Appendix A – Site No. 1

PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Site name: Tionesta 3R

Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission

Prepared by
Level 3 Communications, LLC

Table of Contents

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

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Attachment

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Facility Title:
Level 3 Long-Haul Network, Tionesta 3R

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

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

4. Facility Location:
The project site is located approximately 500 feet southwest of the intersection of County Road 97 and Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway, in Modoc County, California. The site is surrounded on two sides by land owned by Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. The site is located on Modoc County parcel number 9-09-52. The 1.7 acre parcel is rectangular in shape (150' by 500') with the long axis running east-west. The BNSF tracks and right-of-way (ROW), where the long-haul running line will be located, are located approximately 300 feet east of the parcel. Approximately 300 feet south of the parcel, and bordering the Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. property to the south, is a spur of the BNSF system.

Currently the site is used to stockpile rock materials used by Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc., a pumice and rock processing company. A gravel road borders the north, east, and west sides of the site. Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. borders the site to the south. A barbed wire fence approximately 2-3 feet tall is located on the north side of the site (on the south border of the gravel road). Water on the site is provided by well and sewer is provided by a septic system.

Overhead utilities are located along the railroad running north-south. A Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) easement with additional overhead utilities running east-west is located approximately 350 feet south of the project site. The project line will leave the BNSF ROW at this east-west PG&E easement, bore underneath the railroad tracks, and travel west approximately 450 feet. Approximately 350 feet of line will be laid on private property from the site to the PG&E easement.

The site is located just south of CR 97, a paved, two-lane, east-west County-owned road. A gravel road off CR 97 provides access to the site, wide enough for two lanes. The gravel road used to access the project site is also used by Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. and a residence located south 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 A-F).

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: General Agricultural

7. **Zoning:** Industrial

8. Description of Facility:

This checklist evaluates the design, construction, and operation of the Tionesta 3R. This facility, which will support the long-haul network, will be located outside a utility corridor.

A regeneration station is an integral part of the operation of a fiber network. Regeneration is the process of re-shaping, re-timing, and re-modulating the optical signal. The resulting signal is filtered of noise and directed to its end destination along the fiber. Current technology dictates that regeneration stations be placed at 300-mile intervals along the long-haul network. Regeneration can be accomplished at a 3R, and also at distribution nodes, terminals, and gateway facilities. The 3R structure also performs the signal amplification (i.e., ILA) function.

The Tionesta 3R will be constructed on a 1.7-acre (150' x 500') parcel located approximately 500 feet southwest of the intersection of County Road 97 and the BNSF ROW. The site is currently occupied by Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc., a rock-crushing facility, which will remain active on the remainder of the parcel during project construction and operations. The 3R will encompass 11,500 square feet of the parcel. The facility will include one 4,500-square foot concrete tilt-up building and an equipment yard measuring 125 by 56 feet. The 3R component will rest on a new, concrete slab. The equipment yard will contain one 400 kW (587 hp) diesel-powered standby emergency generator and one cooling unit. A separate pad with vibration isolators will be constructed for the standby generator to effectively reduce groundborne vibration caused by generator operation. The vibration isolator would also reduce structure-borne noise by interrupting noise transmission paths caused by "sounding-board" effect. The generator will be housed in a separate, prefabricated shelter measuring 11 feet wide by 29 feet long by 12 feet tall. The equipment yard will be located adjacent to the 3R building and will be oriented to comply with all applicable local ordinances and minimize environmental impacts on surrounding land uses.

No additional buildings will be constructed. Control and maintenance functions will occur within the proposed facility.

Fencing around the 3R facility will be of chain link construction and will be eight feet tall. A locked gate will restrict access to the site. A small porch light will be provided at each structure entrance.

The Tionesta 3R will require electricity and telephone hookup. Overhead utility lines will be run from existing electric and telephone lines located approximately 350-feet south of the 3R site. Utility poles will be located on the adjacent property of Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. per a negotiated easement agreement. The 3R facility will operate using 400-amp, 480-volt, three-phase electrical service.

Water and sewer facilities will also be required on-site. However, no municipal water and sewer service is available at the site. Therefore, a well and septic tank will be required and will be constructed in accordance with all local ordinances.

Some grading of previously disturbed surfaces currently impacted by rock crushing operations will be required for the installation of 3R building and the adjacent equipment yard.

Figure 7 is a conceptual plot plan of the Tionesta 3R site showing setbacks and locations of utility and vehicle access. The area bounded by the setbacks is the "development window" within which the 3R facility will be situated. The precise location of the 3R facility will be determined during the engineering design phase of the project.

The fiber optic cable feed will access the 3R facility from existing utility ROW (a PG&E easement) located approximately 350 feet south of the project site. The cable will go from the BNSF ROW west along the PG&E ROW and then run due north across Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. land to the 3R site. The fiber optic cable feed will remain on existing utility ROW for the remainder of the alignment in the vicinity of the Tionesta 3R. Access and egress to the site will follow parallel routes through a negotiated easement on the property of Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. The connection to the 3R 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. During construction, no offsite areas will be required for mobilization or parking of construction or worker vehicles. No demolition waste will be generated, but there will be a small amount of waste from site clearing activities. An estimated 390 cubic yards of waste will be generated during construction.

One 400-kilowatt (kW), 587-hp diesel-powered generator will provide emergency power to the 3R facility. The pre-cast concrete generator housing or shelter will be approximately 11 feet wide, 29 feet long, and 12 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 1,400-gallon, double-walled, aboveground storage tank. The storage tank is designed to support the weight of the generator. This mounting design is common for emergency generators (Rice, 1999).

During operation at 100-percent load, the 587-hp generator consumes approximately 29 gallons of diesel fuel per hour (gph). At 75 percent load, fuel consumption rate is 21 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 purposes 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). This results in an estimated fuel consumption of 630 gallons per year for testing and maintenance purposes. 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 3R site will not be permanently manned. The site will be visited approximately once a week for routine maintenance, data downloading, and fuel tank filling, as required (assumed for analysis purposes to be 60 trips per year).

Current and potential cumulative projects in the vicinity of the proposed Tionesta 3R site are provided in Table 1. Criteria for inclusion of a project in Table 1 are as follows:

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

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The project site is bordered on the south by Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc., a pumice and rock processing facility. Bordering the site to the east and west are gravel roadways used by Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. and by a residence. The pumice and rock processing facility gives the immediate site area an industrial visual character. The company office of Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. is located approximately 500 feet south of the site. The closest residence is a single-family dwelling located approximately 700 feet south of the site (Figure 8). The BNSF railroad is located approximately 300 feet east of the site and CR 97 is located just north of the site. The remaining land in the project vicinity is vacant.

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The site is located within the jurisdiction of Modoc County. The site lies within the Northeast Plateau Air Basin and within the jurisdiction of the Modoc County Air Pollution Control District (MCAPCD).

The project would require a discretionary conditional use permit from the Modoc County Planning Department (Kessler, 1999). Although the project is on land designated as "General Agricultural" by the Modoc County General Plan (1988), limited commercial and industrial areas are allowed, and the project is compatible with the "Industrial" zoning of the site location. Approval of the conditional use permit requires review by the Modoc County Planning Department/Planning Director and a public hearing before the Planning Commission. According to the County Planning Director, the approval process will be discussed with the applicant on an individual project basis (Kessler, 1999).

A well to provide water at the site will have to be drilled. A permit from Modoc County will be required prior to drilling the well (Farnam, 1999).

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

PROPONENT'S DETERMINATION

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

Environmental Commitments

The proposed facility is an element of the project addressed in an Application for Modification of an existing Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) (Decision No. 98-03-066). That CPCN was supported by a Mitigated Negative Declaration that included mitigation measures to be implemented in the design, construction, and operation of the previously approved telecommunications facilities within existing

utility ROWs. 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 Tionesta 3R site. All potential impacts can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of Level 3's Environmental Commitments.

This page has been left blank.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

Setting

The project site is comprised of relatively flat disturbed land currently used to stockpile rock by Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc., a pumice and rock processing company. A residence is located roughly 1/8 mile south of the site and has a relatively clear view of the site. SR 139 is approximately 4 miles east of the site. The site is not visible from SR 139. There are no state scenic highways in Modoc County designated by Caltrans (California Department of Transportation, 1999).

Evaluation

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

There are scenic vistas of mountains surrounding the project site in many directions. The construction and maintenance of the 12-foot tall 3R building would not significantly obstruct views of these mountains from the single residence near the site or from CR 97.

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

The site is not visible from any designated scenic highway or roadway. The site has been heavily disturbed and there are no scenic resources located on the site.

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

The project site is located on a parcel currently used to store stockpiles of pumice and rock processing related material, giving the site an industrial visual character. The project would not degrade the visual character of the area.

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

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

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is located in an area with the land use designated "General Agricultural" by the general plan, but zoned "Industrial" (Kessler, 1999) with a minimum parcel size of 6,000 square feet. The site is not located on land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local or Statewide Importance. The site is not located within an agricultural preserve, nor is it under a Williamson Act contract (Modoc County General Plan, September 1988).

Evaluation

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

The project is not located on land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance so use of the site for a 3R would not convert such farmland to non-agricultural uses.

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

The project is not zoned for agricultural use, nor is it under 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 ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The existing environment is industrial and the site is zoned industrial. Therefore, the construction of a 3R facility would not result in growth-inducing effects or other off-site changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

III. AIR QUALITY

The Tionesta 3R will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately 11,500 square feet. Project activities will include site preparation to construct a foundation and support pads for the equipment, installation of equipment and shelters, automated testing of the emergency generators, and approximately weekly trips of one vehicle to the site for maintenance and data logging. In addition, a well and septic system will be installed to provide water and septic services to the site.

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

- Estimate of one-way commuting distance (miles) that members of the construction crew will travel to the site and numbers of such trips;
- Equipment (e.g., graders, excavators, and water trucks) that will be used at the construction 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., cement 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 innerduct between the property line and the building.

A key assumption implicit in the estimation of fugitive dust and emissions from 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 manufacturer-supplied emission factors for the 400 kW emergency standby generator that will be housed at the site, the duration of the weekly generator test (30 minutes), and parameters for the weekly travel of one vehicle to and from the site for the purpose of site maintenance and data logging. Normal operation will generate at most one vehicle trip to and from the site on a weekly basis (conservatively estimated as 60 trips/year for emissions estimation). The testing of the emergency generator will be triggered automatically. Operating equipment at the site will be powered by electricity from the utility power grid.

Table 3 shows the emission factors and other parameters used to calculate exhaust emissions and fugitive PM_{10} emissions for mobile equipment (U.S. EPA, 1996). Also included are construction and operation emission thresholds for nitrogen oxides (NO_X), Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC), particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}), sulfur oxides (SO_X), and carbon monoxide (CO) provided by the Modoc County Air Pollution Control District (MCAPCD), the agency responsible for management of air emissions in Modoc County, where the Tionesta 3R Site resides. Modoc County is within the Northeast Plateau Air Basin, which also includes Siskiyou and Lassen counties.

Setting

The project site is located in the community of Tionesta in Modoc County. Modoc County is within the Northeast Plateau Air Basin and is currently designated as a non-attainment area for state air quality standards for PM_{10} (California EPA, 1998). The site is located adjacent to an industrial establishment (rock crushing plant) and an associated residence (Figure 8). The distance of the closest sensitive receptor is approximately 700 feet.

Based on monitoring data collected within the Northeast Plateau Air Basin during the three-year period from 1995-1997, maximum ozone concentrations did not exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (0.12 parts per million for one hour) or the more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standard (0.09 parts per million for one hour) (California EPA, 1996 to 1998).

For the same three-year period from 1995-1997, ambient PM_{10} concentrations in the Northeast Plateau Air Basin exceeded the national 24-hour standard (150 micrograms per cubic meter) on an average of less than 1 percent of sample days (1995-0%, 1996-1%, 1997-0%). Ambient PM_{10} concentrations did not exceed the 24-hour federal standard in Modoc County between 1995 and 1997. The more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standard (50 micrograms per cubic meter) was exceeded in Modoc County for 16 percent of sample days in 1995, but was not exceeded in 1996 or 1997. For the entire Northeast Plateau Air Basin, the California Ambient Air Quality Standard was exceeded on an average of 7 percent of sample days during

the 1995-1997 period (California EPA, 1996 to 1998). PM_{10} precursors include ROC, NO_X, and SO_X, which form secondary PM_{10}, such as nitrates and sulfates.

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

Evaluation

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

The Modoc County Air Pollution Control District (MCAPCD) has not developed a specific air quality plan and recommends that project proponents apply state CEQA guidelines for emissions of criteria air pollutants.

Emissions will be generated during construction and operations phases of the project. Site construction parameters and the resulting emissions are estimated in Table 3. Estimated construction emissions will be well within the CEQA guidelines thresholds (discussed further in Section III(b) below).

The MCAPCD exempts emergency generators from emissions thresholds (Moreo, 1999). Also, mobile sources (associated with maintenance visits to the facility) are exempt from CEQA Guidelines.

Fugitive dust will be generated during construction by use of the gravel access road, by grading activities, during the trenching of the onsite innerduct, and by wind erosion. Fugitive dust generation will vary from day to day, depending on the construction activities, the silt content of the soil, and the weather. Fugitive dust will be controlled by implementing dust control measures throughout the construction. Long-term fugitive dust emissions associated with facility operation will be negligible.

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

For evaluating construction-phase impacts under CEQA, MCAPCD recommends using emissions-based significance criteria following the CEQA Guidelines and the implementation of dust control measures (Moreo, 1999). The recommended daily construction-related emissions criteria are as follows: 550 pounds of CO, 55 pounds of ROC, 55 pounds of NO_X, 150 pounds of SO_X, and 150 pounds of PM_{10}.

For evaluating operational-phase impacts, MCAPCD requires only that the emergency generator employ Best Available Control Technology (BACT) to minimize engine emissions (Moreo, 1999). The 400-kW generator will emit 8.1 g NOx (as NO2) per hp-hr, 1.3 g CO per hp-hr, 0.08 g total hydrocarbons per hp-hr, and 0.13 g particulate matter per hp-hr when operated at 75 percent load (Caterpillar Corporation, 1999). Sulfur oxide BACT requirements require the use of low-sulfur diesel fuel (0.05 percent sulfur by weight). The generator will be equipped with a turbocharger and aftercooler (*ibid.*). Stated performance is consistent with recent BACT determinations for emergency compression-ignition generators in California (California EPA, 1999).

Estimates of construction-related emissions are shown in Table 3. Emissions will be below the CEQA Guidelines thresholds and therefore will be less than significant.

Site Specific Environmental Commitments:

- Level 3 will develop and implement a construction dust abatement program in consultation with the MCAPCD; and
- The proposed emergency generator will comply with BACT requirements.

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 that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

The Tionesta 3R site is the only PEA site under the jurisdiction of the MCAPCD. Therefore, emissions from construction and operation of the Tionesta 3R site represent project total emissions for the district.

Emissions from testing and maintaining the emergency generator are exempt from numerical threshold requirements (due to compliance with State BACT requirements) and will therefore be considered less than significant.

Construction emissions will be a small, incremental contribution to regional emissions of ozone and PM_{10}, amounting to only 0.2, 0.05, and 0.04 percent of county emissions for NO_X, ROC, and PM_{10}, respectively. Given the limited duration of construction activities and the compliance with the site-specific environmental commitments stated in Section III (b), construction emissions will have a cumulative impact that is less than significant.

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

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities that house children, the elderly, and ill members of the population, such as schools, day-care centers, hospitals, retirement homes, hospices, and residences. The nearest sensitive receptor to the proposed 3R site is a residence associated with the adjacent rock crushing plant located approximately 700 feet to the southwest.

Project construction will affect only a small area within the larger 1.7-acre site. Surrounding land uses will be buffered from construction and operational impacts by the placement of 3R facilities and construction staging areas (see Figure 7 for the "conceptual plot plan"). This buffer, the 700-foot distance to the nearest receptor, and the low levels of construction emissions will assure that the sensitive receptors are not exposed to significant pollutant concentrations.

During construction, site access will be easy and direct. Construction vehicles will not block traffic on County Road 97 or State Highway 139 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. Testing will be limited to 30 minutes per week. The distance to sensitive receptors, the small magnitude of operational emissions, and the intermittent nature of generator operations will ensure that the impact of 3R operations on sensitive receptors is less than significant.

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

The only odor that could be associated with site construction activities at the Tionesta 3R Site will be diesel engine exhaust from construction equipment. The low level of construction activity will not produce enough exhaust or objectionable odor to affect the few members of the offsite public working at the adjacent rock crushing plant. Similarly, testing of the emergency generator at the 3R 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

The Tionesta 3R parcel is currently part of a rock processing facility (Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc.), located approximately 2 miles northwest of Timber Mountain summit, 500 feet south of County Road 97 and 300 feet west of the UPRR. The Glass Mountain Pumice property is entirely surrounded by the Modoc National Forest, although railroad, natural gas (PG&E pipeline), and powerline ROWs cross within 1 mile of the site. The upland habitat adjacent to the site is typical of the lower elevations of Modoc County. Sagebrush (*Artemesia tridentata*) predominates on undisturbed land, giving way to rabbitbrush (*Chrysothamnus* sp.) and common mullein (*Verbascum thapsus*) where soils have been disturbed (e.g., road shoulders). Bitterbrush (*Purshia tridentata*) is another common overstory shrub. The herbaceous understory consists of a very sparse (<5%) cover of bunchgrasses.

The 3R site itself is a graded portion of the rock processing facility. It has been used for stockpiling, and is now covered with rock dust, pumice, and piles of basalt cobles and gravels 8" – 2' in diameter. The very limited vegetation on the parcel includes mostly the disturbance species (mullein and rabbitbrush). There are no trees and no sign of wildlife use, although a few of the rock piles appeared to have been used as small mammal burrows sometime in the past.

The conduit access corridor from the UPRR is slightly more vegetated than the 3R parcel, with a few yellow pines (*Pinus ponderosa*) in the immediate vicinity and a deer trail paralleling the north-south portion about 50' to the east. Neither the site nor the access corridor have any natural drainage features, nor any signs of water-dependent vegetation, wetland soils, or other wetland attributes.

Evaluation

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

The quality of habitat for candidate, sensitive, or special status species was determined to be minimal due to the current land use and absence of vegetation, and relative to the abundance of natural habitat on surrounding lands. A list of potential sensitive species in the area was created based upon a California Natural Diversity Database search of occurrences for the Perez Quadrangle (CDFG, October 1999), and knowledge

of the site vicinity. Known records include golden eagles (*Aquila chrysaetos)* from Timber Mountain (2.5 miles west) and Townsend's big-eared bat (*Plecotus townsendii townsendii*) from Mammoth Cave (2 miles north). Table 4 describes the potential for onsite occurrence of these species as well as several CNPS-listed plant species. Due to the poor quality of habitat on the 3R site, there should be no impacts on sensitive species associated with construction and operation of the facility.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: Preconstruction surveys for nesting raptor species were considered, but since no trees will be removed, and due to the high level of ambient noise from the rock operation, no impacts to nesting raptors are anticipated.

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

No sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans (e.g., the Land Management Plan for the Modoc National Forest), policies, or regulations of the California Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Forest Service or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service exists within the site.

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 ☒

There are no wetlands in the vicinity of the site.

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 ☐

Great Basin sagebrush scrub extends for several miles to the north and south, broken only by Timber Mountain, the dry lake west of Perez, and stands where yellow pine/juniper crown closure is somewhat greater than in the vicinity of the site. The surrounding National Forest lands provide ample wildlife movement corridors, and any restriction to wildlife movement would not be distinguishable from that caused by the rock operation at the site currently. Due to the lack of natural habitat elements (e.g., shrubs and trees, water) within the proposed site and cable access routes, it is highly unlikely that they provide any component of a migratory wildlife corridor or native wildlife nursery.

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 ☒

No trees occur within the site or along the cable access alignment. No Forest Service resource protection policies are applicable to the site.

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 ☒

Use of the Tionesta site will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The Tionesta 3R Facility site is located in the Medicine Lake Highlands region of northeastern California between Lava Beds National Monument and Timber Mountain. The parcel is part of the Glass Mountain Pumice Inc. mill site. The ILA parcel has been graded to a depth of approximately 30 centimeters below the original surface and is covered with imported pulverized pumice matrix (pumice, vesicular basalt, and obsidian nodule and chunks). Part of the parcel is covered by large mounds of stockpiled processed pumice.

The Tionesta 3R site is near the northern boundary of the area occupied by the Achumawi in the upper Pit River drainage in north eastern California. The western boundary of their territory followed a line running from Mount Shasta to Lassen Peak and the eastern boundary was the Warner Mountains. Achumawi territory was comprised of many valleys separated by hills and mountains. Elevations ranged from 2,000 to 14,000 feet. General vegetation communities included pine, oak, fir, and chaparral; juniper and sagebrush; swamps, meadows, and grasslands; and barren lava and peaks. A large proportion of food and materials for shelter came from streams, lakes, meadows, and swamps. Salmon, trout, other freshwater fish, crawfish, and freshwater mussels were important food resources. Waterfowl and their eggs were taken from swamps. Tules gathered from swamps were used as floor mats and for covering summer houses. Bulbs and roots were important resources obtained from the grasslands. Deer from the forests were driven into large pitfalls. Acorns were obtained in the fall from oak trees that grew at lower elevations. The Achumawi had access to several sources of obsidian in their territory. Obsidian was a favored material for making arrowheads and other flaked stone tools (Olmsted and Stewart, 1978).

Politically, the Achumawi were organized into tribelets. These were small politically autonomous groups that controlled the resources in a bounded territory. The tribelets were socially connected through intermarriage and a common language. The Achumawi traded with the neighboring groups to west, south, and east, but relations with the Modoc to the north were hostile.

Because of the relatively remote location of their territory, the Achumawi population was not as severely reduced by exposure to European diseases and removal from their lands by Euro-American settlers as were Native American groups further south in California. The original Achumawi population was estimated as 3,000 people. By 1910 there were still 1,000 Achumawi and later in the twentieth century population estimates ranged from 500 to 750. The Achumawi have retained much of their original cultural, especially in their use of traditional foods and medicines.

Evaluation

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

The protocols contained in the *Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optics Project Cultural Resources Procedures* (PBNS, 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, 1999).

Prior to the commencement of fieldwork, Level 3 requested a records search for the proposed Tionesta Facility site, and the lands within a one-mile radius, from the California Historical Resources Information System Northeast Center located at California State University, Chico. 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 3R Facility. The records search was conducted by Information Center staff who also checked the OHP Historic Property Data File for Modoc County, the National Register of Historic Places (listings and eligibility determinations), California Points of Historical Interest, California Register of Historical Resources, and California Historical Landmarks.

In addition, the Level 3 Team sent a letter dated October 22, 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 (White, 1999). The response, dated November 9, 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 Modoc 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, 1999).

The CHRIS records search reported three surveys for cultural resources within a mile of the site (File Number D99-61, California Historical Resources Information System Northeast Center, 1999). The results of the CHRIS records search also showed that the ILA site itself has not been previously surveyed for historic resources and no historic resources have been recorded within one mile of the site. No historic resources within one mile of the site are listed on the California State Historic Resources Inventory, the National Register of Historic Places, the California Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources, nor the California Points of Historical interest (California Historical Resources Information System, Northeast Center, 1999).

The field survey of the parcel and off-ROW cable access corridor that was performed by qualified archaeologists showed that no historic resources are present (Munns and Turner, 1999). There are no historic resources that are potentially eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources present on the property.

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

The results of the CHRIS records search showed that the property had not been previously surveyed for prehistoric archaeological resources. However, twenty-eight archaeological sites have been recorded within a mile of the survey area. These included lithic scatters (tools and waste flakes), a rock shelter, and historic trash scatters. No cultural resources within one mile of the site have been listed on the California State Historic Resources Inventory, the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, the California Historical Landmarks, nor the California Points of Historical Interest (California Historical Resources Information System, Northeast Center, 1999).

The field survey performed by qualified archaeologists provided no evidence of archaeological resources, due to the parcel being graded and covered with pumice (Munns and Turner, 1999).

On the basis of these results, there will be no impacts to archaeological resources associated with site construction and operation activities.

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

As mapped by Gay and Quintin (1958), the project site is underlain by Pleistocene basalt flows (unit Qpv^b), which are unfossiliferous.

No mitigation measure would be necessary, except in the unlikely event fossil remains were uncovered by earthmoving in an unmapped remnant of Quaternary alluvium. If fossil remains were uncovered by earthmoving, construction would be temporarily diverted around the fossil site and a qualified vertebrate paleontologist would be called to the site immediately to recover the remains and to recommend appropriate mitigation measures. Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995, 1996) guidelines for mitigating adverse construction-related impacts on paleontologic resources and for the museum acceptance of a monitoring program fossil collection would be implemented.

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

The CHRIS records search and field survey provided no evidence of the presence of human remains (California Historical Resources Information System, Northeast Center, 1999; Munns and Turner, 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 the *Level 3 Long-Haul Fiber Optics Project Cultural Resources Procedures* (PBNS, 1999:25-39), approved by the CPUC.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Setting

The site lies in a relatively flat area in Tionesta. Tionesta is located in a regionally active geologic area. Although the project site vicinity is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone, or liquefaction, landslide, or subsidence geologic hazard area (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1973, 1999), there is an active fault trace in the northwest corner of the property. Erosion activity is low and the soils are moderately expansive (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1973).

Evaluation

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

The project site, which would not be permanently staffed, is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone, or a landslide or liquefaction geologic hazard area (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1973, 1999). However, the project site is located in a regionally seismically active area. Approximately 20 feet inside the northwest corner of the property line, trending approximately $N5^0E$ across the corner of the property, is an active fault associated with the Medicine Lake Volcano. The fault is active and is the result of east-west tectonic extension (Donnelly-Nolan, 1999). The fault appears as a fissure, a few to several feet wide and tens of feet deep. The fault is capable of producing at least a 5.0 magnitude earthquake and possibly up to a 7.0 magnitude earthquake. The Medicine Lake Volcano is currently dormant, but could become active again.

Regionally, the project site area can experience moderate magnitude groundshaking from nearby active fault systems (i.e., faults exhibiting displacement within the last 11,000 years) (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1994). The major active regional faults in the vicinity of the project site are the Mayfield, McArthur, and Cedar Mountain faults (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1994). These faults are located approximately 24, 30, and 36 miles from the project site, respectively. The Mayfield, McArthur, and Cedar Mountain faults can produce a maximum earthquake magnitude of approximately 7.0, 7.0, and 6.9 (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1996). A 10% probability of peak ground accelerations of 10% to 30% g in 50 years is expected in the site vicinity (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1996).

Site-Specific Environmental Commitment: Any potential seismic hazard will be minimized by compliance with the California seismic code standards and applicable local building and seismic codes, and by the fact that the site will not be permanently staffed. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects attributable to these potential geologic hazards, and impacts will be less

than significant.

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

The site is nearly flat, and is located in an area of low erosion activity (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1973). Therefore, substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would not occur as a result of the project.

c)	Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The site is not within any landslide, subsidence, or liquefaction geologic hazard area (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1973). The site is relatively flat, and the geologic units and soils on the site are not unstable. Therefore, the minimal plowing or trenching from the BNSF ROW to the proposed 3R facility would not result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

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

The area in which the site is located has moderately expansive soils (California Division of Mines and Geology, 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 ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Soils at the site and surrounding the site are capable of supporting the use of septic tanks as evidenced by existing septic systems installed and operated by other facilities in the vicinity of the site.

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 the site visit. There are no schools within one-quarter mile of the site. Prior to development of this site, a complete Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be conducted as part of Level 3's due diligence work.

There are no airports in the vicinity of the site and the site is not located within any airport safety zone.

Evaluation

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

The 1,400-gallon, double-walled above-ground storage tank containing diesel fuel would be located on site to supply the 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 and procedures prescribed by Level 3 (see Section 8, Description of Facility, under Environmental Checklist). 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 a building in which all doors and windows will be locked to provide security.

b)	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in an 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 a pre-cast concrete generator housing or shelter which will be locked and surrounded by an eight foot chain link fence to provide security.

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

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

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

The project would not be located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 (Vista Information Solutions, *California Site Assessment,* 1999).

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

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

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

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

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

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

h)	Would the 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 ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The proposed structure would be located in an area zoned Industrial and surrounded by properties and land containing little vegetation. While wildlands surround the site, they are located a considerable distance from the site and the area between the site and the beginning of the wildlands does not have sufficient vegetation to support a wildfire such that it would reach the site. Generators would be equipped with spark arrestors to further reduce the potential for loss, injury, or death involving fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Setting

The site is not located in a 100-year floodplain (Modoc County General Plan, 1988, page 100, Figure II-3, page 101). However, a FEMA floodplain map showing the surrounding area is included as Figure 9. The site is not located in an area that would be subject to inundation as a result of dam failure, tsunami, or seiche.

The Tionesta 3R site is not anticipated to significantly modify drainage of stormwater from the site. However, any stormwater drainage measures that may be included in the 3R facility design will be installed in accordance with applicable Modoc County codes.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: The following actions will be taken to ensure that hydrol-

ogy/water quality impacts are minimized during construction and operation of the Tionesta 3R.

As appropriate, Level 3 will implement the following measures to avoid and minimize hydrology and water quality impacts 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;
- Limit refueling activities to areas beyond 100 feet from an aquatic environment;
- Comply with state, federal, and local permits;
- Perform proper sediment control;
- Prepare and implement a spill prevention and response plan;
- Remove all installation debris, construction spoils, and miscellaneous litter for proper offsite disposal; and
- Complete post-construction vegetation monitoring and supplemental revegetation where needed.

A Notification of Intent (NOI) will be submitted to the applicable RWQCB and the State Water Resources Control Board for construction of the Tionesta 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 Tionesta 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, Distribution Node, and terminal 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 ☒

The proposed project would not discharge substances that could contaminate water. Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in a 1,400-gallon, double-walled, above-ground storage tank, with monitoring and leak containment features. The tank would provide hazard containment against reasonably foreseeable upsets 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 ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

The project will extract a minimal quantity of groundwater (estimated at 2,000 gallons per month). To put this use in perspective, a single-family house located on one acre of land would use between 13,500 and 27,000 gallons per month. There are several groundwater basins in Modoc County with large capacities. The site is located in an area of grazing lands which result in a much lower groundwater use than an agricultural area (Modoc County General Plan, September 1988, Background Report, pages 18-26). Finally, there is not much development in the vicinity of the site, so use of groundwater should not be large. It is therefore believed that groundwater supplies will not be depleted by the site's use nor will the project interfere with groundwater recharge. The site is not located in a groundwater recharge area as identified by the California Department of Water Resources (Modoc County General Plan, 1988).

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

The project would minimally alter the existing drainage pattern of the site due to installation of concrete pads for the 3R facility and emergency generator. No stream or river course would be altered. The site is essentially flat, so no substantial increase in erosion or siltation is expected.

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

The project would minimally alter the existing drainage pattern of the site due to installation of concrete pads for the 3R facility and emergency generator. No stream or river course would be altered. The site is essentially flat, so no substantial increase in surface runoff is expected.

e)	Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

The project would minimally alter the existing drainage pattern of the site due to installation of concrete pads for the 3R facility and the emergency generator. However, the site is essentially flat, allowing for ample on-site-drainage on undeveloped portions of the property. No activities contributing to liquid or solid releases of

pollutants to the property surfaces are anticipated other than those from a septic system. Thus, substantial additional sources of polluted runoff are not anticipated.

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

Installation of concrete pads for the 3R facility and emergency generator may minimally increase the quantity of stormwater runoff but the project would not result in polluted runoff, nor generate wastewater, nor discharge substances that could contaminate water.

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

The project would not include housing. The project is not located within a 100-year floodplain (Figure 9; Modoc County General Plan, 1988).

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

The project is not located within a 100-year floodplain (Figure 9; Modoc County General Plan, 1988).

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

The site is not located within an area subject to inundation from dam or levee failure (Modoc County General Plan, 1998).

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

The Modoc County General Plan (1988) does not discuss tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. However, the site is too far from the ocean to possibly be impacted by a tsunami. It is also too far from lakes to be impacted significantly by a seiche. The site is flat, surrounded by flat land for several miles, and therefore not subject to mudflows. Finally, the site will not be permanently manned and even if a seiche or mudflow did occur, there would not be significant risk to human life.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

Setting

The general plan land use designation for the project site is "General Agricultural" (Modoc County, Land Use Map, 1988) which is to be used primarily for single family dwellings, agricultural activities, and related uses. The surrounding properties are also designated as "General Agricultural".

The project site is zoned "Industrial" (Kessler, 1999) which permits a broad range of commercial and industrial uses including manufacturing, wholesaling, and limited agricultural uses (Modoc County, 1991). The purpose of this zone is to designate areas suitable for industrial development in the County. The project site is currently used by a pumice and rock processing facility, a resource-based industry. The general plan describes that accommodations must be made to permit the location of resource-based processing industries near the raw product (Modoc County General Plan, 1988). This explains a location zoned "Industrial" and designated "General Agricultural".

Evaluation

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

There is one residence in the vicinity of the site (Figure 8). This single resident does not constitute an established residential community. In addition, the project will not divide the single residence from any other residences.

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

The Modoc County land use designation for the site is "General Agricultural", and the site is zoned "Industrial". The project site is currently used by a pumice and rock processing facility, a resource-based industry. The general plan describes that accommodations must be made to permit the location of resource based processing industries near the raw product (Modoc County General Plan, 1988), so the zoning is compatible with the general plan. However, since the proposed project element is not a resource-based industry, a conditional use permit is required by the Modoc County Planning Department (Kessler, 1999). The project is compatible with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations.

The requirement for a conditional use permit does not imply a lack of conformance with local land use designations. Rather, a use permit is implemented to assure the local jurisdiction that the proposed use, already determined to be consistent with local land use designations, also is in compliance with the many and varied other concerns the local community may have. Such concerns may include, but are not limited to, hours of operation, building height, setbacks, landscaping, exterior materials and colors, parking, and architectural character. Conditions imposed through the use permit process will be fully complied with by Level 3.

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

There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that affect the site.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is not located in an area designated by the state or Modoc County for mineral resources (Modoc County General Plan, 1988).

Evaluation

a)	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

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

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

The site is not located in an area with known mineral resources so construction on the pre-developed site would not result in loss of locally important mineral resources.

XI. NOISE

Setting

The Tionesta 3R Site is located in the community of Tionesta in Modoc County (Figure 2). The property is designated as "General Agricultural" (Modoc County General Plan, 1988) and is zoned as Industrial (Modoc County, 1991). The BNSF ROW runs north-south on the east side of the site, within 300 feet of the site. The nearest public receptor, an office building associated with the rock-crushing plant that occupies the surrounding parcel, is located approximately 500 feet from the site boundary.

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

The Tionesta 3R facility will involve development of approximately 11,500 square feet of currently undeveloped but disturbed land. Construction activities would include site grading, installation of foundations for the 3R building and generator shelter, installation of the fiber optics innerduct, delivery and installation of the generator shelter, and construction of the 3R facility. Operations-phase activities would be limited to weekly trips to the site by one vehicle for maintenance and data logging, as well as automated weekly testing of the emergency standby generator.

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

A key assumption implicit in the evaluation of noise impacts is that only one piece of heavy equipment would operate at any one time. Therefore, maximum construction noise levels at each site are based on the loudest piece of construction equipment. This maximum potential noise (at full engine power) for normally-muffled diesel-powered construction equipment up to 200 horsepower (hp) measured at 50 feet is 84 dBA (U.S. EPA, 1971). The public receptor distance is approximately 500 feet (rock crushing plant office). The resulting maximum construction noise level at the closest public receptor would be 64 dBA. Detailed methodologies, algorithms, and assumptions associated with the noise analysis are provided as Attachment A. Modoc County does not restrict the hours for construction or set a numerical threshold for noise from construction sites (Table 2).

Operational parameters related to noise include the size/gross hp and period of operation (approximately 30 minutes/week) of the emergency standby generator (Table 3). The generator will be automatically tested weekly. The maximum noise level at the closest receptor was estimated by adjusting the noise level for the generator at 50-foot distance (91 dBA for the unsheltered generator, Caterpillar Corporation, 1999) with the algorithm described in Attachment A. Resulting operational noise would produce a day-night average sound level (L_{dn}) of 57 dBA, which is less than the 60 dBA limit that would apply to the facility (Modoc County General Plan, 1988).

Evaluation

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

The project would not generate noise levels in excess of local standards during construction because no numerical standards apply. Therefore, no regulatory-based threshold would be exceeded.

The generator would be located at least 500 feet from the nearest public receptor. The resulting operational noise level of 57 dBA L_{dn} at the nearest public receptor (rock crushing plant office) would comply with the maximum permissible exterior noise level of 60 dBA L_{dn} (Modoc County General Plan, 1988) at the public receptor.

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

The low level groundborne vibration and noise generated during construction would be short term in nature and generally would not extend more than a few feet from the active work area. Since the nearest public receptor is 500 feet from the site, there would be a less than significant impact from groundborne vibrations or noise during construction.

During project operations, the generator would cause only intermittent, localized vibration. The generator would be mounted on a concrete pad with rubber isolators. These vibration isolators would reduce groundborne vibration by more than 95 percent (Ace Mountings Company, 1999). The buried innerduct would not generate perceptible vibration or noise. Consequently, there would be no excessive groundborne vibration or noise impacts from site operations.

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

Construction noise would be temporary, lasting no more than two months. Noise emitted during operations would be intermittent. The project would therefore include no permanent source of ambient noise and would have no permanent impact on ambient noise levels in the vicinity.

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

Temporary increases in ambient noise levels would occur during the construction period and may last up to two months. Because of the distance to public receptors, the effects of construction noise would be limited. In the absence of a local threshold governing construction noise levels, the temporary increase in ambient noise would be less than significant in the project vicinity.

Weekly generator tests would be of short duration and would be consistent with local noise control policy. Generator placement away from the parcel boundary, in addition to the 500-foot distance to the nearest noise receptor, would further buffer receptors from the intermittent and temporary increase in ambient noise levels. Effects on ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the 3R facility would therefore be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Setting

The project site is located within Modoc County, which had a population of 9,925 as of January 1999. This represents a 0.5 percent decrease from January 1998 (California Department of Finance, 1999). The community of Tionesta, located approximately two miles east of the site, has a population of roughly 30 to 50 people (Farnum, 1999). The only residence in the project vicinity is located approximately 700 feet south of the 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 ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The 3R facility would not be permanently occupied and would, therefore, not create new housing or extend roads or other infrastructure that would indirectly induce population growth.

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

The project would not displace any existing housing units.

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

The project would not displace any people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The site is located within Modoc County. Police protection is provided by Modoc County Sheriff's Division. Wildland fires are handled by the US Forest Service, Modoc National Forest. Structure fires are handled by the Tule Lake Fire Protection District, a volunteer fire force (even though Tionesta does not reside in that district). There are no parks, public facilities, or schools in the area (Messenger, 1999).

Evaluation

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

Fire and police protection are currently being provided to the site and addition of the 3R facility will not significantly increase the need for protection. Therefore, the project would not result in a need for new or physically altered government fire and police protection facilities nor affect response time or other performance objectives. Since the project will not be permanently occupied, there will be no need for schools, parks, and other similar public facilities.

XIV. RECREATION

Setting

There are no parks or recreational facilities in the area.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

There are no parks or recreational facilities in the area.

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

The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction of recreation facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Setting

The site is located just south of County Route 97, a paved, two-lane, east-west County-owned road. A gravel road off County Route 97 provides access to the site, wide enough for two lanes. There are no traffic control facilities at the intersection of the gravel road and County Route 97. The BNSF railroad runs north-south approximately 300 feet east of the site and intersects with County Route 97 accordingly. There is a stop sign on County Route 97 as it intersects with the railroad tracks northeast of the site. County Route 97 intersects with State Route 139, a paved, two-lane, north-south state highway owned by Caltrans. There are no bike lanes, pedestrian facilities, or alternative transportation facilities located in the project area. The gravel road used to access the project site is also used by Glass Mountain Pumice, Inc. which sustains truck and auto traffic.

Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

The project would not affect air traffic patterns.

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

The project would be accessed from CR 97 that currently does not have curbs or gutters. CR 97 does not have dangerous curves or intersections. The existing gravel road would provide access to the site.

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

The project would not affect emergency access routes.

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

The project would not affect offsite parking, and the one or two parking spaces that would be required for vehicles used in periodic maintenance visits would be provided on-site.

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

There are no alternative transportation facilities located near the site, nor are there plans, policies, or programs supporting such transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Setting

Water at the site will be provided by well water and sewer will be provided by a septic tank. Estimated monthly water consumption at the Tionesta 3R site will be 2,000 gallons. Gas and electricity to the site are provided by Pacific Power & Light Corporation. Phone service is provided by Cal-Orr Telephone Company.

Waste will be generated during site preparation, facility construction, and routine operations. Every attempt will be made to minimize waste generation in the detailed, site-specific facility-siting process. During operation of the 3R facility, there should be no appreciable generation of solid waste since the site will not be permanently staffed and site visits will be infrequent (one per week) and of short duration (one to several hours).

Residents in the area (including Tionesta) deliver their waste to the Newell Transfer Station, located in Newell, approximately 15 miles north of the site on SR 139. Waste Management then transfers the waste to the Lockwood Regional Landfill located in Reno, Nevada. Lockwood Regional Landfill has an average daily load of 6,600 tons with no daily limit (per Nevada law) and an expected closure in over 200 years (Franchie,

1999). Construction debris is to be delivered to the Alturas Landfill. The Alturas Landfill, serving the area with the greatest probable growth potential, has a projected life of well over 100 years (*Modoc County General Plan*, 1988). Approximately 20 tons of waste is delivered to the Alturas Landfill annually.

Evaluation

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

The project would produce minimal wastewater. A septic system will be installed at the site. The site would not be occupied continuously and toilet facilities will not be installed. During construction, portable chemical toilets will be used on-site by construction workers. There will be no hookups to any wastewater treatment systems. Therefore, no wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board would be impacted.

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

The project will produce minimal wastewater. A septic system will be installed at the site. The site would not be occupied on a continuous basis and permanent toilet facilities will not be provided onsite. There will be no hookups to any water or wastewater treatment systems. Therefore, the project will not result in construction of new offsite water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, there will be no impact.

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

The project will require paving of some land. However, this area will be small. Storm water drainage facilities will be designed so that no additional wastewater is carried off the site. Storm water drainage will be installed per Modoc County Ordinance 221 B, which adopts the most recent State of California code for storm water drainage facility design and construction (Teuscher, 1999), and with NPDES CAF00002 Order No. 92-08 DWQ (Crowe, 1999). No specific storm water permit is required. Level 3 will prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that will include Best Management Practices (BMPs) for storm water pollution prevention. Impacts will be less than significant.

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

The project will not require water hook-ups. Water will be provided by an on-site well.

e)	Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not require wastewater treatment. Wastewater will be handled with an on-site septic system.

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

The quantity of waste generated during construction and clean-up of the site after construction is estimated to be 390 cubic yards (260 tons). Waste generated during operation of the facility will be minimal. The Alturas landfill can easily accommodate the construction waste generated by the project and the minimal quantity of waste generated during operation will also be easily accommodated by the Lockwood Regional Landfill in Nevada.

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

The project would not generate significant amounts of solid waste. The construction waste generated and the minimal quantity of waste generated during operation will be deposited in landfills that are in compliance with all applicable solid waste laws. In addition, the project will comply with all applicable solid waste laws.

Analysis Team

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

Technical Coordination:

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

Engineering:

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

Hydrology/Geology/Hazardous Materials:

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

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

Land Use/Aesthetics/Public Utilities/Transportation/Field

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

Land Use/Aesthetics/Public Utilities/Transportation/Analysis

Kristie Wilkie, BS, Environmental Engineering (2 years experience)
David Augustine, P.E, JD, CHMM, REA, Permitting Specialist (25 years experience**)**
TRC Environmental Corporation
5052 Commercial Circle, Concord, CA 94520
Phone: (925) 688-1200 Fax: (925) 688-0388

Noise/Air Quality

Steve Huvane, BS, Civil Engineering
TRC Environmental Corporation
5052 Commercial Circle, Concord, CA 94520
Phone: (925) 688-1200 Fax: (925) 688-0388

Historic & Cultural Resources: Field

Ann Munns, MA, Anthropology (14 years experience)
Rhonda Turner, BA, Archaelogy (5 years experience)
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614

Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Historic & Cultural Resources: Analysis
Brant Brechbiel, BA, History, MBA (10 years experience)
Roger Mason, Ph.D., Anthropology/Archaeology (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 Assurance:
David Augustine, P.E., JD, CHMM, REA, Permitting Specialist (25 years experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
5052 Commercial Circle, Concord, CA 94520
Phone: (925) 688-1200 Fax: (925) 688-0388

Graphics:
Bill Boynton, MA, Geography (5 years experience)
Derek Ross, BA, Environmental Analysis and Design (2 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 Part 93. *Determining Conformity of Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans,* July 1998.

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

California Department of Finance. *City/County Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change*, January 1, 1998 and 1999.

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

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). *California Scenic Highways Program*, From Caltrans – California Scenic Highways Website, Accessed http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/ LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html, October 25, 1999.

California Division of Mines and Geology. *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. *The California State Implementation Plan for Ozone*, November 1994.

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

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

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

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

-----. *BACT Clearinghouse*, Accessed at http://www.arb.ca.gov/BACT/BACTSearch.htm, October 1999.

California Historical Resources Information System, Northeast Center. *Records Search Request for Long Haul Fiber Optic Cable Project,* IC File # D99-61, Information on file, Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, November 2, 1999.

Caterpillar Corporation. *Generator Emissions Guarantees*, 1999.

----. *3406 Industrial Engine Spec Sheet*, 1998.

Crowe, Carole, Regional Water Quality Control Board. Personal communication with Carolyn Trindle, TRC, July 9, 1999.

Donnelly-Nolan, J.M., U.S. Geological Survey. Personal communication regarding mapping in progress,

October 27, 1999.

ERSI/FEMA. *Project Impact Hazard Information Awareness Site*, Accessed at http://www.esri.com/hazards, December 1999.

Farnum, Greg, Director, Modoc County Environmental Health Department. Interviewed by Bella Bakrania, TRC, October 27, 1999, and by David Augustine, TRC, December 27, 1999.

Franchie, Mark, Landfill Manager of Lockwood Regional Landfill, Reno Disposal. Interviewed by Kristie Wilkie, TRC, November 9, 1999.

Gay, T.E., and Quintin, A.A., Compilers. *Geologic Map of California, Alturas Sheet,* California Division of Mines and Geology, 1958.

Kessler, Scott, Planning Director, Modoc County Planning Department. Interviewed by Kristie Wilkie, TRC, October 27, 1999.

Mason, R.D. *Cultural Resources Survey Report and Paleontological Resources Literature Review Report for Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optic Project: Tionesta 3R Facility Site, near Tionesta, Modoc County, California,* Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA for Level 3 Project Office, Pleasanton, CA, November 1999.

McNulty, G., Native American Heritage Commission. Written communication to David White, Level 3 Long Haul Project Team, November 9, 1999.

Messenger, Monty, California Department of Forestry. Interviewed by Bella Bakrania, TRC, October 27, 1999.

Modoc, County of. *General Plan*, Adopted September 19, 1988.

-----. *Land Use Map*, 1988.

-----. *Zoning Ordinance (Title 18)*, August 19, 1991.

Moreo, Joe, Air Pollution Control Officer, Modoc County Air Pollution Control District. Interviewed by Steve Huvane, TRC, October 26, 1999.

Munns, A. M. and R.R. Turner. *Cultural Resources Field Survey Report*, Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, October 18, 1999.

Olmsted, D.L. and O.C. Stewart. Achumawi, In: Robert F. Heizer (Editor), *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California*, pp. 225-235, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 1978.

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

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

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.

Wade, Teuscher, Modoc County Building Department. Personal communication with Carolyn Trindle, TRC, July 9, 1999.

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

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

Vista Information Solutions Inc. *California Site Assessment Plus Report: Tionesta 3R Site*, October 25, 1999.

-----. *NEPA Checklist: Tionesta,* October, 1999.

White, D., Level 3 Network Communications. Written communication to Gail McNulty, Native American Heritage Commission, October 22, 1999.

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Photo A View of Proposed 3R Site from Northeast Corner Facing Southwest
Photo B View of Proposed 3R Site from Approximately 100 feet East of Site
Photo C The North-South Overhead Utility Lines run Adjacent to the BNSF Railroad Tracks Approximately 300 feet East of the Proposed 3R Site.
Photo D View of Proposed 3R Site from Outside Northwest Corner of Site Facing East
Photo E View of Residence from Southwest Corner of Proposed 3R Site Facing South
Photo F View of Area South of Proposed 3R Site from Southwest Corner Facing Southeast

Attachment

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