

Appendix A – No. 9

**PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

Site name: San Ardo ILA

**Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission**

**Prepared by
Level 3 Communications, LLC**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Environmental Checklist.....	1
Analysis Team	34
Sources.....	36

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

Tables

Table 1	Specific Local Policies Applicable to Each Issue Area for the San Ardo ILA Site.
Table 2	Construction and Operation Emissions Summary for the San Ardo ILA Site.

Figures

Figure 1	Regional Map
Figure 2	Vicinity Map
Figure 3	Parcel Map
Figure 4	U.S.G.S. Quad Sheet
Figure 5	Surrounding Land Use Map
Figure 6	Photo Key Map
Figure 7	Conceptual Plot Plan
Figure 8	Air and Noise Receptor Map
Figure 9	FEMA Floodplain Map

Photo Plates

Photo A	Overall View of Site
Photo B	Existing Structures on Site
Photo C	View of the Site from the South
Photo D	On-site Water Pump and Equipment

Attachment

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- 1. Facility Title:**
Level 3 Long-Haul Network, San Ardo ILA
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 703-2782
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**
Bill Vander Lyn, Level 3 Communications, LLC
6689 Owens Drive, Suite A, Pleasanton, CA 94588 (925) 398-3040
- 4. Facility Location:**
The site is located in an industrial area in the unincorporated community of San Ardo in Monterey County, California. The 2.85-acre parcel located at the northeast intersection of Cattlemen Road and Short Street (see Figure 1, Regional Map, Figure 2, Vicinity Map, Figure 3, Parcel Map, and Figure 4, U.S.G.S. Quad). It is bordered by vacant land to the north, the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way (ROW) to the east, Short Street to the south, and Cattlemen Road to the west (Figure 5). Photos A-D show the site and surrounding area from the vantage points identified in Figure 6.
- 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:** Industrial
- 7. Zoning:** Heavy Industrial (HI)
- 8. Description of Facility:**
This checklist evaluates the design, construction, and operation of the San Ardo ILA facility, which will be located on vacant, disturbed land outside of existing utility corridors in support of the long-haul network. The facility, which will include the In Line Amplification (ILA) structure, the generator shelter, an access driveway and limited parking space will require development of approximately 5,000 square feet of the parcel. The "development window" within which the facility will be sited is shown in Figure 7.

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

The ILA station will include up to four prefabricated, transportable, modular amplification units (huts), each measuring 12 feet by 36 feet (432 square feet) and 10 feet 3 inches height. The set of four huts will be installed on a 24-foot-by-72-foot (1,728 square feet or 0.04-acre) concrete pad, with the huts attached side-by-side to form a continuous building. These structures will be assembled at the site.

One 300-kilowatt (kW), 449-horsepower (hp) diesel-powered generator will provide emergency power to the set of four ILA huts. The pre-cast concrete generator housing or shelter will be approximately 12 feet wide and 24 feet long (288 square feet) and 10 feet high. It will be assembled at the site and installed on a concrete foundation. The generator will be mounted on a 1,000-gallon, double-walled, aboveground storage tank that is thirteen feet long by 8 feet wide by 1 foot 9 inches high. Tank system design incorporates a high fuel alarm (local) and a tank rupture alarm (remote). The double-walled storage tank on which the engine/generator set is mounted is designed to support the weight of

the engine/generator set and this mounting is a common design for emergency engine/generators. For engine/generator sets that are operated more frequently, the fuel tank is mounted separate from the engine/generator since greater fuel storage capability is required and the storage tank would be too large to be located beneath the engine/generator.

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 could not be managed by Level 3 personnel, a contractor will be called to respond.

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 oil 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, a 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(s) for the generator tank(s), describe the site safety requirements, observe the fueling process, and listen for the high fuel alarm. Should a release occur, the Level 3 technician will immediately initiate containment and cleanup procedures.

The ILA site will not be permanently staffed. Each will be visited approximately once a week for routine maintenance and data downloading (assumed for analysis purposed to be 60 trips per year). No additional buildings will be constructed. Control and maintenance functions will occur within the proposed facilities. Fencing around the ILA facility will be of chain link construction and will be nine feet tall.

The San Ardo ILA will require electricity and telephone. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are located overhead on wooden poles with wooden crossarms. These lines run along Cattlemen Road on the western edge of the site. Normal electrical power will be provided, consisting of 400-amp, 480-volt, three-phase service. Telephone service would be provided at the site by either hard-wired, cellular or satellite-link service. All onsite utility lines will be run underground. No water or sewer attachments would be required. Stormwater drainage and fire protection equipment would be installed per local codes. Access to the site would be provided from Cattlemen Road.

Site development will include minimal clearing of buffer strips, demolition of existing structures (small wooden building, tower, and truck scale), minimal grading to level the building and shelter sites and to provide an access driveway and parking area, pouring of the foundations, delivery and assembly of prefabricated components, installation of utility connections, and erection of perimeter fencing. Estimates of solid waste include 4 cubic yards of building demolition refuse, 8 cubic yards of tower demolition refuse, 23 cubic yards of truck scale demolition refuse and 40 cubic yards of dirt associated with grading and foundation work. Total solid waste generation during construction is 75 cubic yards (approximately 50 tons). Removal of old machinery currently occupying the site is the responsibility of the current owner. The fiber optic cable to which the ILA will be attached is located along the east side of the site on the UPRR ROW, which forms the eastern boundary of the site. The connection to the ILA facility will be installed at a depth of approximately 42 inches either by plowing in the conduit (which does not require a trench) or by digging a trench, laying the conduit, and then back-filling the trench.

Based on conversation with Delinda Robinson, Land Use Technician for the County of Monterey, (and a follow-up visit to county offices, there are no current projects within two miles of the San Ardo ILA site, nor are any currently planned.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The site is bordered by vacant land to the north, with Cattlemen Road along the western edge of the parcel. Residential units are located on the west side of Cattlemen Road (See Figure 5, Surrounding Land Use Map). To the east of the site is the UPRR ROW, with an agricultural field beyond. To the south of the site is Short Street, beyond which is a parcel containing a trucking facility to the east and residential uses to the west. Photos A-D show the site from the vantage points identified in Figure 6 (the photo key). The environmental setting for each natural and physical resource topic is described in the resource sections of the checklist.

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The site is located within the jurisdiction of the County of Monterey. It is also located within the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. Because the site is within a "Heavy Industrial" zone, the project is permitted as a "public utility structure" and is allowed with a Use Permit. The project will also require that a preliminary seismic and geologic hazard report be prepared by a registered geologist and submitted to the County. The Use Permit application would not be deemed complete until this report is submitted. The project will require the submittal of a General Development Plan, which will be submitted for review and approval prior to or concurrent with approval of the Use Permit. The plan shall address the long range development and operation of the facilities, and includes an application with questions regarding environmental impacts of the project.

Specific local policies relevant to each of the sixteen environmental impact issue areas are provided in Table 1. 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 an existing Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) (Decision No. 98-03-066). That CPCN was supported by a Mitigated Negative Declaration that included mitigation measures to be implemented in the design, construction, and operation of the previously approved telecommunications facilities within existing utility rights-of-way. Level 3 has incorporated all of these mitigation measures into its design of the project addressed in this Proponents' 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 San Ardo ILA 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 site is comprised of relatively flat, sandy soils with little vegetation (see Photo A). The site contains some machinery and facilities that were previously used for agricultural distribution, including a truck scale, small building, loading platform, and water pump (see Photo B and D). The site is visible from all surrounding uses, including residential uses to the south and west. There are rolling hills located to the east of the site (see Photo C). There are no scenic highways near the project site (Caltrans, 1999).

The characteristics of the San Ardo ILA facility, including buildings, fencing, and aboveground utilities are described in Section 8, Description of Facility. The exact location of the ILA facility on this site has not yet been determined. Figure 7 shows the "development window" within which the facility can be sited.

Evaluation

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

The facility might partially impede views of the rolling hills to the east of the site, which are presently in the viewshed of residences to the east and south. The site currently contains old machinery and equipment from the previous use as an agricultural distribution center. Construction of the ILA facilities would not have a substantial adverse effect on the vista of the rolling hills, because existing machinery and equipment from previous agricultural distribution uses currently impedes such vistas, and the building would be only about 10 feet tall.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not visible from a state scenic highway. 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project site is surrounded by nearby commercial, industrial, and residential uses. The proposed ILA facility would not degrade the mixed 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The outside light to be provided would be a small 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 site is located in an urbanized area, surrounded by residential and industrial uses. The site was formerly used as an agricultural distribution center, but is presently out of service. The site does not appear to have recently supported farmland uses. The site is not located on Prime Farmland (California Department of Conservation, 1994), nor is it under a Williamson Act contract (Monterey County Property System Assessor Inquiry printout, 1999).

Evaluation

a) Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, so use of the site for an ILA would not convert such farmland to non-agricultural use.

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

The project site is zoned "Heavy Industrial" by the County of Monterey, which permits utility and communication facilities through the Use Permit process (Monterey County, *Zoning Map*, 1988). Thus, the site would not conflict with an existing zoning for agricultural use. The site is not covered by a Williamson Act contract.

c) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The construction of an ILA would not result in growth-inducing effects nor other off-site changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY

The San Ardo ILA Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying 2.85 acres. Project activities include site preparation, construction of the ILA and generator pads and shelters, installation of equipment, access road development, automated testing of the emergency generators, and approximately weekly vehicular trips to the site for maintenance and data logging. Site development will be limited to less than an acre with approximately 2,000 square feet of buildings and up to 12,000 square feet in grading for roads and very limited parking. The access road/parking will be graveled.

Table 2 provides relevant information on construction and operation activities contributing to emissions of pollutants. Additional technical information used in the air quality analysis is provided in Attachment A. Included in Table 2 are the following construction-related items:

- Estimate of one-way commuting distance (miles) that members of the construction crew will travel to the construction 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 (in gross horsepower (hp)) 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 and gravel trucks) are represented in terms of number of trips per day, total number of trips, and number of one-way miles traveled; and
- The amount of material (soil) that will be disturbed during trenching operations at the proposed site as well as during construction of the fiber optic between the ROW and the site.

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

Operational parameters specified in Table 2 include specification of the 300 kW size of the emergency standby generator, the short 25-minute duration of its weekly test, and parameters for the weekly vehicular trip to the ILA site associated with site maintenance and data logging. Normal operation will generate at most one vehicle trip to and from the site on a weekly basis (conservatively estimated as 60 trips/year for emissions estimation). The testing of the emergency generator will be triggered automatically. Operating equipment at the site will be powered by electricity from the utility power grid.

Table 2 shows the emission factors and other parameters used to calculate exhaust and fugitive PM₁₀ emissions for mobile equipment (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1996). Construction and operation emission thresholds for NO_x, ROG, PM₁₀, SO_x, and CO are listed in Table 2, as provided by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). This agency is responsible for management of air emissions in the where the San Ardo ILA site resides. In addition to the San Ardo ILA, one other PEA facility (Salinas 1 ILA site) is located in the Monterey County and are under the jurisdiction of the MBUAPCD.

Setting

The project site is located in the vicinity of San Ardo in southern Monterey County. Monterey County, along with San Benito and Santa Cruz Counties, comprise the North Central Coast Air Basin, which is currently designated as a non-attainment area for the state ambient air quality standards for ozone and PM₁₀ (California Environmental Protection Agency, 1998). The North Central Coast Air Basin is also designated as a "maintenance" area for the national one-hour-average ozone standard, which denotes that it had once been designated as a nonattainment area for that standard as well. There are a number of residences located near the site (Figure 8). The distance of the closest air/noise receptor to the closest boundary of the site is 40 feet.

The federal Clean Air Act and the State California Clean Air Act require plans to be developed for areas designated as nonattainment, except for areas designated as nonattainment for the state PM₁₀ standard. Plans are also required for federal "maintenance" areas. Such plans are to include strategies for attaining or maintaining the standards. The current state ozone plan is the *1997 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region* (1997 AQMP) (MBUAPCD, 1997a). The 1997 AQMP is the second triennial update of the original state ozone plan adopted in 1991. The current federal "maintenance" plan is the *Maintenance Plan*

and Contingency Control Measures for the Monterey Bay Region (Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1994).

MBUAPCD prepares these air quality plans, and has permit authority over most types of stationary sources in the North Central Coast Air Basin. Two ILA sites will be located in the MBUAPCD: San Ardo and the Salinas.

MBUAPCD exercises permit authority through its *Rules and Regulations*, which includes New Source Review (NSR). MBUAPCD's Rule 207 (Review of New or Modified Sources) contains the NSR requirements for new stationary sources proposed within MBUAPCD's jurisdiction. Both state ozone (attainment) and federal ozone (maintenance) plans rely heavily upon the stationary source control program that is embodied in MBUAPCD's *Rules and Regulations*. As part of the regional ozone planning strategy, MBUAPCD has tightened NSR requirements to insure that the operation of new sources does not interfere with the attainment or maintenance of ambient air quality standards.

New stationary sources of air emissions are required to obtain an authority to construct and permit to operate under MBUAPCD Rule 200 (Permits Required). Under Rule 201 (Sources Not Requiring Permits), certain sources (e.g., some aboveground fuel storage tanks) do not require an operating permit. Under MBUAPCD Rule 207 (Review of New or Modified Sources), new sources are required to be constructed with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) to minimize emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x). By controlling NO_x emissions, the NSR BACT requirements also indirectly reduce PM₁₀ emissions because NO_x is a precursor to PM₁₀ as well as to ozone. In addition, MBUAPCD would require sources such as standby diesel engine to use fuel meeting the latest specifications established by the Air Resources Board for diesel fuel.).

In addition to BACT, NSR typically requires offsets if a new source will emit greater than specified quantities of pollutants after implementation of BACT. MBUAPCD allows for an exemption for equipment used exclusively for emergency, standby, non-utility electrical power generation and not used in conjunction with any utility-voluntary-demand-reduction program. In such cases, offsets are not required as long as operation of the standby engine for maintenance and testing purposes and operation does not exceed 60 hours per year (Steele, 1999b). To receive continued exemption from the offset requirements, the project Proponent would be required to document the hours of equipment use on an annual basis.

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

Evaluation

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Site construction parameters affecting emissions from mobile sources and the emergency generator, and the resulting emissions are estimated in Table 2. These resulting emissions are well within regulatory thresholds (discussed further in Section III(b) below). These emissions are, therefore, in compliance with the applicable air quality plan.

Fugitive dust will be generated during the construction phase (Table 2) from grading activities and travel of heavy equipment over temporary roads at the construction site. Fugitive dust generation will vary from day to day, depending on the level and type of activity, the silt content of the soil, and the weather. Fugitive dust will be controlled in a manner consistent with the applicable air quality plans by implementing effective dust control measures throughout the construction phase. Long-term fugitive dust emissions associated with facility operation will be negligible. The project will include use of a graveled road on-site to provide access

directly to the buildings and equipment.

Level 3 will be required to obtain authority to construct and permit to operate for the standby engine under MBUAPCD Rule 200. The standby engine would normally be operated 1 hour per week for testing and maintenance purposes, and would also operate during emergencies when utility power was unavailable.

The proposed standby engine would also be subject to MBUAPCD's NSR requirements under Rule 207, which applies to all new stationary sources subject to Rule 200. No permit would be required for the above-ground diesel storage tank under Rule 201 (Sources Not Requiring Permits).

Generator testing and the visiting technician vehicle will contribute operational air emissions as shown in Table 2. The generator will be constructed and operated in a manner consistent with existing air quality plans by fully complying with the requirements of Rule 200, and particularly meeting the BACT requirements of Rule 207 for NO_x emissions. Operation of the emergency standby generator will be in compliance with the offset because it will be operated less than 60 hours per year (Steele, 1999b), will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program, and will be fully documented with regard to duration of use.

Normal operations at the site will generate approximately one vehicle trip to and from the site each week.

Site Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3 will take the following actions to implement Environmental Commitments in the CPCN Decision:

- Obtain an authority to construct and permit to operate the emergency standby generator under MBUAPCD Rule 200;
- Construct and operate the generator under BACT in accordance with Rule 200 to minimize NO_x emissions. Based on MBUAPCD guidance, BACT for NO_x emissions will include either a turbocharger with intercooler/aftercooler and fuel injection timing retarded at least 4 degrees below the standard factory setting or a maximum certified NO_x emission rate of 7.2 grams per horsepower-hour (Steele, 1999a). BACT for VOC emissions will include positive crankcase ventilation and use of fuel satisfying reformulated diesel specification established by the Air Resources Board; and
- Document that the generator will not and does not operate more than 60 hours per year and will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary-demand-reduction program.

As described under III(b) below, Level 3 will comply with requirements in the permit exemption for the emergency standby generators and will also implement fugitive dust control measures to control PM₁₀ emissions during construction.

b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

As discussed above the project site lies in an area designated as nonattainment for the state ambient air quality standards for ozone and PM₁₀.

MBUAPCD has developed CEQA Air Quality Guidelines that provides guidance to lead agencies in determining whether a project would be likely to result in an exceedence of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected exceedence (MBUAPCD, 1997b). For evaluating construction-phase air quality impacts, MBUAPCD recommends using an emissions-based significance criterion (threshold) of 82 pounds per day of PM₁₀ (MBUAPCD, 1997b). For evaluation of operational-phase impacts, MBUAPCD recommends use of the following thresholds expressed on a daily basis: 550 pounds per day for CO; 150 pounds per day for VOC, NO_x, and SO_x; and 82 pounds per day of PM₁₀.

Based on the past three years of pollutant concentration data collected throughout the North Central Coast Air Basin, maximum ozone concentrations in the Air Basin rarely exceed the national ozone standard (0.12 parts per million) but exceed the more stringent state standard (0.09 parts per million) on an average of approximately eight days per year (California EPA, 1996-1998). The ozone problem in the North Central Coast Air Basin is affected by emissions sources within the Air Basin but also by transport of pollutants from the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.

Based on pollutant concentration data collected at the closest monitoring station to the project site, which is located in King City (approximately 18 miles northwest of the site), ambient PM₁₀ concentrations in the project vicinity do not exceed state or national PM₁₀ standards (California EPA, 1996-1998). The highest PM₁₀ concentration measured in King City over the 1995 to 1997 period was 42 micrograms per cubic meter. In contrast, the corresponding State and national PM₁₀ standards are 50 and 150 micrograms per cubic meter, respectively. Exceedences of PM₁₀ standards do, however, occur in other parts of Monterey County. The PM₁₀ problem in Monterey County is primarily due to wind-blown dust, entrainment of dust from vehicle travel over paved and unpaved roads, farming operations, and construction activities.

Estimates of construction-related engine emissions (Table 2) were 0.40 tons of NO_x, 0.061 tons of VOC, 0.03 tons of SO_x, and 0.52 tons of CO. The daily PM₁₀ emissions are the only construction-related emissions of concern since MBUAPCD only has a PM₁₀ emission threshold. Maximum daily emissions of PM₁₀ are less than regulatory thresholds and, therefore, are less than significant.

Fugitive dust emissions during site construction activities will be 0.44 ton Fugitive PM₁₀. There are no numerical thresholds for fugitive dust (PM₁₀) from construction activities. Instead, MBUAPCD requires dust control measures to be implemented during construction. As discussed under III(a) above, Level 3 will implement a comprehensive series of dust control measures to manage fugitive dust during construction.

Daily emissions estimates for operation of the proposed 300 kW emergency standby engine are shown in Table 2. Because the emergency standby generator will operate for less than 30 hours annually, it is exempt from compliance with numerical thresholds associated with offset requirements (Table 2). Additional VOC emissions from the aboveground diesel storage tank will be negligible because of its integral construction, infrequent filling, and strict adherence to procedures to avoid spillage during tank filling.

During an actual power outage, the proposed standby engine may operate for periods longer than one hour with proportionately greater daily emissions. However, the MBUAPCD-recommended operational-phase significance thresholds are not intended to be used for evaluating temporary or infrequent activities such as the use of a standby generator during an actual emergency (Brennan, 1999).

In addition to criteria air pollutants (such as VOC, NO_x, and PM₁₀), combustion of diesel fuel by the proposed emergency standby engine would generate toxic air contaminants. As part of the permitting process, MBUAPCD would require the project Proponent to evaluate toxic air contaminants associated with combustion particulate emissions from the emergency generator. As a result, additional emissions controls on the standby engine may be imposed, if necessary, to avoid substantial increased health risks to members of the public (Brennan, 1999).

Additional operation emissions associated with weekly site visits of one vehicle will be minor (Table 2).

Site Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3 will develop and implement a construction dust abatement program as required by MBUAPCD. Implementation of that program will keep potential impacts to less than significant levels. Level 3 will also comply with all requirements of MBUAPCD Rule 207, including documentation that the generator will not be operated more than 60 hours per year and will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program. Thus, no numerical standards apply to emissions from these generators.

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

Level 3 will implement the following dust control measures during construction:

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

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

The San Ardo ILA site is one of two PEA sites under the jurisdiction of the MBUAPCD. Potential Total District Construction Emissions were analyzed for the possibility of simultaneous construction at these sites. The same thresholds apply to assessment of cumulative emissions as were used to evaluate emissions from individual project sites (Table 3). The key assumption is made that no more than one piece of heavy equipment will operate at any one time at a site. "Worst case" cumulative daily emissions are, therefore, those associated with use of the most polluting piece of equipment at each of the two sites.

Simultaneous construction at two sites will not exceed the annual or daily numerical thresholds (Table 3), and therefore, the potential cumulative impacts of the two sites on air quality in the North Central Coast Air Basin will not be significant.

As a general matter, emissions from the use of emergency equipment have already been accounted for in the 1997 AQMP emission inventory (Brennan, 1999). Since the principal source of emissions from the project would be from such equipment, the project would be consistent with the assumptions used for the 1997 AQMP, and hence, would not have a significant cumulative impact on air quality.

Because project construction will affect an area of less than one acre within the 2.9-acre site, surrounding uses will be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "development window"). This buffer will help minimize the possibility that the project will cause a cumulatively significant short-term PM₁₀ impact from simultaneous and unrelated construction projects taking place within the same general area, which is dominated by industrial use.

Cumulative emissions from testing and maintaining the emergency generators at both PEA sites in the Monterey Bay area are exempt from offset requirements because these emissions from each generator are exempt. Emissions that are exempt from regulatory requirements are considered to have impacts that are less than significant.

The project's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect of additional emissions sources on the regional ozone and PM₁₀ concentrations will not be cumulatively considerable because ozone impacts are the result of the cumulative emissions from numerous sources in the region and transport from outside the re-

gion. All but the largest individual sources emit VOCs and NO_x in amounts too small to make a measurable effect on ambient ozone concentrations.

d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities that house children, elderly, and ill members of the population, such as schools, day-care centers, hospitals, retirement homes, hospices, and residences. The nearest neighbors to the ILA site are a number residential uses adjacent to the site with outdoor use areas (Figure 8) that qualify as sensitive receptors. The distance of the closest sensitive receptor to the (closest edge of the) site is approximately 40 feet.

Project construction would affect an area of less than one acre within the larger 2.9-acre site; therefore, receptors associated with surrounding uses would be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "development window"). This buffer, along with the low levels of construction emissions, would prevent substantial pollutant concentrations from reaching sensitive receptors. Through application of fugitive dust control measures, these emissions will be kept below a level of significance.

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

The emergency generator will produce operation emissions during testing and power outages. Two factors prevent these emissions from significantly affecting sensitive receptors. First, the generator will not be located in close proximity to sensitive receptors due to the establishment of buffer zones where development will be excluded (see Figure 7 for the "development window"). Second, generator usage will be restricted to 0.5 hour per week. These measures will assure that sensitive receptors are not exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The only potential odor that may be associated with site construction activities at the San Ardo ILA Site will be diesel engine exhaust. The low level of construction activity would not produce enough exhaust to affect the offsite public, which is limited to the few employees in the surrounding industrial facilities. Similarly, testing of the emergency generator at the ILA site for no more than one half hour per week will not produce sufficient exhaust or odor to be objectionable to a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Setting

The site is flat, with compacted soil that is nearly devoid of vegetation. There are small patches of ruderal vegetation scattered on the site. The site contains no trees, drainages, wetlands, or mammal burrows. The site lies adjacent to the railroad and is surrounded on the three other sides by paved roads.

Evaluation

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

There are no records of the presence of special status species at or near the project site (California Department of Fish and Game, March 1999). There is no evidence to suggest that this site provides significant habitat for any sensitive species.

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

There are no riparian resources or other sensitive natural communities present on the site (CDFG, 1999).

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

The site is located on relatively flat, disturbed land and does not support wetland hydrology. The project would not discharge materials into any jurisdictional waterway.

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

There are no native habitats present on the site, so the project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

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

There are no applicable policies or ordinances protecting biological resources on the site (Whitney, 1999).

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

There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans applicable to the site (Whitney, 1999).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is located in the community of San Ardo on level terrain in the Salinas River Valley near Pancho Rico Creek. The Salinas River is approximately 0.5 miles west of the parcel.

Ethnographically, the project area was inhabited by the Salinan-speaking peoples. The Salinan occupied the Salinas River watershed above Soledad. Their territory also included the adjacent Pacific Coast from Lopez Point to Morro Bay. Except for the Salinas River Valley, this was a heavily wooded mountainous area with rocky cliffs along the coast. The San Ardo ILA facility is located along the Salinas River a few miles north of the reported location of the Salinas village of *Tsho-hwal* (Hester 1978:Figure 1).

The principal settlement was a village made up of domed houses. The houses had a pole frame covered with grass and were up to 10 feet in diameter. Other structures in the village likely included a sweathouse and a dance house. Villages and their surrounding territory, which could include other smaller villages, were autonomous political units. Each of these political units had a chief who inherited his office patrilineally. In addition to villages, other settlements and activity areas included small temporary camps, places with bed-rock mortars for acorn processing, and caves with rock art that were probably used in ceremonies.

The most important plant food was acorns. Acorns were gathered in the fall and stored in granaries made of willow twigs until they were processed by grinding and leaching. Other plant foods included sage seeds, wild oat seeds, berries, and fruits. The most important animals hunted were deer, bear, and rabbits. Rabbits were usually taken with nets. Fish were obtained from the ocean and from rivers. Important items of material culture included the bow and arrow, stone mortars and pestles, manos and metates, stone bowls, scrapers, and choppers. Awls were made from bone and fishhooks were made from marine shell.

Shell beads made from mussel and abalone were used in trade. The Salinan traded extensively with the Yokuts of the San Joaquin Valley. The Salinan received salt, obsidian, seeds, lake fish, and tanned antelope and deer skins from the Yokuts in exchange for shell beads.

Salinan population at the time of European contact is estimated to have been 3,000. Two missions were founded by the Spanish Franciscan missionaries in Salinan territory. Mission San Antonio de Padua was established in 1771 in the northern part of Salinan territory and Mission San Miguel was established in 1797 in the southern part of Salinan territory. Most Salinan were taken to the missions where they were required to give up their hunter-gatherer way of life and were taught agriculture, stock raising, and weaving. Population declined rapidly as a result of the introduction of European diseases to which Native Americans had no immunity. After secularization of the missions in the 1830s, Salinan continued to live in the vicinity of the missions and the population continued to decline. Ethnographers could find only three Salinan families with which to work in the early twentieth century.

Evaluation

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The protocols contained in Level 3's Long Haul Fiber Optics Project Cultural Resources Procedures (Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services, 1999), requiring records searches and field survey, where appropriate, will be followed as summarized below. A technical report, providing more information on the results of the records search and field survey has been prepared (Mason and Linder, 1999).

Prior to the commencement of fieldwork, Level 3 archaeologists requested a records search for the proposed San Ardo ILA site, and the lands within a one half mile radius of the site, from the Northwest Office of the California Historical Resources Information Center located at Sonoma State University. 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 site. The records search from the Northwest Office of the California Historical Resources Information Center was conducted by Information Center staff who included a review of topographic maps with sites, isolates, and surveys marked for the project area, as well as a review of the National Register of Historic Places (1996), the California Register of Historical Resources (1998), the California Historical Landmarks, Office of Historic Preservation (1996), and the California points of Historical Interest listing (May 1992 and updates), the Historic Property Directory (Office of Historic Preservation current computer list), GLO Plats, and other pertinent historic data available at the NWIC for the relevant county/counties.

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 Monterey 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 and Linder, 1999).

The CHRIS records search California Historic Reserves Information Center, Northwest Center, November, 1999; (NWIC File Number 99-669) reported that no historic archaeological sites have been recorded within a half mile of the project area. No historic resources within a half mile of the current project area have been listed on the California State Historic Resources Inventory, the National Register of Historic Places, the California Historical Landmarks, nor the California Points of Historical interest. The project parcel had not been previously surveyed and no surveys for cultural resources have been recorded as having taken place within a half mile of the project area. The project area was surveyed for cultural resources by qualified archaeologist Ann Munns, M.A. of Chambers Group.

The parcel contains the remains of the Holly Sugar Company (established in the early 1900s) receiving facility, including intact loading and handling structures, probably for transferring sugar beets into waiting railcars from the adjacent tracks. The facilities include a truck scale and scale house, overhead conveyor/loader, and subterranean conveyor facility. A large diesel engine is present which powered an adjacent horizontal piston pump/compressor by means of belts and pulleys. The receiving facilities are located adjacent to the railroad tracks, while the rest of the parcel is vacant.

The sugar beet facilities have been investigated by a qualified architectural historian. It was determined that these facilities were rebuilt 25 to 30 years ago (Delvac, 1999). The structures on the project parcel are not eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources. They are not associated with significant historic events or important persons, do not have distinctive architectural characteristics, nor do they have the potential to yield information important in history. In addition, the structures are less than 50 years old.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The CHRIS record search cited in V(a) above indicated that no previous archaeological field surveys have been conducted in the area of the proposed San Ardo ILA site and that there are no previously-recorded archaeological sites on or within a one-half mile radius of the site.

The field survey indicated that, in the northern portion of the parcel, both historic and prehistoric cultural materials are present on the ground surface. Potential prehistoric items include marine shell (2 *Tivela* spp. fragments), a freshwater mussel shell fragment, and seven chert fragments (Monterey: brown/tan and pink, and Franciscan: red, green, and pink). The chert fragments do not appear to be worked and could be natural rather than cultural items. Historic artifacts observed include ceramic fragments (Franciscan ware), two fragments of aquamarine glass with an iridescent patina, and one fragment of amber glass with an iridescent patina.

An archaeological test program was performed to determine whether subsurface cultural material is present. The test program consisted of the excavation of ten shovel test probes (STPs) excavated in 20 centimeter levels. No cultural material was found in any of the STPs. It appears that the material seen on the surface was imported to the area as a part of the gravel used to build the road along the western side of the parcel. The test program results showed that the proposed construction of the ILA facility will have no impact on archaeological resources eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (Mason and Linder, 1999).

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

As mapped by Jennings and Strand (1958), the project site is underlain by Quaternary alluvium (unit Qal). No fossil site is recorded in the archives of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Section or the University of California Museum of Paleontology) as occurring in this rock unit at the project site or elsewhere in the San Ardo 7.5-minute quadrangle (Holroyd, 1999). Moreover, no fossil vertebrate site is reported as occurring in this rock unit in the immediate facility site vicinity by Jefferson (1991a, b). However, two of the previously recorded fossil sites (UCMP V-4002, -48056) reported by Jefferson (1991b) elsewhere in the Salinas Valley of Monterey County are in areas underlain by alluvium and have yielded the fossilized remains of extinct species of late Pleistocene (Ice Age) camel and bison land mammal species. These fossil occurrences suggest there is a potential for late Pleistocene and early Holocene continental vertebrate and land plant fossil remains occurring in the subsurface of the facility site but it is unlikely that construction-related earth moving would extend to a depth sufficient to encounter remains old enough to be considered fossilized.

Site Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3, as part of the project design, is committed to paleontological monitoring during construction. Monitoring would be initiated where earth moving extended to a depth greater than 4 feet below current grade. Below 4 feet, construction-related earth moving would be monitored by a qualified vertebrate paleontologist to allow for the recovery of larger fossil remains, and rock samples would be processed to allow for the recovery of smaller fossil remains. All recovered fossil remains would be fully treated (prepared, identified by knowledgeable paleontologists, curated, catalogued) and, along with associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data, placed in a recognized museum repository. The paleontologist would prepare a final report of findings that includes an in-

ventory of recovered fossil remains. These measures would be in compliance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995, 1996) guidelines for the management of paleontologic resources and for the museum acceptance of a monitoring program fossil collection.

d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

As shown on maps and as confirmed by field survey, no formal cemetery is located along the alignment. Although prehistoric human remains are often interred outside of formal cemeteries, they are usually only found in villages and residential bases. Because there is no evidence of a prehistoric archaeological site along the alignment, human remains are not expected. The records search and field survey provided no evidence of the presence of human remains. If suspected human remains are encountered during construction, operations will stop until the proper official will be notified, the find evaluated, any mitigation recommendations implemented, and Level 3 has been cleared to resume construction in the area of the find. The procedures to be followed are described in detail in Level 3's *Long-Haul Fiber Optics Project Cultural Resources Procedures* (Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services, 1999:25-39), approved by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Setting

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone or other designated fault zone (California Department of Conservation, *Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California*, 1997). The site is located in an area shown as "high seismic hazard/recent alluvium," (County of Monterey, *Monterey County Potential Seismic and Geologic Hazards Map*, 1975), primarily from the San Andreas and King City-Mincie Canyon faults. The site is not within any other geological risk areas, including those for landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, or erosion (County of Monterey, *County of Monterey General Plan*, 1997).

Evaluation

a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Rupture of known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic-related groundshaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides? 	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

The site would not be permanently staffed. It is not located in an Alquist-Priolo zone or other zone of faulting. The site is not subject to ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides. Thus, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects related to these hazards.

The project site is in a county-designated zone of severe groundshaking, so damage to the structure or equipment could occur during an earthquake. Monterey County policies related to this seismic hazard require that the applicant submit a preliminary seismic and geologic hazard report, to be performed by a registered geologist, with all other permits. This preliminary analysis will be considered by the county during review of submitted permit applications, and conditions to the project would reflect findings from this report.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3 will submit a preliminary seismic and geologic hazard report, researched and written by a registered geologist, to the Monterey County for their review as part of the local permitting process.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The site is nearly flat, so soil erosion and loss of topsoil is not a concern.

c). Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The geologic units and soils on the site are not unstable. The minimal grading of this relatively flat site would not result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located in an area known for expansive soils. The project would comply with the Uniform Building Code, as required under a Monterey County building permit.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

Because the ILA facility would be occupied for only a brief period each week, water or sewer service, septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal are not required.

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). During a site visit, a diesel tank was observed associated with an unused water pump and equipment (see Photo D), which has not been recently used for storage of fuel. The truck facility, located approximately 40 feet to the south of the site, contains drums and aboveground storage tanks.

San Ardo Union School is located approximately one-quarter mile south of the site, but no evidence of pupils or residents frequently walking by the site was observed. A private airplane landing strip is located approximately one-quarter mile northwest of the site.

Evaluation

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

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

b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

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

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

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

d) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

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

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located within an airport land use plan, nor within two miles of a public or private 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The site is located one-quarter mile from a private airstrip. The site would be an unmanned facility, and thus would not expose anyone to any safety hazards for being within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

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

h) Would the proposal expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

Proposed structures would be concrete and/or pre-fabricated buildings. They would not be inhabited on a daily basis. Generators would be equipped with spark arrestors. Grading and cleared buffer strips would be used in wildland and wildland interface areas to further reduce any risk of loss or damage.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Setting

The site is located within the Upper Valley sub-area of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, which is noted as an area with a high potential for groundwater recharge (Monterey County, *South County Area Plan*, 1988). On-site drainage consists of irregular sheet flow, with no evidence of man-made facilities. The site shows no evidence of recent flooding.

The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (Vista Information Solutions, *NEPA Checklist*, 1999). However, a FEMA floodplain map showing the surrounding area is included as Figure 9. The site is also not located within a dam or levee inundation area, nor is it subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (Monterey County, 1983). The site is not located in proximity to or functionally linked to any jurisdictional wetlands (Vista Information Solutions, *NEPA Checklist*, 1999).

Evaluation

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: The following actions will be taken to ensure that hydrology/water quality impacts are minimized during construction and operation of the San Ardo ILA site.

As appropriate, Level 3 will implement the following measures to avoid and minimize effects on the aquatic environment at the San Ardo ILA site. Appendix E of the PEA identifies the documents and practices in which these measures will be specified.

- Bore under sensitive habitats when practicable;
- Implement erosion control measures during construction;
- Remove cover vegetation as close to the time of construction as practicable;
- Confine construction equipment and associated activities to the construction corridor;
- No refueling of construction equipment will take place within 100 feet of an aquatic environment;
- Comply with state, federal, and local permits;
- Perform proper sediment control;
- Prepare and implement a spill prevention and response plan;
- Remove all installation debris, construction spoils, and miscellaneous litter for proper offsite disposal; and
- Complete post-construction vegetation monitoring and supplemental revegetation where needed.

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

Although the area of disturbed ground on the San Ardo ILA 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, and Distribution Node sites associated with this project is greater than five acres. Accordingly, an NOI will be submitted, and a SWPPP will be prepared.

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The proposal would not discharge substances that could contaminate water. Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in a 1,000-gallon, double-walled, above-ground storage tank, with monitoring and leak containment features. The tank would be located at least 100 feet from any stream, drainage ditch or wetlands. The tank would provide hazard containment against reasonably foreseeable upset and accidents.

Wastes generated by equipment maintenance would be disposed of off-site in accordance with all applicable regulations.

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

The project will not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The site will be graded such that alteration of the existing drainage pattern will be minimized. Rain that encounters impermeable surfaces such as building pads or roofs will run off of these surfaces and onto the gravel compound surrounding the building pads. The gravel compound will consist of ¾inch rock to a thickness of approximately four inches. Rainwater will percolate through the gravel into the underlying soils. This minor modification will be sufficient to handle the additional runoff/design level event. Additional drainage or water retention measures are not included in the proposed construction.

c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is relatively flat, with irregular sheet flow drainage across the site. There are no streams or rivers on or adjacent to the site. Substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site would not be 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

The site is relatively flat, with irregular sheet flow drainage across the site. There are no streams or rivers on or adjacent to the site. The general drainage patterns would not be significantly altered by construction. Concrete pads and the structures on the site represent impermeable surfaces, which can concentrate runoff. The grading and drainage plan measures proposed above for groundwater recharge, would prevent surface runoff from resulting in flooding on- or off-site.

e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The grading and drainage plan mitigation proposed above would contain water on-site for use as groundwater recharge. Thus, there are no impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.

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

No impacts to water quality are expected as a result of this project. 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The project would not include housing.

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

The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain.

i) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located within a levee or dam inundation area.

j) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The site is not located within an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

Setting

The general plan land use designation for the project site is "Industrial" (Monterey County, 1987), which applies to areas designated for the development of suitable types of manufacturing, research, mineral extraction, and processing operations (Monterey County, *South County Area Plan*, 1988). The surrounding properties are designated as "Industrial" to the immediate east (UPRR ROW) and southeast (truck facility),

"Farmlands" to the east beyond the UPRR ROW, "Commercial" to the north and southwest, and "High-Density Residential" to the west.

The project site is zoned "Heavy Industrial" (Monterey County, *Zoning Map*, 1988), which permits water system facilities, manufacturing plants, and several other industrial uses. The zoning also allows public utility structures and uses (Monterey County, 1997). The surrounding zoning includes "Heavy Industrial" to the southeast, "Heavy Commercial" to the south, "Light Commercial" to the southwest, "High-Density Residential" to the west, and "Farmlands-40" to the east beyond the UPRR ROW.

Table 2 provides specific policies relative to land use (and other environmental impact areas) at the San Ardo ILA site. This table also indicates the need for local land use permits/approvals. A site parcel map showing the ILA property and surrounding parcels is provided as Figure 3.

Site Specific Environmental Commitment: Level 3 will obtain all required local land use permits for the San Ardo ILA site. The San Ardo ILA facility is consistent with local policies and is a permitted use within the site-specific land use and zoning designation. Permitted uses fall into categories by local land use regulations, resulting in some permitted uses being allowed by right, with only administrative approval, and other permitted uses being allowed through a discretionary process. The San Ardo site will require discretionary land use review and approval from the local jurisdiction prior to issuance of building permits. Discretionary land use processing requires approval of a decision-making body, such as the Planning Commission or City Council.

The local land use designations will not "... 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." Therefore, by definition, there will be no impact to local land use designations associated with this site.

The requirement for a discretionary 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. At this time, however, it is not possible to identify the conditions of the use permit that will be applied to the San Ardo ILA site.

As part of the planning process, Level 3 will prepare a preliminary seismic and geological hazard report, researched and written by a registered geologist, and will also develop a General Development Plan. These documents will be submitted for review and approval prior to or concurrent with approval of the Use Permit. The General Development Plan will address the long range development and operation of the facilities, and will include an application with answers to questions regarding environmental impacts of the project element.

Evaluation

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

The site is located in an area with multi-family residences. The site is currently unfenced. The site shows no evidence of serving as a pedestrian "short-cut" between residences and the remaining community; the UPRR ROW is on the opposite side of the parcel from the residences. The project would not create a visual barrier within an established community.

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

The Monterey County land use designation for the site is "Industrial," which allows the "Heavy Industrial" zoning on the site. The Monterey County zoning is thus compatible with the general plan land use. Because public utility structures and uses are permitted within the "Heavy Industrial" zoning, the project is compatible with the applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations.

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

The site is not located within any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (Whitney, 1999).

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is not located in an area designated by the state or Monterey County for mineral resources (Whitney, 1999).

Evaluation

a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located in an area with known mineral resources so development of the site would not result in impacts to mineral resources of value to the region 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located in an area with known mineral resources so development of the site would not result in the loss of locally important mineral resources.

XI. NOISE

Setting

The San Ardo ILA Site is located in the vicinity of San Ardo in southern Monterey County (Figure 2), approximately 200 feet from the UPPR ROW. A number of residences are located approximately 40 feet from the site boundary (Figure 8). It is designated as "Industrial" (Monterey County Zoning Ordinance, 1997) and is zoned as "Heavy Industrial (HI)". Based on observations of the field personnel, who performed the site investigation, the nearest sensitive receptors are located approximately 40 feet to the west and south of the site (residences, Figure 8). A public receptor (trucking facility) is located approximately 40 feet to the south.

The site is located approximately one-quarter mile from a private landing strip for airplanes. The site is not within the vicinity of a public airport, nor is it within an airport land use plan. Estimates of daytime and nighttime ambient noise levels (52dBA and 47 dBA respectively) were derived from Schomer and Associates (1991) as typical of sites designated as "quiet commercial and industrial areas and moderate residential areas."

The San Ardo ILA Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility consisting of 2,000 square feet of buildings and up to 12,000 square feet in grading for roads and very limited parking. Project activities include site preparation, construction of the ILA and generator pads and shelters, installation of equipment, access road development, automated testing of the emergency generator, and approximately weekly vehicular trips to the site for maintenance and data logging. The standard shelter for an ILA generator housing is a pre-cast concrete building measuring approximately 12 feet wide, 24 feet long and 10 feet high placed on a concrete pad. Less than one acre of the 2.9 acre property will be developed, resulting in substantial buffering of the surrounding uses from noise from project construction and operation (see Figure 7 for the "development window").

Noise will be generated from both construction and operation of the ILA facility. Table 2 provides relevant information on construction and operation activities and equipment contributing to noise. 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. Included is the size (in gross horsepower (hp)) of each type of heavy construction equipment and the numbers of hours per day that each piece of equipment will operate. A key assumption implicit in the evaluation of noise impacts is that only one piece of heavy equipment will operate at any one time. Therefore, maximum construction noise level at each site was based on the noisiest 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).

Two maximum construction noise levels were estimated for San Ardo ILA. One noise level was estimated at 50 feet from the noise source to compare with the county noise threshold that was given with respect to the distance of 50 feet from the source (85 dBA, Title 10-40.5, County Ordinance 2450, 1978). The other noise level was estimated (86 dBA) at the closest noise receptor. Both maximum construction noise levels were estimated by adjusting the 84 dBA using the inverse square of the distance between the site and the 50 feet distance from the source and the closest receptor. The resulting 86 dBA estimated at the closest receptor is higher than the 84 dBA at 50 foot distance because the nearest receptor is estimated to be only 40 feet away. The increase over ambient is the difference between the maximum noise at the receptor and the ambient noise level. Detailed methodologies, algorithms, and assumptions associated with the noise analysis are provided as Attachment A.

Operational parameters related to noise include the size/gross hp and period of operation (30 minutes/week) of the emergency standby generator (Table 2). The generator will be automatically tested weekly. The maximum noise level at the closest receptor (Table 5) was estimated by adjusting the noise level for the generator at 50 foot distance (84 dBA, Attachment A) using the inverse square of the distance between the site and the receptor. Additional calculation was required to incorporate the source noise level into the background and convert to the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) in order to compare the estimated maximum noise level with the local standard which is expressed in terms of CNEL. CNEL is an average noise exposure over a 24-hour day, discussed in detail in Attachment A.

Monterey County General Plan (Chapter 22, Table 6, 1995) states that the external noise level for office buildings, business and commercial and professional areas should be in the range of 50 to 67 dBA CNEL.

Evaluation

a) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---

The project would not generate noise levels in excess of local standards during construction. As discussed above, the estimated maximum construction noise level is 84 dBA at 50 feet from the source, which is below the local standard for construction (85 dBA measured 50 feet from the source). Because the facility will utilize prefabricated structures, the construction period will be the brief 33 days shown in Table 2. The estimated maximum noise level at the nearest receptor (a residence) is 86 dBA. This assumes that site development occurs at the site boundary adjacent to that facility. Since less than an acre of the 2.9-acre site will be developed and the developed area will be surrounded by buffer zones on all sides (Figure 7), the actual noise level at the receptor will be less.

During operation, the potential maximum noise level at the nearest receptor(s) (various residences at 40 feet) was calculated to be 66 dBA CNEL, which is within the range of permissible CNEL (50 dBA to 67 dBA). The 66 dBA CNEL calculation is based on a 20 foot setback from the property boundary in addition to the 40 foot distance to the receptor (total distance is 60 feet).

Site Specific Environmental Commitment: Level 3 will comply with the local construction operation noise ordinance by installing the generator shelter at a 20-foot setback from the property boundary.

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

Project construction would not generate excessive groundborne noise or vibration. The low level of groundborne vibration and noise generated during construction will be short term in nature, and generally will not extend more than a few feet from the active work area. Since the nearest public receptor is approximately 40 feet and the nearest sensitive receptor is also approximately 40 feet from the site boundary, there will be a less than significant impact from groundborne vibrations.

The 300 kW generator is the only potential source of excessive groundborne noise or vibration from the site operations. The generator will be mounted on rubber isolators that effectively reduce groundborne vibration (Ace Mountings Company, Inc., 1999). Additionally, the vibration isolator reduces structure-borne noise by

interrupting noise transmission paths caused by "sounding-board" effect. Hence, groundborne noise and vibration are reduced to levels of insignificance. The 60-foot minimum distance to the nearest receptor provides additional assurance that no excessive groundborne noise or vibration will be detected.

c) Would the proposal result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

Construction noise will be temporary, lasting only 33 days. Therefore, there will be no permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the site. Noise emitted during 25 minutes each week to test the generator, and during power outages, will be temporary and below the regulatory threshold.

d) Would the proposal result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Temporary increases in ambient noise levels will occur during the 33 days of construction but these will not be significant and will comply with the local construction noise ordinance. Temporary (25 minutes) and periodic (weekly) noise will be generated during testing of the emergency generator, and during power outages and periodic maintenance. This temporary, periodic noise will not be a substantial increase in ambient noise levels because the increased distance from the boundary with the nearest industrial facility will create a buffer area around the generator (Figure 7).

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

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

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

The site is located one-quarter mile from a private airstrip. However, construction noise will be temporary and operational noise will be reduced to a level of insignificance by utilizing an insulated generator housing and setting the generator back from the property line.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Setting

The site is located within Monterey County, with a population of 386,200 as of January 1999 (Bradley, 1999). The nearest housing is located to the northwest of the site, and across Railroad Street to the west.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

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

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

The project would not displace existing housing units.

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

The project would not displace people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The site is located within Monterey County. Fire protection is provided by the San Ardo Volunteer Fire Company, with additional service from the Monterey County Fire Department. Police protection is provided by the Monterey County Sheriff's Department. There are no nearby recreational or public park facilities. Other public or quasi-public facilities located within the vicinity of the site include the San Ardo Union School, located approximately one-quarter mile to the west, and the Monterey County Library located one-half mile west of the site. The UPRR ROW is located along the eastern boundary of the property.

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 of the public services: Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

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

XIV. RECREATION

Setting

No public parks or recreational facilities are located in the project vicinity.

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

No public parks or recreational facilities are located in the project vicinity.

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

No public parks or recreational facilities are located in the project vicinity.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Setting

The site is located adjacent to Cattlemen Road, a two-lane, north south street. Short Street is located adjacent to the south of the site, which is an east west unpaved road.

There are no sidewalks on Cattlemen Road or Short Street. There are no bike lanes, bus stops, or other alternate transportation facilities located near the site.

The site abuts on the UPRR ROW in which the running line will be placed. Therefore, no public streets will be encroached by the fiber optic cable.

Evaluation

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

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

b) Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

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

The project would not 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The project would be accessed from Cattlemen Road, which currently does not have curbs or gutters. Cattlemen Road does not have dangerous curves or intersections. The driveway would be located per Monterey County Building Department direction.

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

The project would not affect emergency access routes.

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

The project would not affect parking and only one or two parking spaces would be required on-site for maintenance personnel.

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

No alternative transportation facilities are located near the project site.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Setting

The San Ardo ILA will require electricity and telephone. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are located overhead along Cattlemen Road on the western edge of the site (Figure 7) on wooden poles and wooden crossarms. No sewer or water hookups will be needed, and there will be no wastewater discharge or water usage.

Waste will be generated at the San Ardo ILA site during site preparation activities. Since the precise site-specific location of the ILA facility in the available "development window" at the San Ardo ILA Site has not yet been determined (see Figure 7) it is not possible at this time to estimate the volume of waste generated by site clearing activities. However, the site is already highly disturbed and there is virtually no vegetation cover. Every attempt will be made to minimize waste generation in the detailed, site-specific facility-siting process. Removal of old machinery currently occupying the site is the responsible of the current owner. The machinery, including a truck scale and a water pump, was previously used for agricultural distribution. Any residual levels of lubricants will be drained from the truck scale and water pump before this equipment is removed from the site, and as there are no other hazardous materials present at the site, there is no po-

tential for release of hazardous materials during removal. Station construction will not proceed before the machinery is removed. Therefore, solid waste generation during construction should be minimal.

During construction of the ILA facility, waste will be generated during site grading activities associated with building, parking and access road development. Estimates of solid waste include 4 cubic yards of building demolition refuse, 8 cubic yards of tower demolition refuse, 23 cubic yards of truck scale demolition refuse and 40 cubic yards of dirt associated with grading and foundation work. Total solid waste generation during construction is 75 cubic yards (approximately 50 tons). There should be no appreciable generation of solid waste since the construction materials are pre-fabricated, the site will not be permanently staffed, and site visits will be infrequent (one per week) and of short duration (one to several hours).

Level 3 will utilize the Johnson Canyon Landfill for disposal of the small amount of solid waste generated during site clearing. Based on personal communication with Erin Hernandez of the Monterey Regional Waste Management District, the permitted daily capacity of this landfill is 175 tons with average daily intake of 170 tons. Level 3's small, short-term solid waste disposal needs can be accommodated by the existing capacity of this landfill.

Stormwater drainage will be installed per Monterey County regulations. According to Jennifer Bitting, Regional Water Quality Control Board, for commercial facilities of less than 5 acre size all that is required is the Construction Activities Stormwater General Permit (NPDES CAF00002 Order No. 92-08 SWQ).

Fire protection equipment will be installed per Monterey County Ordinance 3600, which adopts the 1998 California Fire Code Article 79 (Mike Giabbini, Monterey County).

Evaluation

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

The project would not increase the burden on wastewater treatment. During construction, portable chemical toilets will be used on-site. During operation, the site will be occupied for only a brief period each week.

b) Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The project would not increase the burden on wastewater treatment. No sewer hookups or sewage generation are anticipated.

c) Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project would not increase the burden on stormwater drainage facilities. As noted in Section VIII, drainage from the structures would be maintained on-site in order to be available to recharge the groundwater underlying the property.

d)	Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

This project would not require water hook-ups.

e)	Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

This project would not require wastewater treatment.

f)	Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

This project would not generate significant amounts of solid waste. The general clean-up of the site after construction will produce a minimal amount of solid waste which could easily be accommodated within local landfills.

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

This project would not generate significant amounts of solid waste. The general clean-up of the site after construction will produce a minimal amount of solid waste which could easily be accommodated within local landfills.

Analysis Team

General Field Team:

Chris Mueller, MS, Planning (9 Years Experience)
Environmental Science Associates
700 University Avenue, Suite 130, Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 564-4500

General Agency Team:

Chris Mueller, MS, Planning (9 Years Experience)
Environmental Science Associates
700 University Avenue, Suite 130, Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 564-4500

Biological Resources Team:

Jack Barclay, MS, Biology (20 Years Experience)
Environmental Science Associates
700 University Avenue, Suite 130, Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 564-4500

Historical & Cultural Resources Team: Field and Analysis

Wendy Nelson, PhD, Anthropology (10 Years Experience)
Far Western Anthropological Research Group
P.O. Box 413, Davis, CA 95617
(530) 756-3941

Paleontological Resources Team: 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

Hazardous Materials Team:

Chris Mueller, MS, Planning (9 Years Experience)
Peter Hudson, BS, Hazardous Material/Water Quality (11 Years Experience)
Environmental Science Associates
700 University Avenue, Suite 130, Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 564-4500

Air Quality Team:

Mark Hagmann, BS, Air Quality (2 Years Experience)
Environmental Science Associates
225 Bush Street, Suite 1700, San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 986-5900

Document Preparers:

Derek Ross, BA, Environmental Analysis and Design (2 Years Experience)
Donna McCormick, BLA, Environmental Planning (12 Years Experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff
505 South Main Street, Suite 900, Orange, CA 92868
(714) 973-4880

Quality Control:

David Shpak, BS, Environmental Planning (12 Years Experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff
3840 Rosin Court, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 567-2500

Technical Coordination:

Gary Finni, Ph.D., Aquatic Entomology (22 Years Experience)
Charles Comiskey, Ph.D., Ecology (23 Years Experience)
BHE Environmental
11733 Chesterdale Road, Cincinnati, OH 45246
(513) 326-1500

Engineering:

Tom Ogg, BS, PE, MBA, Civil Engineering (10 Years Experience)
Kiewit Pacific Co.
14203 Denver West Parkway, 1st Floor
Golden CO 80401
(303) 215-8768

Hydrology/Geology/Hazardous Materials:

Chris Dennis, MS, Geology/Law (8 Years Experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation/Alton Geoscience
5025 Commercial Circle
Concord, CA 94520
(925) 688-2463

Land Use/Aesthetics/Public Utilities/Transportation:

Carolyn Trindle, MA, MBA, Education/Business (23 Years Experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
21 Technology Drive
Irvine, CA 92618
(949) 727-7315

Air Quality/Noise:

Bill Guyton, BS, Mechanical Engineering (12 Years Experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
11 Inverness Drive East
Englewood, CO 80112
(303) 638-7207

Historic & Cultural Resources: Field

Ann Munns, MA, Anthropology/Archaeology (14 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 (20 years experience)
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Architectural History: Analysis

Barbara Delvac, BA, Art History, Graduate Studies Restoration and Preservation/Historic Architecture
(27 years experience)

Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc.

811 West 7th Street, Suite 800, Los Angeles, CA 90017

Phone: (213) 627-5376 Fax: (213) 627-6853

Sources

- 40 CFR Parts 93. *Determining Conformity of Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans*, July 1998.
- Ace Mountings Company Inc. Manufacturer's literature for Series 630 Spring Isolators, 1999.
- Bitting, Jennifer, Regional Water Quality Control Board. Interviewed by Carolyn Trindle, TRC, July 15, 1999.
- Bradley, Paula, Planner, Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. Interviewed by Sonja Downing, Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS), May 13, 1999.
- Brennan, Janet, Supervising Planner, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. Interviewed by Level 3 Project Staff, May 7, 1999.
- California Department of Conservation. *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*, 1994.
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). *San Ardo Quadrangle, California Natural Diversity Database*, Updated March 1999.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). *California Scenic Highways Program*, Accessed at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>, January 1999.
- California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG). *Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California: Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act*, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997.
- California Environmental Protection Agency (California EPA), Air Resources Board. *California Air Quality Data*, 1996 to 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.
- California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Center. *Records Search for San Ardo ILA Facility Site*, NWIC File #99-669, November 1999.
- Delvac, Barbara H., Senior Architectural Historian. Appendix B, Building Evaluation and Description, In Mason, R.D., and M. Linder, *Cultural Resources Survey Report, Test Report and Paleontologic Resources Literature Review Report for Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optic Project: San Ardo ILA, San Ardo, Monterey County California*, Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, Prepared for Level 3 Project Office, Pleasanton, CA, November 1999.
- ERSI/FEMA. *Project Impact Hazard Information Awareness Sites*, Accessed at <http://www.esri.com/hazards>, December 1999.
- Giabbini, Mike, Monterey County. Interviewed by Carolyn Trindle, TRC, July 15, 1999.
- Hernandez, Erin, Monterey Regional Waste Management District. Interviewed by Carolyn Trindle, TRC, July 15, 1999.
- Hester, T.R. Salinan, In: Robert F. Heizer (Editor), *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California*, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 1978.

- Holroyd, P., University of California Museum of Paleontology. Written communication to E.B. Lander, Paleo Environmental Associates, 1999.
- Jefferson, G.T. *A Catalogue of Late Quaternary Vertebrates from California: Part One, Nonmarine Lower Vertebrates and Avian Taxa*, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Technical Reports Number 5, 1991a.
- *A Catalogue of Late Quaternary Vertebrates from California: Part Two, Mammals*, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Technical Reports Number 7, 1991b.
- Jennings, W.W. and R.G. Strand, Compilers. *Geologic Map of California, Santa Cruz Sheet*, California Division of Mines and Geology, Salinas, 1958.
- Mason, R.D and M. Linder. *Cultural Resources Survey Report, Test Report, and Paleontologic Resources Literature Review Report for Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optic Project: San Ardo ILA, San Ardo, Monterey County California*, Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, Prepared for Level 3 Project Office, Pleasanton, CA, December 1999.
- McNulty, G., Native American Heritage Commission. Written communication to David White, Level 3 Long Haul Project, November 9, 1999.
- Monterey, County of. *Monterey County Potential Seismic and Geologic Hazards Map*, 1975.
- *Monterey County Title 10-40.5*, Chapter 10.60, Section 10.60.030, Ordinance 2450 3, 1978.
- *Flood Prone Areas Map*, 1983.
- *Land Use Plan*, December 15, 1987.
- *Monterey County Zoning Map*, 1988.
- *South County Area Plan*, February 2, 1988.
- *Monterey County General Plan*, November 1996.
- *Monterey County General Plan*, Noise Hazards, 1996.
- *Monterey County Zoning Ordinance*, 1997.
- *Property System Assessor Inquiry Printout*, current as of May 6, 1999.
- Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). *Maintenance Plan and Contingency Control Measures for the Monterey Bay Region*, October 1994.
- *1997 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Monterey Bay Region*, 1997a.
- *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, Revised February 1997b.
- *Rule 200, Permits Required*.
- *Rule 207, Review of New or Modified Sources*.
- Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS). *Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optics Project: Cultural Re-*

- sources Procedures*, July 1999.
- Rice, Tim, Caterpillar Dealer. Interviewed by David Augustine, TRC, December 27, 1999.
- Robinson, Delinda, Land Use Technician, County of Monterey. Personal communication with Carolyn Trindle, TRC, July 13, 1999.
- Schomer and Associates. *Proposed Revisions to Property-Line-Noise-Source Measurement Procedures*, Report No. ILEN/R/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* 163:22-27, 1996.
- Steele, Jerry, Engineering Division, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. Fax Transmittal, April 13, 1999a.
- . Personal communication with Level 3 Project Team, May 7, 1999b.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans and Redesignation of California's Ten Federal Carbon Monoxide Planning Areas to Attainment – Direct Final Rule, *Federal Register*, March 31, 1998.
- . *Noise for Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances*, December 30, 1971.
- . *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, AP-42*, Section 3.3, Gasoline and Diesel Industrial Engines, October 1996.
- Vista Information Solutions, Inc. *California Site Assessment Plus Report: San Ardo*, May 6, 1999.
- . *NEPA Checklist: San Ardo*, May 6, 1999.
- White, D., Level 3 Network Communications. Written communication to Gail McNulty, California Native American Heritage Commission, October 22, 1999.
- Whitney, Mimi, Planner, Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. Interviewed by Chris Mueller, ESA, May 6, 1999.

Tables

Table 1. Specific Local Policies Applicable to Each Issue Area for the San Ardo ILA Site.

Table 2. Construction and Operation Emissions Summary for the San Ardo ILA Site.

Figures

- Figure 1 Regional Map
- Figure 2 Vicinity Map
- Figure 3 Parcel Map
- Figure 4 U.S.G.S. Quad Sheet
- Figure 5 Surrounding Land Use Map
- Figure 6 Photo Key Map
- Figure 7 Conceptual Plot Plan
- Figure 8 Air and Noise Receptor Map
- Figure 9 FEMA Floodplain Map

Photo Plates

- Photo A Overall View of Site
- Photo B Existing Structures on Site
- Photo C View of the Site from the South
- Photo D On-site Water Pump and Equipment

Attachment

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