- Figure 8 Noise Receptor Map
- Figure 9 Floodplains Map
- Figure 10 Wetlands Inventory Map

Photo Plates

Photo A Overall View of Site
Photo B Rear View of Site
Photo C View of Uses to North
Photo D View of Use to East

Attachments

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