Appendix A -- No. 5

PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Site name: Colusa ILA

Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission

Prepared by
Level 3 Communications, LLC

Table of Contents

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

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Attachment

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Facility Title:
Level 3 Long-Haul Network, Colusa 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 subject parcel, 210 10th Street, is located in the County of Colusa, City of Colusa. The parcel measures 125- X 160-feet (0.44 acre) and contains a 30- X 160-foot corrugated sheet metal shed and a fenced dirt parking lot. Access is provided from Market and 10th Streets to the north and west, respectively. Mature walnut trees border Market Street areas (See Figure 1, Regional Map; Figure 2, Vicinity Map; Figure 3, Parcel Map; Figure 4, U.S.G.S. Quad Map; Figure 5, Surrounding Land Use Map; and Figure 6, Photo Key Map and referenced photos).

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

6. General Plan Designation: General Commercial

7. Zoning: General Commercial (C-3)

8. Description of Facility:
This checklist evaluates the design, construction, and operation of the Colusa In-Line Amplification (ILA) station. This facility, which will support the Long-Haul network, will be located outside a utility corridor.

The Colusa ILA station will be constructed on a developed 0.44-acre site at 210 10th Street. The facility will encompass approximately 5,000 square feet and require removal of shed walls and roof. The concrete slab forming the floor will be used for ILA component placement. Prefabricated ILA structures will be delivered and placed on an engineered portion of the concrete pad. A separate generator structure will be constructed utilizing another engineered portion of the existing building pad.

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

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

All structures will arrive pre-assembled. No additional buildings will be constructed. Control and

maintenance functions will occur within the proposed facilities. Limited parking space and a driveway providing access from 10th or Market Street will be developed to support site maintenance activities. Fencing around the ILA facility will be of chain link construction and will be eight feet tall. A locked gate will restrict access to the site.

The Colusa ILA will require electricity and telephone. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are located overhead on wooden poles with wooden cross arms one half block north of the site. These lines run along the west side of 10th Street. Pacific Gas and Electricity provides electricity to the site. Additional wooden poles will be installed along 10th Street to bring electric utilities to the site. Normal electrical power will be provided, consisting of 400-amp, 480-volt, three-phase service. All on-site utility lines will be run underground per National Electric Code (NEC) and local codes. No water or sewer hookups are anticipated because the site is unmanned. No site grading is anticipated nor will there be any net change in impervious surfaces. Thus, no change in storm water drainage characteristics are anticipated. Fire protection equipment will be installed per local codes.

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

Site development will require no grading for placement of the generator shelter or for access and parking. Upgrading of the generator and ILA shelter foundations will be engineered and completed prior to delivery of prefabricated components (i.e., shelters), placement of the fiberoptic cable line, and installation of utility connections. Erection of perimeter fencing will occur prior to all improvements. The fiber optic cable feed to the ILA will be from the utility right-of-way (ROW) along the south side of Market Street. The connection to the ILA facility will be installed at a depth of approximately 42 inches either by plowing in the conduit (which does not require a trench) or by digging a trench, laying the conduit, and back-filling. The existing building will be demolished. Sheet metal from the shed will be recycled. Some concrete removed for pad upgrade will require disposal. The estimated volume of demolition debris requiring disposal is 70 cubic yards. During construction, no offsite areas will be required for mobilization or parking of construction or worker vehicles.

One 300-kilowatt (kW), 449-horsepower (hp) diesel-powered generator will provide emergency power to the set of four ILA huts. The pre-cast concrete generator housing or shelter will be approximately 12 feet wide, 24 feet long (288 square feet), and 10 feet high. It will be assembled at the site and installed on a concrete foundation. Insulation will be provided as needed for noise abatement. The generator will be mounted on a 1,000-gallon, double-walled, aboveground storage tank that is thirteen feet long by 8 feet wide by 1 foot 9 inches high, and designed to support the weight of the generator. This type of mounting is a common design for emergency generators (Rice,1999). The tank system design incorporates a high fuel alarm (local) and a tank rupture alarm (remote).

During operation at 100-percent load, the 449-hp generator consumes approximately 22 gallons of diesel fuel per hour (gph). At 75 percent load, fuel consumption rate is 16.5 gph. During most of the 25 minutes of testing and maintenance run time each week, the generators will run at 50-percent load. However, for the purposes of this "worst-case" calculation, Level 3 assumes a 75-percent load and 30 hours of run time each year (i.e., 1/2-hour/week times 52 weeks, plus four hours contingency). Therefore, 30 hours per year multiplied by 16.5 gph equals 495 gallons of diesel fuel consumption per year for testing and maintenance. Testing of the emergency generator will be controlled remotely, and will not be part of site maintenance activities.

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

and appropriate spill-reporting procedures will be contained in the drum and will also be displayed near the filling port. Should a release occur that Level 3 personnel could not manage, the emergency response contractor will be called.

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

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

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

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

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

Most of the property to the north, across Market Street, is in use as commercial or residential property or is vacant. The lot to the immediate north of the site across Market Street is in use as commercial property. The lot immediately to the west contains a residential house and the lot to the west of the house contains an industrial-type building. The one half of the site's block to the south consists of four lots, three containing houses and one vacant. The next block to the west is also in use a Low Density Residential. The block to the east is a City park.

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The site is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Colusa. It is also located within the Colusa County Air Pollution Control District (CCAPCD).

The City of Colusa Planning Commission will review and approve the project (approval was granted on September 22, 1999 conditioned on implementation of a landscaping and screening plan). A conditional use permit and public hearing are not required. Following approval by the Planning Commission, a building permit is issued and construction may commence. If driveways into the site are changed, and encroachment permit from Caltrans will be required because the site is located on a state highway (State Highway 20).

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

Sources for the policies are provided at the end of the listing.

PROPONENT'S DETERMINATION

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

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

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

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

Setting

The Site is located in the downtown commercial area of the City of Colusa and is surrounded by developed properties.

The Site consists of the northeast one quarter (120- by 160-feet) of a city block bounded on the east by 10th Street and on the north by Market Street. The north one half of the Site is vacant and the south one half is occupied by an old metal building that appears to be at least 20 feet in height. The city block to the north of the site across Market Street is in use as commercial and residential property or is vacant. The lot immediately to the west contains a residential house and the lot to the west of the house contains an industrial-type building. The one half of the site's block to the south consists of four lots, three containing houses and one vacant. The next block to the west is also in use as Low Density Residential. The block to the east is a City park.

The old metal building on the Site will be removed and replaced with five small new buildings (one of which will be an emergency generator). These new buildings will be lower in height (approximately 10 feet) than the existing building. Existing structures in the area consist of older commercial, industrial, and residential buildings and two large water towers.

Evaluation

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

The only scenic vista in the area is Memorial Park, located across 10th Street from the Site. The project will not prevent viewing the park from surrounding properties and will result in removal of the existing large metal building. Views from the park may be improved through removal of the old metal building and replacement with the new project structures.

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

The site is not within or visible from a state scenic highway.

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

The Site is currently only occupied by an old metal building. Removal of the metal building and replacement with lower height buildings may improve the visual quality of the Site. Project structures that will be added are not dissimilar to existing structures in the immediate vicinity.

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

There is a small porch light at each structure entrance. This, however, is not a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The Site is located in the downtown commercial area of the City of Colusa and is surrounded by developed properties.

Evaluation

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

The project site is zoned commercial and is currently being used as commercial property.

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

The project site is commercial zoned property.

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

The Site is surrounded by light industrial property, railroad-right-of-way, city streets, and residential houses, none of which are farmland.

III. AIR QUALITY

Throughout California, the fiber optic cable line will be installed along existing utility corridors in support of the Long-Haul network. The ILA station in the City of Colusa will be constructed outside of a utility corridor. To minimize potential environmental impacts, the ILA facility will be constructed on a pad of an existing building at a previously developed site.

The Colusa ILA site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately 0.44 acres. Project activities include site preparation, building demolition, construction of the ILA and generator pads and shelters, installation of equipment, automated testing of the emergency generators, and approximately weekly vehicular trips to the site for maintenance and data logging. This work will require approximately 5,000 square feet of building space. The access road and parking area is paved.

Table 3 provides relevant information on construction and operation activities contributing to emissions of pollutants based on the above scenario. Methodologies, algorithms, and assumptions used to make these emissions estimates are provided as Attachment A.

Included in Table 3 are the following construction-related items:

- Estimate of one-way commuting distance (miles) that members of the construction crew will travel to the 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 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 on the proposed site.

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

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

Table 3 shows the emission factors and other parameters used to calculate exhaust and fugitive PM_{10} emissions for mobile equipment (U.S. EPA, 1996). Construction and operation emission thresholds for NO_x, ROC, PM_{10}, SO_x, and CO are listed in Table 3, as provided by the CCAPCD. This agency is responsible for management of air emissions in Colusa County where this site resides. This is the only ILA site in this air district.

Setting

Colusa County is within the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin, which is a subregion of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. The Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin is currently designated as a nonattainment area for state and national one-hour average ozone standards and for state and national particulate matter PM_{10} standards (California EPA, 1998). The distance of the closest sensitive receptor to the boundary of the site is approximately 10 feet.

Based on monitoring data collected during the three-year period of 1995-1997, maximum ozone concentrations did not exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone (0.12 parts per million for one hour). The area exceeded the more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standard (0.09 parts per million for one hour) on an average of approximately 3 days per year (California EPA, 1996 to 1998). The ozone

problem in Colusa County is strongly influenced by transport of pollutants from the Sacramento area and from portions of El Dorado, Placer, Sutter, and Yolo counties.

Ambient PM_{10} concentrations in Colusa County during 1995 –1997 did not exceed the 24-hour-average National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 150 micrograms per cubic meter. However, the measured concentrations exceeded the more stringent 24-hour average California Ambient Air Quality Standard of 50 micrograms per cubic meter roughly 12 percent of the time (California EPA, 1996 to1998). The PM_{10} problem in Colusa County is primarily due to road dust, farming, pollutant transport and construction activities.

The federal Clean Air Act and California Clean Air Act require plans to be developed for areas designated as nonattainment of the national and state ozone standards, including strategies for attaining the standards. No plans are required for areas designated as nonattainment of state PM_{10} standards. There are three applicable air quality plans for the project area, two related to the state and national ozone standards, and one related to the national PM_{10} standard.

The applicable ozone air quality plans are the Federal Ozone Attainment Demonstration and the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin 1997 Air Quality Attainment Plan (Tehama County Air Pollution Control District et al., 1998).

The applicable PM_{10} air quality plan is the Federal PM_{10} Attainment Demonstration Plan.

Under CCAPCD Rule 3-3 (Exemptions), installation and operation of a standby generator would not require a CCAPCD authority to construct or a permit to operate. As a stationary internal combustion engine, the generator would be subject to CCAPCD Rule 2-36 (Stationary Internal Combustion Engines). This rule also provides an exemption for emergency standby engines, which operate only during emergencies and for testing and maintenance purposes, as long as the use for testing and maintenance do not exceed 100 hours per year.

CCAPCD recommends consideration of reasonable and appropriate construction related dust control measures. If these measures are instituted, residual impacts are considered to be less than significant. For operational phase impacts, the CCAPCD recommends the use of operational based criteria of 25 tons per year of ROC, NO_x, and PM_{10} to identify significant increases in those nonattainment pollutants (ROC and NO_x are precursor emissions to regional ozone and PM_{10} formation).

General Conformity requirements (40 CFR Part 93, November 1993) do not apply to this project since it does not involve a federal action such as the use of federal land or the need to acquire a federal permit for the site.

Evaluation

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

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

Fugitive dust will be generated during the construction phase (Table 3) from demolition, trenching, travel of heavy equipment over paved roads at the construction site, and wind erosion. 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 construction. Long-term fugitive dust emissions associated with facility operation will be negligible. The project will include use of a paved road to provide access directly to the buildings and equipment.

Generator testing and the visiting technician vehicle will contribute operational air emissions as shown in Table 3. Operation of the emergency standby generator will be in compliance with the exemptions of Rules 3-3 and 2-36 because it will be operated less than 100 hours per year for testing maintenance and emergency use only. Compliance with the exemption requirements will be fully documented with regard to duration of use.

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

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

- Submit a letter to CCAPCD prior to project construction indicating that an emergency standby engine will be located at the project site and that an exemption from permitting requirements is sought under Rule 2-36 based on an annual usage rate of no more than 100 hours per calendar year for maintenance purposes;
- Use the standby engine for emergency, non-utility electrical power generation purposes only (or for related testing and maintenance purposes), and maintain required documentation to support continued eligibility for Rule 2-36 exemption status; and
- Implement a construction emissions abatement program to minimize emissions of fugitive dust (including PM_{10}).

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 PM_{10} emissions during construction work.

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

The Colusa ILA Site lies in an area designated as nonattainment of the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and PM_{10}.

Estimates of construction-related engine emissions are shown in Table 3. These emissions are less than significant because CCAPCD has no thresholds of significance for construction emissions.

Fugitive dust emissions during site construction activities are also shown in Table 3, for which there are no numerical thresholds. Instead, CCAPCD requires dust control measures to be implemented during construction. Level 3 will implement dust control measures to manage fugitive dust during construction.
The weekly test of the standby engine would last approximately one-half hour. Emissions on a given day when the engine would undergo such a test are shown in Table 3. The emergency standby engine would operate under the permit exemption provisions of CCAPCD Rule 2-36, because it would be tested approximately 30 hours per year. These emissions estimates were made using published emission factors for diesel industrial engines (U.S. EPA, 1996). Additional operation emissions associated with weekly site visits of one vehicle will be minor (See Table 3).

Site Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3 will develop and implement a construction dust

abatement program as required by the CCAPCD. Implementation of that program will reduce potential fugitive dust impacts to less than significant levels. Level 3 will also comply with all requirements of CCAPCD Rule 2-36, including documentation that the generator is not being tested more than 100 hours per year and only used for emergencies.

Level 3 will comply with requirements in the permit exemption for the emergency standby generators.

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

The Colusa ILA Site is the only PEA site under the jurisdiction of the CCAPCD.

Because project construction will occur on the existing pad, located on the 0.44-acre site, surrounding uses will be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "conceptual plot plan"). This buffer will help assure that the small amount of project construction emissions taken together with other projects in the area, would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase.

Cumulative emissions from testing and maintaining the emergency generator are exempt. Emissions that are exempt from regulatory requirements are considered to have impacts that are less than significant.

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

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

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities that house children, elderly, and ill members of the population, such as schools, day-care centers, hospitals, retirement homes, hospices, and residences. The nearest existing sensitive receptor to the proposed ILA site is a house located approximately 10 feet from the site boundary (Figure 8).

Project construction would be minimal. Therefore, receptors associated with surrounding uses would be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "conceptual plot plan"). This buffer, along with the low levels of construction emissions, would prevent substantial pollutant concentrations from reaching sensitive receptors. Through application of control measures, fugitive dust 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 10th 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. Because the generator will be tested only approximately 30-minutes per week, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Setting

The proposed Colusa ILA site is located at 210 10th Street in Colusa, California. The property is a 0.44-acre parcel with a storage shed and dirt lot. The site is surrounded by State Route 20 to the east, State Route 45 to the north, an alley way to the south and a private residence to the west. Six large walnut trees (*Juglans* sp.) surround the site. A moderate amount of bat guano is evident throughout the shed. It is likely that one or more bat species utilize the shed as a roosting site during a portion of the year.

Evaluation

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

Prior to conducting a site visit, the California Natural Diversity Database (California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999) was searched for occurrence records of special status biological resources on the Colusa and Meridian quadrangle maps that include the area surrounding the site. Although 14 different special status species were identified during this search, none were likely to occur at the site because of the lack of appropriate habitat (Table 4).

During the site reconnaissance visit, bat guano was observed on the ground throughout the shed. Special status bat species were not referenced in the database search (California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999) but based on known ranges and habitat preferences, one or more of the following species may be present at the site: pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii*), and Yuma myotis bat (*Myotis yumanensis*). The greatest concentration of bat guano occurred on the ground beneath the center support beam of the shed. Based on this observation, it is anticipated that bats utilize the shed as a roosting site during a portion of the year.

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

- Prior to demolition of the shed, a qualified bat specialist will survey the shed and attempt to identify all bat species present; and
- All bats will be encouraged to abandon the roost using passive hazing techniques approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game.

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

The project would not have any impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local, regional, state, or federal regulations. The site has no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

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

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

d)	Would the proposal interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☐	No Impact ☒

The project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. In addition the project will not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

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

The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation ordinances. No trees would be removed as a result of the project.

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

The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan since no such plans exist for the site vicinity.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The ILA site is located in the City of Colusa, Colusa County, near the Sacramento River. The parcel contains a commercial/warehouse structure.

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

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

Salmon and other river resources were important foods. Salmon and sturgeon were caught in weirs and nets. Smaller fish such as perch, chub, sucker, hardhead, pike, trout, and steelhead were netted. Ducks, turtles, and freshwater mussels were also obtained from the river. Large terrestrial animals were hunted, including deer, elk, pronghorn, and bear. Seeds from sunflower, clover, bunchgrass, wild oat, and others, were collected from the plains west of the river. They were parched or dried and then ground into a meal. Acorns were an important storable food resource. Access to oak groves was controlled by the tribelet. A wide variety of bulbs, roots, and berries were collected seasonally (Johnson, 1978).

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

After the Spanish arrived in the area in the late eighteenth century, the Patwin were taken to the San Francisco and San Jose missions. Later, Mission Sonoma was built in 1823 closer to Patwin territory. Patwin population was severely reduced (up to 75 percent) as a result of a malarial epidemic in 1833 and a small-

pox epidemic in 1837. Mexicans and Americans took over much of Patwin territory in the 1830s and 1840s. The few surviving Patwin in the American period after 1848 worked on ranches as laborers and became partly assimilated into Euro-American culture.

Evaluation

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

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

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

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

The results of the CHRIS records search showed that the property had not been previously surveyed for historic resources (File No. 99-572, California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Center, 1999). A field survey of the area indicates that several historic structures are located near the project parcel. The building adjacent at 1035 Market and the building at 230 10th Street directly behind the eastern portion of the project parcel (a double lot), are both listed on the OHP property database. The buildings directly across Market Street from the project parcel also appear to be greater than 50 years old.

The building located on the proposed ILA site at 210 10th Street, Colusa, was evaluated by qualified architectural historians. It does not meet criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources, hence no historical resource would be affected by construction of the proposed Colusa ILA site, and no mitigation would be necessary.

The existing property improvement is a one-story, 9,920-square-foot equipment storage building with a corrugated metal gable roof and corrugated metal siding. The building is located in a rural community and is in

fair condition. According to the Colusa County Assessor Records, the building was constructed in 1925.

The building does not appear to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources. The building is a rather ordinary example of a common type, a corrugated metal storage building for agricultural equipment, and therefore it would not meet California Register criterion 3. Furthermore, it has no known association with important historic persons or events that would warrant consideration under California Register criteria 1 or 2. (California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Center, 1999; Munns, 1999; Starzak, 1999; Miller, 1999).

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

The CHRIS records search showed that the property had not been previously surveyed for archaeological resources. The records indicated that there are no archaeological sites recorded within one half mile of the project area (California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Center 1999). The results of a field survey of the property indicated that the parcel is covered with fill and that there is no evidence of any archaeological resources potentially eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources present on the property.

While there are historic structures in the vicinity of the project site, the probability of finding historical cultural artifacts is low because of the nature of the construction activities that will be employed at the site. These include reinforcement of the concrete slab and connection of the ILA to the fiber optic Long Haul line on the south side of Market Street. Excavation for reinforcement of the concrete slab will be to a depth of one foot or less which is well within the depth of fill at the site. Connection to the fiber optic long line in Market Street will require excavation of a narrow (one foot wide) trench to a depth of about five feet. As such, cable excavation will penetrate to beneath the fill depth, raising the possibility of encountering cultural artifacts onsite associated with the offsite historic buildings.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitment: Because of the potential for buried historic cultural material, all grading and excavation for construction of the ILA facility on this site will be monitored by an archaeologist. If archaeological material is encountered, the monitor will have the authority to halt construction so that the material can be evaluated for the California Register of Historical Resources. If eligible, measures recommended by the archaeologist could include a data recovery program. The data recovery plan would be submitted to California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for review and approval prior to implementation (California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Center, 1999; Munns, 1999).

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

As mapped by Jennings and Strand (1960), the project site is underlain by Holocene stream channel deposits (unit Qsc). 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 Colusa 7.5-minute quadrangle. Moreover, no fossil vertebrate site is reported as occurring in this rock unit in the immediate project site vicinity by Jefferson (1991a, 1991b). Although there is a potential for late Pleistocene and early Holocene continental vertebrate and land plant fossil remains occurring in the subsurface at the project site, it is unlikely construction-related earth moving at the project site would extend to a depth great enough to encounter remains old enough to be considered fossilized.

Site Specific Environmental Commitment: Level 3, as part of the project design, is committed to paleontological monitoring during construction. Monitoring will be initiated where earth moving extends to a depth greater than 5 feet below current grade. Monitoring will be conducted by a qualified vertebrate paleontologist to allow for the recovery of larger fossil remains. Rock samples will be processed to allow for the recovery of smaller fossil remains. All recovered fossil remains will be fully treated (prepared, identified by knowledgeable paleontologists, curated, catalogued) and, along with associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data, placed in a recognized museum repository. The paleontologist will prepare a final report of findings that includes an inventory of recovered fossil remains. These measures will be in compliance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995, 1996) guidelines for mitigating construction-related impacts on paleontologic resources and for the museum acceptance of a monitoring program fossil collection.

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

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Setting

The site lies in a relatively flat area in the City of Colusa. Colusa is located in a relatively stable geologic area. The site vicinity is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone, or landslide or subsidence geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973, 1999). Due to the proximity of the Sacramento River to the project site, the site may be in an area of liquefaction. Erosion activity is low. The soils are moderately expansive.

Evaluation

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

The project site would not be inhabited, and is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone or landslide geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973, 1999). The project site may be in an area of liquefaction. There are no active faults in the vicinity of the project site area (i.e., faults exhibiting displacement within the last 11,000 years) (CDMG, 1994). The project site area can, however, experience moderate magnitude groundshaking associated with faults that may rupture with sufficient magnitude to affect the Colusa area. A 10% probability of peak ground accelerations of 10% to 20% g in 50 years is expected in the site vicinity (CDMG, 1996). As part of the Proponent's environmental commitment to this project, any potential seismic hazard would be minimized by compliance with: (1) standard engineering practices for construction of foundations in areas known for liquefaction; (2) the California seismic code standards and applicable local building and seismic codes. Because of Proponent's environmental commitment to this project, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects attributable to these potential geologic hazards. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

The site is nearly flat, and is located in an area of low erosion activity (CDMG, 1973). The ILA would be placed on the existing building concrete slab. Therefore, substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would not occur as a result of the project.

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

The site is not within any landslide, subsidence, or liquefaction geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973). The site is relatively flat, and the geologic units and soils on the site are not unstable. The existing building's concrete slab would be used for the ILA facility. Therefore, the minimal plowing or trenching from the street to the existing concrete slab for the fiber optic cable would not result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

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

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

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

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

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Setting

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

Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed structure would be located in an urbanized area zoned C-3 General Commercial District. The structure is not located in the vicinity of any wildland areas. Generators would be equipped with spark arrestors to further reduce the potential for loss, injury, or death involving fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Setting

The site is located within a 100-year floodplain (Figure 9, Vista Information Solutions, NEPA Checklist, 1999). The site is located in the Shasta Lake, Black Butte Lake, Lake Oroville, and Whiskeytown Lake dam inundation areas (Colusa County General Plan, 1989). The site is not located within an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

The Colusa ILA site is not anticipated to significantly modify drainage of stormwater from the site. However, any stormwater drainage measures that may be included in the ILA facility will be installed in accordance with applicable Colusa County codes. The site is located in the Sacramento Groundwater Basin, but not within its specified recharge area (Colusa County General Plan, 1989).

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 Colusa site.

As appropriate, Level 3 will implement the following measures to avoid and minimize effects on any nearby aquatic environments. Appendix B identifies the documents and practices in which these measures will be specified.

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

A Notification of Intent (NOI) will be submitted to the applicable RWQCB and the State Water Resources Control Board for construction of the Colusa 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 Colusa site will be less than five acres, and will therefore be less than the minimum size requirement for a SWPPP, the cumulative area of the total ILA, 3R, Terminal, and Distribution Node sites associated with this project is greater than five acres. Accordingly, an NOI will be submitted, and a SWPPP will be prepared.

Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because it will be placed on the concrete slab of the existing building. Existing site drainage will not be altered.

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

The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because it will be placed on the concrete slab of the existing building. Existing site drainage will not be altered.

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

The project would not create or contribute additional runoff water because the facility will be placed on the concrete slab of the existing building. Existing site drainage will not be altered.

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

No impacts to water quality are expected as a result of this project. Because the facility will be placed on the concrete slab of an existing building within a developed commercial area, the project would not produce contaminated runoff, generate wastewater, or discharge substances that could contaminate water.

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

The project would not include housing. The project is located within a 100-year floodplain (Figure 9, Vista Information Solutions NEPA Checklist, 1999).

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

The project is located within a 100-year floodplain (Figure 9, Vista Information Solutions NEPA Checklist, 1999). The ILA will be located on the concrete slab of an existing building; however, the design will incorporate all flood-protection measures deemed necessary for the site by Colusa County, taking into consideration the type of use and risk level at this location.

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

The site is located in the Shasta Lake, Black Butte Lake, Lake Oroville, and Whiskeytown Lake dam inundation areas (City of Colusa General Plan, 1994). According the City of Colusa General Plan (1994), flood waters would reach the City as follows: Lake Oroville - 8 hours; Lake Shasta - 42 hours; Black Butte Lake - 35 hours; and Whiskeytown Lake - 82 hours. Responses to an emergency as a result of dam failure, would be coordinated by the state and county offices of emergency services. Installation of the ILA would not expose people to a significant risk because the site would not be occupied.

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

The site is not located within an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Neither the City of Colusa or Colusa County General Plans discuss tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. However, the site is too far from the ocean to possibly be impacted by a tsunami. It is also too far from lakes to be impacted significantly by a seiche. If a seiche did occur from Lake Oroville, Lake Shasta, Black Butte Lake, or Whiskeytown Lake, impact to the site would be less than dam failure from those lakes as discussed in VIII (i). The site is flat, surrounded by flat land for many miles, and therefore not subject to mudflows. Finally, the site will not be permanently manned and even if a seiche or mudflow did occur, there would not be significant risk to human life.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

Setting

The Site is located in the downtown commercial area of the City of Colusa and is surrounded by developed properties.

Most of the property to the north, across Market Street is in use as commercial, residential or is vacant. The site consists of the northeast one-quarter of a city block bounded on the east by 10th Street and on the north by Market Street. The city block to the north of the site across Market Street is in use as commercial and residential. The quarter of the site's block to the west contains a residence and an industrial building. The one half of the site's block to the south is in use as residential with one lot vacant. The next block to the west from the site's block is also in use as residential and the block to the east is a City park.

The City's plan for future land use recognizes the existing zoning and patterns of land use which have evolved over the last several decades. Based on this, the Site will continue to be in the General Commercial District, and zoned C-3 (City of Colusa General Plan, 1994).

The proposed project fits within the City's plan for future land use and the current zoning of the Site allows for uses such as the proposed project.

Evaluation

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

Although the south one half of the site's city block is in use as residential, the project would not divide an established community since the property is currently being used as commercial property. Also, property to the north of the site is in use as commercial property.

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

The site is zoned commercial (C-3) and the proposed use is compatible with this zoning designation which includes electric substations, telephone exchanges, and water works (utilities). In addition, the City's Planning Consultant has stated that in his opinion, there is no conflict (Walker, 1999).

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

There are no habitat or natural community conservation plans that apply to the Site or Project.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

Included in the Colusa County General Plan is a map depicting areas within Colusa County that have known mineral resources and areas with mineral resource potential. The project site is not within any of the areas with known mineral resources or areas with mineral resource potential.

Evaluation

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

The site is not within an area with known mineral resources or with mineral resource potential.

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

The site is not within an area with known mineral resources or with mineral resource potential.

XI. NOISE

Setting

The Colusa ILA Site is located in the City of Colusa in Colusa County (Figure 2). The site is bordered by residential land uses on the south and west (Figure 8). The area is designated as "General Commercial" (City of Colusa, 1989) and is zoned as C-3.

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

The Colusa ILA Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately 0.44 acres. Project activities include site preparation, building demolition, construction of the ILA and generator pads and shelters, installation of equipment, trenching onsite for the innerduct, automated testing of the emergency generators, 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 5,000 square feet of the 0.44 acre (approximately 19,000 square feet) property will be developed, resulting in substantial buffering of the surrounding uses from noise caused by project construction and operation (see Figure 7 for the "conceptual plot plan"). Site development will be limited to installation of prefabricated structures on the existing foundation to house the ILA equipment installation of the emergency generator and shelter on a new, separate concrete pad, and trenching for installation of the innerduct. The access road and parking area are already paved.

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

A key assumption implicit in the evaluation of noise impacts is that only one piece of heavy equipment will operate at any one time. Therefore, maximum construction noise levels at each site are 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 hp measured at 50 feet is 84 dBA (U.S. EPA, 1971).

The City of Colusa does not restrict hours of construction. However, Level 3 will voluntarily limit construction activities to the period between 7 AM and 7 PM. There is no numerical threshold for noise from construction sites. Colusa County limits operational noise levels at the nearest residential-zoned property boundary to an Ldn of 60 dBA (Colusa County, 1991). Colusa County also restricts median hourly noise levels (Leq) to 50 dBA or less at the nearest residential-zoned property line during the 7 AM to 10 PM period (*ibid.*).

Operational parameters related to noise include the size/gross hp and period of operation (30 minutes/week) of the emergency standby generator (Table 3). The generator will be automatically tested weekly. The maximum noise level at the nearest receptor was estimated by adjusting the generator noise level for distance as described in Attachment A. To comply with restrictions on operation noise in Colusa County, the generator will be enclosed in a noise-insulated shelter from which noise will not exceed 75 dBA at a distance of 5 feet from the shelter. The generator shelter will also be located at least 80 feet from the property line of the nearest receptor. The resulting noise level at the receptor boundary will be 55 dBA Ldn to comply with the Colusa County noise level restrictions described above.

The L_{eq} limit of 50 dBA was found to be non-applicable due to the conservative assumption of a daytime ambient noise level of 52 dBA, which exceeds the L_{eq} limit without additional noise from the generator. Calcula-

tion of the L_{eq} with the additional generator noise results in an insignificant increase of 1.4 dBA over ambient for the one-half-hour per week that the generator will run. Also, because the generator will only operate for one half-hour each week, an hourly L_{eq} calculation for a weekly event is considered to be highly conservative. Detailed methodologies, algorithms, and assumptions associated with the noise analysis are provided as Attachment A.

Evaluation

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

The project would not generate noise in excess of local standards during construction because no numerical standards apply. Therefore, the noise impact of construction would be less than significant. Level 3 will voluntarily restrict construction activities to the period 7 AM to 7 PM even though no such regulatory limit exists. Because the facility will utilize prefabricated structures, the construction period will be the brief, up to two months as shown in Table 3.

Based on the proximity of the nearest receptor, the generator shelter will be setback at least 80 feet from the property line of residences to the south and west of the site. The generator will be housed in a noise-insulated enclosure that limits the noise level to 75 dBA at 5 feet. The resulting noise from generator operation will not exceed the limit of 60 dBA Ldn or 50, and hence, the potential noise impact would be less than significant.

Site Specific Environmental Commitments:

- Level 3 will restrict construction activities to the period from 7AM to 7 PM;
- The emergency generator will be housed in a noise-insulating enclosure that reduces noise levels to 75 dBA or less at a distance of 5 feet from the generator shelter;
- The generator shelter will be placed at least 80 feet from the property line of residences to the south and the west; and
- Testing of the generator will be restricted to the hours from 7 AM to 10 PM.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Setting

The site is located within the City of Colusa, which had an estimated population of 5,525 as of January 1, 1998, and an estimated population of 5,448 as of January 1, 1999.

Evaluation

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

No. The project would not be permanently staffed and would not create demand for new housing or result in extension of roads or other infrastructure.

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

The project consists of the redevelopment of an existing parcel and would not displace any existing housing units.

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

The project would not displace any people. The project would be developed on a parcel that currently with a corrugated metal shed and parking lot.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The site is located within the City of Colusa. The City of Colusa provides police and fire protection, water, sewer service, and waste collection. Pacific Gas & Electric Company provides electricity and natural gas.

Evaluation

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

Existing facilities are sufficient to provide service to the project. The ILA will not be manned and, therefore, will not require services of schools or parks. The facility will be surrounded by an eight-foot fence and will require minimum police protection against theft, vandalism, and sabotage. There is minimal fire risk, since the buildings are concrete and diesel fuel is stored in a double-walled storage tank.

XIV. RECREATION

Setting

City of Colusa Memorial Park is just across 10th Street to the east of the Site. The park occupies a full city block and is used by both local residents and persons passing through. There is also the Colusa Levee Scenic Park located along the Sacramento River approximately two to three city blocks north of the site.

Evaluation

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

The project facility will not be manned and will therefore not result in additional use of the parks.

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

The project will not include recreational facilities. Since the project will not cause additional use of the parks, it will not result in expansion of the parks.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Setting

The site is located at the corner of 10th and Market Streets. Tenth Street is State Highway 20 which turns right on Market Street and right again after 9 city blocks on Bridge Street, which exits the City to the south. Highway 20 is joined by State Highway 45 at the intersection of Market Street and Tenth Street. Market Street is a four-lane street from 10th to Bridge Street. Although through traffic on Highway 20 and 45 uses Market Street, the City of Colusa General Plan states that this does not create congestion because Market Street is a four-lane road between 10th and Bridge Streets.

Evaluation

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

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

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

The project will not cause an increase in traffic on 10th Street, Market Street, or any other streets in the City of Colusa because the facility will not be occupied.

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

The project will not affect air traffic patterns. The nearest airport is Colusa County airport, located approximately three miles south of the site.

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

The project will not add new streets or roads and only occasionally use existing City streets. Vehicles employed will be standard cars and light trucks.

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

The project will not affect emergency access routes.

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

The project will not add new streets or roads and only occasionally use existing City streets. Vehicles employed will be standard cars and light trucks, and personnel visiting the ILA will park on the site.

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

The only alternative transportation system serving the City of Colusa is the Colusa County Transit system. No bus turnouts from this system will be impacted by the project.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Setting

The project will require electricity and telephone. Electric and telephone service is available since it is a commercial/light industrial area and there are operating facilities present (overhead electric and telephone lines are visible along 10th and Market Streets). No sewer or water hookups will be needed, and there will be no water usage or wastewater discharge.

Waste will be generated at the site during site preparation, facility construction, and routine operation. The quantity of waste generated during construction is estimated to be about 70 cubic yards (approximately 47 tons), but every attempt will be made to minimize waste generation. Waste generated during construction will consist primarily of metal and wood from removal of the existing building that occupies the south one-half of the site. Most of the metal and some of the wood should be salvageable. Other construction waste from erection of the new buildings will be minimal. No trees will need to be removed. During operation of the facility, no appreciable quantity of solid waste will be generated since the site will not be permanently staffed, and site visits will be infrequent (one per week) and of short duration (one to several hours).

Waste generated during construction will be taken to the Maxwell Transfer Station. Most of the metal and some of the wood from removal of the building located on the site should be salvageable or recyclable. Colusa County hauls and disposes of the non-recyclable waste collected at the transfer station at the Anderson Solid Waste Landfill located about 10 miles south of Redding, California (about a 100-mile haul). During operation, waste will be collected by the City of Colusa, which has its own collection trucks. The waste is then taken to the Maxwell Transfer Station where it is transferred to Colusa County long-haul trucks for disposal at the Anderson Solid Waste Landfill.

Stormwater drainage will be installed according to the City of Colusa specifications (Martinez, 1999).

Fire protection equipment will be installed in accordance with the Uniform Fire Code and the Uniform Building Code, both of which are conformed to by the City of Colusa (Dunn, 1999).

Evaluation

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

The site will not be occupied and wastewater will not be produced at the site during operation. During construction, portable chemical toilets will be used on-site.

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

The site will not be occupied, wastewater will not be produced and therefore wastewater treatment facilities will not be used.

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

One-half of the site is currently vacant and a metal building occupies the other half. The metal building will be removed and the new ILA structures will consist of buildings placed on the removed structure's pad. The quantity of stormwater runoff is expected to remain approximately the same such that new stormwater drain capacity will not have to be increased.

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

The project will not require a water hook-up.

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

The project will not generate wastewater or 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 ☐	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐	Less than Significant Impact ☒	No Impact ☐

The project will not generate significant quantities of solid waste during either construction or operation except for the metal and wood from the building removed from the property. Some of the metal and wood may be salvageable. The remainder that will be landfilled is estimated to be approximately 70 cubic yards (approximately 47 tons). The City of Colusa collection system, transfers waste to Colusa County for out-of-county disposal at the Anderson Solid Waste Landfill located about 10 miles south of Redding California (about a 100-mile haul). The Anderson Landfill is permitted for 1,018 tons per day and is currently taking in 450 tons per day on average. There is therefore plenty of capacity for the small quantity of waste that will be generated by the project.

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

Only solid waste (garbage or refuse) will be generated and the quantities generated will not be significant. The existing solid waste disposal system of the City and County can easily handle the waste generated by the project. The project will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding solid waste.

Analysis Team

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

Technical Coordination:

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

Engineering:

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

Hydrology/Geology/Hazardous Materials:

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

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

Land Use/Aesthetics/Public Utilities/Transportation/Field:

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

Land Use/Aesthetics/Public Utilities/Transportation/Analysis;

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

Noise/Air Quality;

Ron Brugger, BS, Mechanical Engineering (17 years experience)
Eric Walther, Ph.D., Atmospheric Science (32 years experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
21 Technology Drive, Irvine, CA 92618
Phone: (949) 727-7315 Fax: (949) 727-7399

Historic & Cultural Resources: 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

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

Architectural History/Analysis:
Richard Starzak, MA, Architectural History (20 years experience)
Gail Miller, MA, Historic Preservation (6 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

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

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

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

Sources

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

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

Anania, Karen, Colusa County Planing Department. Interview by Level 3 Team, July 7, 1999.

California Department of Finance. *City/County Population Estimates With Annual Percent Change*, Accessed at http//www.dof.ca.gov/html/Demograp/E-1table.xls January 1, 1998 and 1999.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). *Colusa and Meridian Quadrangles*, *California Natural Diversity Database*, September 1999.

California Department of Transportation. Accessed at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/1.htm, 1999.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Caterpillar Corporation. *Generator Emissions Guarantee*, 1999.

Colusa, City of. *General Plan*, Resolution 94-22, Adopted on October 4, 1994.

----. *Ordinance No. 278*, *An Ordinance Regulating Loud or Unusual Noises Within the City of Colusa, State of California*, 1972.

----. *Zoning Ordinance No. 191*, Adopted July 8, 1963, Reprinted with Amendments June 1979.

Colusa, County of. *General Plan*, Final, Resolution No. 89-3, January 13, 1989.

----. *Zoning Ordinance*, 1991.

Dunn, Randy, City of Colusa Fire Chief. Personal communication with David Augustine, TRC, September 21, 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, C.W., and Strand, R.G., Compilers. *Geologic Map of California, Ukiah Sheet*. California Division of Mines and Geology, 1960.

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

Kelley, David, Planning Director, Colusa County. Personal communication with David Augustine, TRC, September 20, 1999.

Martinez, Randy, Superintendent of Streets and Waste, City of Colusa. Personal communication with David Augustine, TRC, September 21, 1999.

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

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

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

Miller, Gail, Architectural Historian. *Building Evaluation and Description*, Appendix B in Mason, R.D. *Cultural Resources Survey Report and Paleontologic Resources Literature Review Report for Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optic Project: Colusa ILA, in the City of Colusa, Colusa County, California,* Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, Prepared for Level 3 Project Office, Pleasanton, CA, November 1999.

Munns, Ann, Archaeologist. *Cultural Resources Field Survey Report*, Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, September 24, 1999.

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

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

Schomer and Associates. *Proposed Revisions to Property-Line-Noise-Source Measurement Procedures,*

Report No. ILENR/RE-EA-91/10, June 1991.

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

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

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

Starzak, Richard, Senior Architectural Historian. *Initial Study Section and Statement of Significance* Appendix B in Mason, R.D. *Cultural Resources Survey Report and Paleontologic Resources Literature Review Report for Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optic Project: Colusa ILA, in the City of Colusa, Colusa County, California,* Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, for Level 3 Project Office, Pleasanton, CA, November 1999.

Tehama County Air Pollution Control District (TCAPCD), Butte County Air Quality Management District, Colusa County Air Pollution Control District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, Glenn County Air Pollution Control District, and Shasta County Air Quality Management District. *Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin 1977 Air Quality Attainment Plan,* 1998.

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

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

Vista Information Solutions, Inc. *California Site Assessment Plus Report: Colusa,* September 13, 1999.

----. *NEPA Checklist: Colusa,* September 1999.

Walker, Stan, Planning Consultant, City of Colusa. Personal communication with David Augustine, TRC September 17,18, and 21, 1999.

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Photo A Facing East
Photo B Facing Southeast
Photo C Facing Northwest
Photo D Facing South
Photo E Facing East

Attachment

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