Appendix A -- No. 18

PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Site name: Fresno 3R

Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission

Prepared by
Level 3 Communications, LLC

Table of Contents

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

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Attachment

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

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

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

4. Facility Location:
The site is located along the southern edge of W. Napa Avenue, east of its intersection with N. Fruit Avenue, in the City of Fresno, Fresno County, California. The site is located on the Fresno County parcel number: 458-163-27. The entirely fenced site is 2.08 acres in size, with a 29,225 square foot "L"-shaped packaging/distribution building and parking lot to the northwest. The site currently has water, sewer, gas and electrical hook-ups. The site is entirely paved with intermittent landscaping along its entryway (northern side). Access to the site is currently at its north border with W. Napa Avenue. The site is presently being used for packaging and distribution. The running line, located in the UP ROW, would be located approximately 100 feet south of the site (See Figure 1, Regional Map; Figure 2, Vicinity Map; Figure 3, Parcel Map; Figure 4, U.S.G.S. Quad Map; Figure 5, Surrounding Land Use Map; and Figure 6, Photo Key Map and referenced photos).

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: Light Industrial

7. Zoning: Light Manufacturing

8. Description of Facility:
This checklist evaluates the design, construction, and operation of the Fresno 3R. This facility, which will support the Long-Haul network, will be located outside a utility corridor.

A regeneration or 3R station is an integral part of the operation of a fiber network. Regeneration is the process of detecting or shaping, re-timing, and re-modulating the optical signal. The resulting signal is filtered of noise and directed to the end destination along the fiber. Current technology dictates that this type of signal enhancement is required every 300 miles of signal travel distance. Regeneration can be accomplished at a 3R, a D-node, or a terminal facility. The 3R structure also performs ILA functions; both 3R and ILA facilities will service four fiber optic cable ducts.

The Fresno 3R will be constructed on a developed 2.08-acre site at 249 West Napa. The site contains a one-story, 29,225 square foot concrete building. The 3R equipment will encompass approximately 5,000 square feet of the building. A mechanical equipment yard will house an emergency generator and a cooling unit. This yard will be located adjacent to the building and surrounded by a concrete block wall or a chain link fence at least 8 feet tall depending on security needs. The yard dimensions will be approximately 125 feet by 56 feet. A locked gate will restrict access to the site.

No additional buildings will be constructed. Control and maintenance functions will occur within the proposed facility. Parking space and a driveway providing access from Napa Street exists to support site maintenance activities.

The Fresno 3R will require water, electricity, and telephone service. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are located on site. Normal electrical power will be provided, consisting of 400-amp, 480-volt, three-phase service. No significant site grading is anticipated nor will there be any net change in impervious surfaces. Thus, no change in storm water drainage characteristics is anticipated. Fire protection equipment will be installed per local codes.

Figure 7 is a conceptual plot plan of the Fresno 3R site showing required setbacks and locations of utility and vehicle access. The area bounded by the setbacks is the "development window" within which the 3R facility will be situated. The precise location of the equipment yard within the "development window" and the equipment within the building 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 foundations will be engineered and completed prior to delivery of components (i.e., shelter placement), placement of the fiber optic cable line, and installation of utility connections. Erection of perimeter fencing will occur prior to all improvements.

The fiber optic cable feed to the 3R will be from the railroad ROW entering the property from the south. The connection to the 3R facility will be installed at a depth of approximately 42 inches either by plowing in the conduit (which does not require a trench) or by digging a trench, laying the conduit, and back-filling.

Some of the interior walls will be demolished. These walls, and a minor amount of asphalt to be removed for the emergency generator installation, will require disposal. The estimated volume of demolition debris requiring disposal is 191 cubic yards. During construction, no offsite areas will be required for mobilization or parking of construction or worker vehicles.

One 400-kilowatt (kW), 587-horsepower (hp) diesel-powered generator will provide emergency power to the facility. The weatherproof generator housing or shelter size will depend on the soundproofing required but will be approximately 11 feet wide, 29 feet long, and 12 feet high. It will arrive at the site preassembled and will be installed on the concrete foundation. Insulation will be provided as needed for noise abatement. The generator will be mounted on a 1,400-gallon, double-walled, aboveground storage tank. The double-walled storage tank on which the engine/generator set is mounted is designed to support the weight of the engine/generator set and this mounting is a common design for emergency engine/generators. For engine/generator sets that are operated more frequently, the fuel tank is mounted separate from the engine/generator since greater fuel storage capability is required and the storage tank would be too large to be located beneath the engine/generator (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 587-hp generator consumes approximately 29 gallons of diesel fuel per hour (gph). At 75 percent load, fuel consumption rate is 21.8 gph. During most of the 30 minutes of testing and maintenance run time each week, the generators will run at 50-percent load. However, for the purposes of this "worst-case" calculation, Level 3 assumes a 75-percent load and 30 hours of run time each year (i.e., 1/2-hour/week times 52 weeks, plus four hours contingency). Therefore, 30 hours per year multiplied by 21.8 gph equals 654 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 3R site will not be permanently staffed. It will be visited approximately once a week for routine maintenance, data downloading, and fuel tank filling (assumed for analysis purposes to be 60 trips per year).

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

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

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The surrounding property uses are as follows: (North) two single family residences, N. Arthur Avenue, and an automotive repair shop and yard (all are across W. Napa Avenue); (East) a large construction storage yard; (South) the UP ROW, beyond which are light industrial uses; and (West) a large processing plant and warehouse for distribution (See Figure 5, Surrounding Land Use Map).

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The site is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Fresno and the San Joaquin Valley United Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD).

The project would be considered a "Public Utility Service Yard with Incidental Buildings," which is a permitted use under the Light Manufacturing-zoning district (Fresno Zoning Ordinance 12-226.3-J). The City will require the applicant to apply for a Site Plan Review, which is an administrative review and permit process reviewed by the City's Development Department, Redevelopment Agency, and other City departments. No public hearing is required during the Site Plan Review process unless the City's environmental review requires the adoption of findings, or the Site Plan approval is appealed.

Under SJVUAPCD Rule 2010, installation and operation of an emergency standby generator requires a permit construct and a permit to operate.

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

PROPONENT'S DETERMINATION

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

Environmental Commitments
The proposed facility is an element of the project addressed in an Application for Modification of an existing Certificate of Public 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 Fresno 3R site. All potential impacts can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of Level 3's Environmental Commitments.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

Setting

The facility site is located in a community of mixed uses, including residential and light industrial uses. The site consists of a chain link/barbed-wire fenced lot, that is entirely paved and contains a light gray, mid-rise, concrete, packaging/distribution building (See Photos A and B). The fencing is partially landscaped by bushes where it fronts W. Napa Avenue, and is almost devoid of landscaping throughout the remainder of the site. The west side and rear of the site contain various equipment associated with its current use. There is some overhead lighting attached to the building, which shines on the parking lot to the northwest of the building.

There are no scenic highways located at or near the site (Caltrans, 1999). The site is located within the Roeding Business Park Redevelopment District (Fresno, 1999).

The City of Fresno General Plan does not contain any policies related to scenic, visual, or lighting issues (Fresno, 1984). Furthermore, the Roeding Business Park Plan is currently in its draft stage, with no approved goals or policies (Wahlenmaier, 1999). Intended objectives of the Redevelopment Agency for development in the Roeding Business Park Planning Area are as follows:

- A project should influence better development;
- Outdoor equipment should be consistent in color and style to major building;
- Screening is encouraged;
- Masonry-type buildings are encouraged; and
- Existing zoning standards are to be enforced.

The project would comply with the stated objectives of the Fresno Redevelopment Agency listed above through the City's Site Plan Review process (Brock, 1999).

Evaluation

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

The surrounding topography is relatively flat, with no views of mountains, landmarks, or other significant scenic resources. Development to the south is fairly open across the UP ROW and low in density. The project would consist of the reuse of the existing industrial building and would not result in additionally obstructing views through or around the site. Thus, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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

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

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

The site is located in a mixed-use area without a consistent design or landscaping theme (See Photos C and D). The site is currently an industrial use, and would continue to be an industrial use with project implementation. The project would be located inside the existing building, and may involve an outdoor emergency generator and fuel tank. Landscaping or other physical alterations required by the City would be incorporated and approved by the City of Fresno Planning Department and Redevelopment Agency during the required Site Plan Review process (Brock, 1999). Thus, the project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

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

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

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The site is located on a paved, highly disturbed parcel that is entirely fenced and is currently used as a packaging/distribution facility for produce. The site does not appear to have been used for agricultural uses in the recent past. The site is not zoned for agricultural use, and is located in a "Light Manufacturing" zoning district (Fresno, 1999). The site is not designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (California Department of Conservation, 1994). The site is not under a Williamson Act Contract (Brock, 1999). Surrounding uses are also non-agricultural.

The following City policy related to agricultural resources is found in the Agricultural Land section of the Conservation of Natural Resources Chapter of the City of Fresno General Plan:

> Policy 2: The City of Fresno shall encourage project development proposals that result in in-filling of the existing urban area, including small parcels of farmland that have become surrounded by urban or industrial uses.

The proposed project will result in in-fill development, and avoid the use of agricultural land for an urban use. There are no other local policies for agricultural resources which apply to the proposed project or the project site.

Evaluation

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

The site is not designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance. It is currently paved, fenced, and highly disturbed and has not been recently used for agricultural purposes. Thus, the project would not convert farmlands to a non-agricultural use.

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 not zoned for agricultural use. The site is zoned "Light Manu
the City of Fresno. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Thus, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use nor a Williamson Act contract.

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

The site is currently paved, fenced, and highly disturbed. There are no farmland uses surrounding or near the site. Construction and operation of the project would not result in impacts to any agricultural uses. Thus, the project would not involve other changes which could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY

Throughout California, the fiber optic cable line will be installed along existing utility corridors in support of the Long-Haul Network. In the city of Fresno, a regeneration station, referred to as the Fresno 3R Facility (3R), will be constructed outside an existing utility corridor. To minimize potential environmental impacts, the 3R facility will be constructed within an existing building at a previously developed site; the 3R facility is the subject of this air quality checklist analysis. The 3R facility will tie into the fiber optic line along the ROW.

The 3R station will be built utilizing an existing developed 2.08-acre site and an existing 29,225 square foot commercial building. Site development will include modification of the existing commercial building to house the 3R facility components; constructing the emergency generator, dry cooler, and transformer pads; installation of site equipment; approximately weekly vehicular trips to the site for maintenance and data logging; and minor site improvements for parking for maintenance personnel.

The generator pad will be constructed outside of the existing pad, and completed with a pre-fabricated structure to house a 400-kilowatt, diesel powered emergency generator. The generator structure will be

approximately 12-feet by 24-feet (488 square feet). Generator fuel will be stored in a 1,400-gallon double-walled, aboveground tank that will also be housed within the generator shelter.

Table 3 provides detailed information on construction activities contributing to emissions of criteria pollutants and generation of fugitive dust (including PM_{10}). Methodologies, algorithms, and assumptions associated with these activities and estimates of associated emissions 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 soil that will be disturbed during trenching operations on the proposed site for installation of the fiber optic line between the property line and the building.

A key assumption in the estimation of fugitive dust generation and emissions from construction 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 400 kw size of the emergency standby generator, the short approximately 30-minute duration of its weekly test (conservatively estimated as 30 hours/year for emissions estimation), and parameters for the weekly trip of one vehicle to the site for site maintenance and data logging. Normal operation will generate at most one vehicle trip to and from the site on a weekly basis (conservatively estimated as 60 trips/year for emissions estimation). The testing of the emergency generator will be triggered automatically. Operating equipment at the site will be powered by electricity from the utility power grid.

Table 3 shows the emission factors and other parameters used to calculate exhaust and fugitive PM_{10} emissions for mobile equipment (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1996). Construction and operation emission thresholds for NO_x, VOC, PM_{10}, SO_x, and CO are listed in Table 3, as provided by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD). This agency is responsible for management of air emissions in the San Joaquin Valley where the Fresno 3R site resides. In addition to the Fresno 3R site, three ILA PEA facilities (Hanford, Bakersfield, and Stockton) are located in the San Joaquin Valley and are under the jurisdiction of the SJVUAPCD.

Setting

Fresno City and County are located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, which 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}") standard (California EPA, 1998). There is a mix of commercial, industrial and residential properties near the site. The nearest public receptors are industrial plants adjacent to the western property boundary; the nearest sensitive receptor is a residence located 55 feet to the north.

Based on the past three years of monitoring data collected at various monitoring stations throughout the portion of the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin within Fresno County, maximum ozone concentrations exceeded the National Ambient Air Quality standard for ozone (0.12 parts per million) on an average of approximately 18 days per year and exceeded the more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standard

(0.09 parts per million) on an average of approximately 91 days per year (California EPA, 1996 to 1998). The ozone problem in Fresno County is primarily due to mobile sources (motor vehicles), solvents, oil and gas production, and occasionally to transport of pollutants from San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and Sacramento Valley Air Basin.

Ambient PM_{10} concentrations in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin did not exceed the 24-hour-average National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 150 micrograms per cubic meter for the years 1995 - 1997. However, the measured concentrations exceeded the more stringent 24-hour-average California Ambient Air Quality Standard of 50 micrograms per cubic meter roughly 14 days per year **(**California EPA, reference database 1996 through 1998**)**. The PM_{10} problem in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is primarily due to road dust, farming, and construction activities (SJVUAPCD, August 1998).

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

The applicable ozone air quality plans are the Federal Ozone Attainment Demonstration and the State Ozone Air Quality Attainment plan (SJVUAPCD, December 1998). The federal ozone plan predicts attainment of the national ozone standard in Fresno County by 1999. The state ozone plan identifies the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin as both a source and receptor of transported ozone. The applicable PM_{10} air quality plan is the Federal PM_{10} Attainment Demonstration Plan. The applicable carbon monoxide plan is the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan, which documents continued attainment of the national carbon monoxide standard for the foreseeable future in the Fresno urbanized area.

As part of the ozone and PM_{10} attainment strategies under the applicable federal and state air quality plans, SJVUAPCD requires that there be no significant increase in emissions of NO_x, ROC, and PM_{10} from new and modified sources. To meet these objectives, numerical thresholds are set on construction and operation related emissions of pollutants from internal combustion engines.

In addition, SJVUAPCD has adopted Regulation VIII which mandates implementation at construction sites of fugitive dust control measures contained in the federal PM_{10} plan. Fugitive dust is defined as solid airborne particulate matter emitted from sources other than a flue, stack, or tail pipe, but in this case mainly refers to the dust created during construction. SJVUAPCD's Rule 8020, "Fugitive Dust Requirements for Control of Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{10}) from Construction, Demolition, Excavation, and Extraction Activities" describes the required dust control measures. These control measures are used in lieu of numerical thresholds to manage fugitive dust emissions from construction sites.

Rule 8060 of Regulation VIII regulates entrainment of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) emissions from roadways. Entrainment is the kicking up of fugitive dust particles when a vehicle passes over an unpaved roadway. Unpaved roads less than one-half mile long are exempt from Rule 8060.

Under SJVUAPCD Rule 2010, installation and operation of an emergency standby generator requires an authority to construct permit and a permit to operate. The construction and operation of the standby generator must be in accordance with SJVUAPCD's Rule 2201 which requires Best Available Control Technology (BACT) to minimize nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions, precursors to ozone. By controlling NO_x and VOC emissions, the BACT requirements also indirectly reduce PM_{10} emissions because both NO_x and VOC are also precursors to secondary formation of PM_{10}. SJVUAPCD Rule 2201 includes an offset exemption for emergency standby generators for which adequate documentation can be provided that operation would not exceed 200 hours per year, and would not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program. Under this exemption, emissions associated with the occasional use and testing of emergency generators are not subject to numerical thresholds.

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

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

Evaluation

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

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

Since the site will use an existing building and associated paved access roads and driveways, grading activities and travel of heavy equipment over temporary roads will not be necessary; as such, fugitive dust will not be generated in a significant amount during the construction phase (Table 3). The only expected construction activity at this site is the preparation of a an equipment yard (occupying approximately 7,000 square feet) to house the emergency standby generator and mechanical coolers. Fugitive dust generated will vary in amount from day to day, depending on the level and type of activity (e.g., trenching, grading, and vehicular traffic bringing materials to the site), the silt content of the soil (during trenching activities), and the weather. Fugitive dust generated will be controlled in a manner consistent with the applicable air quality plans by implementing effective dust control measures throughout the construction phase, as required by Regulation VIII. Long-term fugitive dust emissions associated with facility operation will be negligible.

Emergency generator testing and the visiting technician vehicle will contribute operational air emissions as shown in Table 3. The emergency generator will be constructed and operated in a manner consistent with existing air quality plans by fully complying with the requirements of Rule 2010, and particularly meeting the BACT requirements of Rule 2201. Operation of the emergency generator will be in compliance with the offset exemption requirements of Rule 2201 because the generator will operate less than 200 hours per year and will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program. In addition, generator operations will be fully documented based on Rule 2201 record keeping requirements.

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

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

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

per horsepower-hour. BACT for VOC emissions will include positive crankcase ventilation and use of fuel satisfying reformulated diesel specification established by the Air Resources Board; and

- Obtain an offset exemption for the emergency standby generator as provided by Rule 2201and document that the generator will not and does not operate more than 200 hours per year and will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program.

As described under III(b) below, Level 3 will comply with requirements in the permit exemption for the emergency standby generators and will also implement fugitive dust control measures to control PM_{10} emissions during construction work.

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

As discussed above, the Fresno 3R site lies in an area designated as nonattainment of the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and PM_{10}.

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

The 3R facility would be built on an a previously developed building site occupying approximately 2.0 acres. Site development would be limited to installation of the standby generator in a new enclosure and the installation of the 3R equipment in pre-fabricated shelters on an existing building pad. The access road/parking already exists and is paved. Construction activities would require up to two months to complete. Construction of the project would generate fugitive dust (including PM_{10}), and other criteria air pollutants from exhaust emissions. Air quality impacts from fugitive dust emissions during construction will be temporary and intermittent.

SJVUAPCD Rule 8020 requires dust control measures to be implemented during construction. As discussed under III(a) above, Level 3 will implement a comprehensive series of dust control measures to manage fugitive dust during construction.

Over the long-term, the project would result in emissions from operation of both stationary and mobile sources (Table 3). However, mobile source emissions would be negligible because the site would be unmanned and routine motor vehicle activity would result only from weekly site visits (single vehicle) to check on the computers, download information, and test-run the emergency generator. Stationary source emissions would result from operation of the emergency generator during weekly routine testing and during unforeseen emergency electricity loss.

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

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

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

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

Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, fugitive dust emissions from the piles will be effectively stabilized utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer or suppressant.

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

The Fresno 3R facility is one of four PEA sites in the San Joaquin Valley under the jurisdiction of the SJVUAPCD (the other three being the Hanford, Bakersfield, and Stockton ILA facilities). Potential total construction emissions from all four sites were analyzed for the possibility of simultaneous construction. The same thresholds apply to assessment of total project emissions as were used to evaluate emissions from individual project sites (see Table 4).

Simultaneous construction at all four sites would not exceed the annual or daily numerical thresholds (see Table 4), and therefore, the potential cumulative impacts of the four sites on air quality in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin will not be significant.

Because project construction will affect an area of less than one acre within the 2.08-acre site, surrounding uses will be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7, Conceptual Plot Plan). This buffer will help minimize the possibility that the project will cause a cumulatively significant short-term PM_{10} impact from simultaneous and unrelated construction projects taking place within the same general area.

Total project emissions from testing and maintaining the emergency generators at all four PEA sites in the San Joaquin Valley are exempt from offset requirements because the emissions from each generator are exempt. Emissions that are exempt from regulatory requirements are considered to have impacts that are less than significant.

The project's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect of additional emissions sources on the regional ozone and PM_{10} concentrations will not be cumulatively considerable because ozone impacts are

the result of the cumulative emissions from numerous sources in the region and transport from outside the region. All but the largest individual sources emit VOCs and NO_x in amounts too small to make a measurable effect on ambient ozone concentrations.

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

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities that house children, elderly, and ill members of the population, such as schools, day-care centers, hospitals, retirement homes, hospices, and residences. The nearest neighbors to the 3R site are adjacent industrial facilities residences (Figure 8) which are public receptors. The distance of the closest sensitive receptor to the site is a residence located 55 feet from the northern boundary of the site.

Project construction would affect an area of less than one acre within the larger 2.08-acre site; therefore, receptors associated with surrounding uses would be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "conceptual plot plan"). This buffer, along with the low levels of construction emissions, would prevent substantial pollutant concentrations from reaching sensitive receptors. Through application of fugitive dust control measures outlined above, these emissions will be kept below a level of significance.

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

The emergency generator will produce operation emissions during testing and power outages. Two factors prevent these emissions from significantly affecting sensitive receptors. First, the generator will not be located in close proximity to sensitive receptors (See Figures 7 and 8). Second, generator usage will be restricted to 30 minutes per week or less and not more than 30 hours per year. These measures will assure that sensitive receptors are not exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

The only potential odor that may be associated with site construction activities at the Fresno 3R facility 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 3R 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

A large warehouse (Mountain Produce) currently occupies the proposed site. The site includes a building and parking lot surrounded by a chainlink fence. The site is predominately surrounded by similar warehouse development. The area is also characterized by some residential development.

The site is heavily disturbed and supports no native habitat.

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 ☒

A list of potential sensitive species was created based upon a California Natural Diversity Database Search (Fresno South Quadrangle), field reconnaissance, and knowledge of the site vicinity. Table 5 includes these species and their potential for occurrence onsite (California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999).

The site is heavily disturbed and does not support any native habitat. Similar levels of development characterize the vicinity.

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 ☒

This site does not support any riparian vegetation or other sensitive natural habitat. No sensitive habitat has been identified by local or state agencies (California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999; Lewis, 1999).

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

The proposed site and vicinity is not characterized by any jurisdictional waterways or vernal pool habitat.

d)	Would the project 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 site and vicinity are characterized by heavy development. It is unlikely that this site is located within a wildlife movement corridor or provides any significant nursery resources (California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999).

e)	Would the project 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 City of Fresno does have a tree preservation ordinance but the few landscaped trees onsite would not be protected under this ordinance (California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999; Lewis, 1999).

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

There are no habitat conservation plans that would be applicable to this site. There are no biological resources onsite that would likely be protected under any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans (California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999; Lewis, 1999).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The 3R site is located in the western part of the City of Fresno in the northern San Joaquin Valley. The parcel contains a recently built commercial/warehouse structure and the rest of the parcel is paved.

The prehistory of the northern San Joaquin Valley is not well known. Few sites have been investigated and most of these date to the Late Prehistoric Period. Earlier sites are likely buried under later Holocene alluvium. The archaeological sites appear to reflect the same settlement and subsistence systems practiced by the Northern Valley Yokuts who occupied the area when the Spanish arrived in California. The northern San Joaquin Valley was originally covered by sloughs and marshes along the San Joaquin River. The Northern Valley Yokuts obtained fish and waterfowl from the river and marshes. Grass and tule seeds were important plant foods. Acorns from the valley oaks were also collected. The Yokuts lived in permanent villages on mounds along the river. They were organized in territorial tribelets of up to 300 people. The name of the tribelet which inhabited the Fresno area is Pitkachi. Gathering parties left the villages seasonally to collect seeds and acorns (Wallace, 1978).

During the later nineteenth century the drier areas of the northern San Joaquin Valley were used for ranching. Agricultural use of the region did not begin until completion of the Southern Pacific Railroad through the valley in 1876 (Beck and Haase, 1974). The Santa Fe Railroad later acquired a parallel line through the valley. Towns developed along the rail lines and farms developed along the rivers and drainages. The area remains mostly agricultural today.

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 survey has been prepared (Mason, 1999b).

Level 3 archaeologists requested a records search for the proposed Fresno 3R site, and the lands within a one half mile radius, from the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center. The search had two objectives: (1) to determine whether previous archaeological investigations have been conducted in the project area, and (2) to provide information on known historic sites or culturally sensitive areas on and in the vicinity of the proposed 3R Facility. The records search was conducted by Information Center staff who checked:

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

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

The results of the records search (File No. 99-324) showed that the property had been previously surveyed and that no historic resources are recorded on the property. The records search indicated that no historic resources have been previously recorded within one-half mile of the of the proposed facility site (California Historical Resources Information System, Southern San Joaquin Valley Center, 1999). There is no exposed ground surface on the parcel where a field survey could be undertaken.

The building is an obviously modern commercial warehouse structure (built in 1966 with additions in 1970 and 1975, see Photos A-D) and has no historical associations. The structure on the project parcel is not eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources. It is not associated with significant historic events or important persons, does not have distinctive architectural characteristics, nor does it have the potential to yield information important in history. In addition, the structure is less than 50 years old.

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

The records search from the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center showed that the property has been previously surveyed and that no archaeological resources are recorded on the property. The records search indicated that no archaeological resources have been previously recorded within one-half mile of the property (California Historical Resources Information System, Southern San Joaquin Valley Center, 1999). There is no exposed ground surface on the parcel where a field survey could be undertaken. The facility will be installed inside the existing building.

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

As mapped by Matthews and Burnett (1965), the project site is underlain by Quaternary alluvial fan deposits (unit Qf), which include the Modesto Formation. No fossil site is recorded in the archives of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Section (LACMVP) or the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) as occurring in this rock unit at the project site or elsewhere in the Fresno South West 7.5-minute quadrangle. Moreover, no fossil vertebrate site is reported as occurring in this rock unit in the immediate project site vicinity by Jefferson (1991a, 1991b). However, previously recorded fossil sites reported by Firby and Schorn (1993) and Jefferson (1991b) as occurring in the Modesto Formation at previously recorded fossil sites (UCMP fossil sites V-7002, -72186) elsewhere in the northern San Joaquin Valley have yielded the fossilized remains of extinct late Pleistocene (Ice Age) land mammal species (giant ground sloth, bison), and other previously recorded fossil sites (LACMVP fossil site 7254) reported to have yielded similar fossilized remains in the northern San Joaquin Valley are in areas underlain by alluvial fan deposits (see Rogers, 1966). These fossil occurrences indicate that there is a potential for late Pleistocene continental vertebrate fossil remains occurring at the project site.

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

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

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

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Setting

The site lies in a relatively flat area in the City of Fresno. Fresno is located in a relatively stable geologic area. The site vicinity is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone, or landslide, liquefaction, or subsidence geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973, 1999). Erosion activity is low. The soils are slightly expansive.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic-related groundshaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	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 or liquefaction geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973, 1999). There are no active faults in the vicinity of Fresno (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 Fresno area. A 10% probability of peak ground accelerations of 10% to 20% g in 50 years is expected in the project site vicinity (CDMG, 1996). As part of the Proponent's environmental commitment to this project, any potential seismic hazard would be minimized by compliance with the California seismic code standards and applicable local building and seismic codes. Because of Proponent's environmental commitment to this project, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects attributable to these potential geologic hazards. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b)	Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	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 existing building at the site would be used to house the 3R facility. Therefore, 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 at the site would be used to house the 3R facility. Therefore, the minimal plowing or trenching from the street to the existing building for the fiber optic cable would not result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

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

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

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

Because the 3R 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. The Fresno-Chandler Downtown Airport is located approximately 1.0 mile to the southwest of the site but the site is not located within any airport safety zone or other land use planning overlay zones.

Evaluation

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

The 1,400-gallon, double-walled above-ground storage tank containing diesel fuel would be located on site to supply 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 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 ☒

There are no schools or proposed schools 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 located approximately 1.0 mile from the Fresno-Chandler Downtown Airport, but not within an airport land use plan or other land use planning overlay zones.

f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	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 "Light Manufacturing" (Fresno, 1999). 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 within a groundwater recharge area, as is the entire City of Fresno and surrounding area (City of Fresno, 1984). The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain, but is located within a 500-year floodplain area (Vista Information Solutions, NEPA Checklist, 1999). The site is not located in an area subject to inundation from dam or levee failure, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

The Fresno 3R site is not anticipated to significantly modify drainage of stormwater from the site. Electronics for the 3R will be installed in an existing building. No site grading is anticipated. However, any stormwater drainage measures that may be included in the 3R facility will be installed in accordance with applicable Fresno County codes.

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

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

- Bore under sensitive habitats when practicable;

- Implement erosion control measures during construction;
- Remove cover vegetation as close to the time of construction as practicable;
- Confine construction equipment and associated activities to the construction corridor;
- Prohibit refueling of construction equipment 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 Fresno 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 Irvine 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 1,400-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. The site is located within an area potentially used for groundwater recharge; however, since the facility will be placed inside an existing building, there will be no change in the site's contribution to 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 inside an existing building.

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

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

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

The project would not create or contribute runoff water because the facility will be placed inside an existing building. Surface drainage management will not be altered by site grading.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The site is not located within a dam or levee inundation area (City of Fresno, 1991, p. 205).

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 ☒

Since the site would not be subject to inundation from dam failure (City of Fresno, 1991, p. 205), it is not subject to impact from a seiche. (There are no lakes without dams in the vicinity). The site is too far from the ocean to be impacted by a tsunami. Since the site is located on flat, developed land and is surrounded for several miles by flat land, the potential for impact by a mudflow is minimal.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

Setting

The City's General Plan land use designation for the site is "Light Industrial" (Fresno, 1998). This designation is oriented toward the production of goods and services which are primarily marketed elsewhere, as well as providing adequate industrial sites at locations which are compatible with other land uses and consistent with broad environmental goals (Fresno, 1984). The surrounding land use designations are "Light

The site is zoned "Light Manufacturing" (Fresno, 1999). This zoning district is intended to provide for the development of industrial uses which include manufacturing or processing of materials which are compatible with surrounding uses. Typical Light Industrial uses are auto repair, grocery stores, restaurants, manufacturing, processing, fabrication, communications buildings, public utility service yards with incidental buildings, and other similar uses. The surrounding properties are all within the "Light Manufac district.

The project would be considered a "Public Utility Service Yard with Incidental Buildings," which is a permitted use under the Light Manufacturing zoning district (Fresno Zoning Ordinance 12-226.3-J). The City will require the applicant to apply for a Site Plan Review, which is an administrative review and permit process reviewed by the City's Development Department, Redevelopment Agency, and other City departments. No public hearing is required during the Site Plan Review process unless the City's environmental review requires the adoption of findings, or the Site Plan approval (or denial) is appealed.

The site is located within the Southern Pacific Railroad Corridor, an industrial area established by the City of Fresno for non-policy purposes. The site is located in the Roeding Business Park Redevelopment Planning Area. A land use plan for this area is currently in the draft stage (Wahlenmaier, 1999). The previous community plan for the project area is the Fresno High – Roeding Community Plan (1993). This plan contains land use policies applicable to the planning area in conjunction with the 1984 Fresno General Plan (Brock, 1999).

The site is not within the Fresno Chandler Downtown Airport Land Use Planning area. The site is not located within any other land use planning overlay zones.

The following applicable land use policies are identified in the City of Fresno General Plan (1984):

- Objective: To promote planned industrial development that reduces land use conflict with neighboring activities;
- Policy: Establish performance standards to minimize any adverse impacts of industrial activities in areas where industrial development is integrated with non-industrial uses. This could include architectural transitions between uses or permitting only compatible light industrial uses;
- Objective: To maximize the desirability, flexibility, and functional efficiency of industrial sites;
- Policy: Develop an ordinance to provide an acceptable interface between land uses, provide the greatest flexibility in development to the private sector, encourage land infill, structural rehabilitation, and neighborhood revitalization in the established area of the Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area;
- Objective: Prevent the further decline of industrial sites within the Central Area in order to promote the economic viability of the Area;
- Policy: Continue the current redevelopment and renewal activities in the Central Area (removal of substandard buildings, reduced area devoted to streets and alleys, and assembly of smaller parcels) to continue the regeneration of the area; and
- Policy: Develop a strategy to better utilize rail-accessible industrial sites for industries which need such capability.

The following applicable land use policies are identified in the Fresno High-Roeding Community Plan (1993):

- Objective: Encourage the conservation and rebuilding of older sections of the community through joint public-private cooperation; and
- Objective: Promote the clustering of light industrial uses to meet their common needs and to reduce conflicts with neighboring land uses.

The proposed project would comply with all applicable local policies for land use and planning and would undergo local review during the required Site Plan Review process.

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
	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is entirely fenced and would remain so with project construction and operation. There are no pedestrian paths through the site. The site is in between mixed land uses, including residences to the north and light industry on all other sides. This mix of land uses is not considered an established community. Thus, the project would not physically divide an established community.

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

The project site is zoned "Light Manufacturing," which is compatible with the "Light Industrial" land use designation for the site (Brock, 1999). The project would be considered a "Public Utility Service Yard with Incidental Buildings," which is a permitted use under the Light Manufacturing zoning district. Because the proposed project is a permitted use in the Light Industrial zoning district, it is assumed that the use would be compatible with other uses in the Light Industrial zone. Surrounding residences are existing non-conforming uses on land zoned for light Industrial use.

The City will require the project proponent to apply for a Site Plan Review, which is an administrative review and permit process, reviewed by the Development Department, Redevelopment Agency, and other City departments. No public hearing is required during the Site Plan Review process unless the City's environmental review requires adoption of findings, or the Site Plan decision is appealed. Because the proposed use is considered a permitted use subject to administrative Site Plan Review in the Light Manufacturing zoning district, there would be no impacts due to conflict with applicable land use plans or policies. The project proponent has committed to comply with any conditions placed on Site Plan approval.

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

There are no habitat conservation plans that would be applicable to this site. There are no biological resources onsite that would likely be protected under any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans (California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999; Lewis, 1999).

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is not located in an area designated by the state or the City of Fresno for mineral resources (Fresno, 1984). There are no local policies for mineral resources which apply to the proposed project or the project site.

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 ☒

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

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

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

XI. NOISE

Setting

The 3R facility is located in the City of Fresno in an area of mixed land use including residential, commercial and industrial sites. The existing 29,225 square foot building present on the site will be utilized to develop the 3R facility. The 2.08-acre 3R site is entirely paved and is the subject of this noise checklist analysis.

The proposed site layout is shown on Figure 7, Conceptual Plot Plan. Site development will include installation of the 3R facility components inside the existing building; construction of a concrete pad for the generator and enclosure; trenching onsite to install the fiber optic innerduct; and minor site improvements for parking for maintenance personnel. The 3R site will not be permanently staffed and will be visited approximately once a week for routine maintenance.

Estimates of daytime and nighttime ambient noise levels (60 dBA and 52 dBA, respectively) were derived from Schomer and Associates (1991) as typical of sites designated as "moderate commercial and industrial areas". The closest public noise receptors to the 3R site are adjacent industrial facilities (Figure 8). The nearest sensitive receptor is a private residence located 55 feet to the north of the site. It should be noted however, that the generator would be setback from the property line to provide a buffer zone for infrequent generator noise. The operational noise limit in residential areas is 60 dBA L_{dn} There are no established thresholds for construction noise that apply to the site (City of Fresno, 1999; City of Fresno, 1984).

Noise will be generated from both construction and operation of the 3R facility. 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. Long-term operational noise is limited to 60 dBA L_{dn} or less. There are no established thresholds for construction noise that apply to the site (City of Fresno, 1999; City of Fresno, 1984). Table 3 provides relevant information on construction and operation activities and equipment contributing to noise. Included is the size (in gross horsepower (hp)) of each type of heavy construction equipment and the numbers of hours per day that each piece of equipment will operate.

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 ☐

A key assumption implicit in the evaluation of noise impacts is that only one piece of heavy equipment will operate at any one time. Therefore, maximum construction noise level at each site was based on the noisiest piece of construction equipment. This maximum potential noise (at maximum engine power) for diesel-powered construction equipment (muffled) measured at 50 feet is 84 dBA (U.S. EPA, 1971). Construction noise will be temporary and is not subject to a local noise ordinance threshold or other quantitative standards. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

The City of Fresno Noise Ordinance prohibits construction activities between the hours of 10 PM and 7 AM, Monday through Saturday, or any time on Sundays or holidays. Construction activities would be completed in accordance with these noise ordinance standards.

Operational parameters related to noise include the size/gross hp and period of operation (30 minutes/week) of the standby generator (Table 3). The calculated 24-hour average noise level is 60.9 dBA Ldn. This result is primarily an artifact of conservative assumptions regarding ambient noise levels. In fact, noise levels at the nearest adjoining parcel will be increased by less than 1 dBA during generator operation. Under these circumstances, the normally acceptable noise level of 60 dBA does not apply. Rather, Level 3 will insure consistency with the general plan by including a noise-insulating generator shelter into the design of the 3R facility. Because Level 3 will incorporate this design feature as a site-specific environmental commitment, and because generator operations will be limited to only 30 minutes per week for normal maintenance, impacts from generator noise will be less than significant.

Site Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3 will comply with local construction and operation-related noise ordinances by:

- Limiting construction to the hours of 7 AM to 7 PM Monday through Saturday;
- Enclosing generator within a sound-insulating enclosure rated at 85 dBA at a distance of 5 feet, and mounting generator on spring isolators; and
- Providing a generator setback from adjacent property lines as shown on Figure 7.

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 ☐

Project construction would not generate excessive groundborne noise or vibration. The 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. Consequently, there will be a less than significant impact from groundborne vibrations or noise during construction.

The 400 kW generator is the only potential source of excessive groundborne noise or vibration from site operations. The generator will be mounted on spring isolators which will effectively reduce groundborne vibration by more than 95 percent (Ace Mountings Company, 1999). Additionally, the vibration reduces structure-borne noise by interrupting noise transmission paths caused by "sounding-board" effect. Hence, groundborne noise and vibration are reduced to a level of insignificance.

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 ☐

The proposed project would not increase permanent ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the site because construction would be temporary. Noise emitted by emergency generator operation during power outages and periodic maintenance would be intermittent and temporary.

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

Temporary increases in ambient noise levels would occur during construction. Construction activities will be of limited duration and scope due to the reuse of the existing building and will comply with the local ordinance governing hours of construction. Therefore, noise impacts will be less than significant.

Temporary and periodic noise would be generated by the emergency back-up generator, both during power outages and during periodic maintenance. This noise would not significantly increase the ambient noise levels, particularly since surrounding uses will be separated from the source by a substantial buffer area around the perimeter of the site (Figure 7). In addition, the two-fold combination of a noise-insulated generator enclosure and spring isolator generator mounts, further reduces temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise to a level of insignificance.

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 located approximately 1.2 miles north of the Fresno Chandler Downtown Airport. However, the site is not located within the Fresno Chandler Downtown Airport Land Use Planning Area, or any other land use planning overlay zones. As indicated above, any construction related noise would be temporary. Operations related noise, limited to infrequent operation of the standby generator, would be minimized through sound buffer zones, the installation of a noise-insulating generator enclosure, and spring isolator generator mounts.

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 Fresno, with a population of 479,137 as of January 1999 (Brock, 1999). The nearest housing is located across W. Napa Avenue to the north of the site, and consists of single family residences. There are no local policies for population and housing which apply to the proposed project or the project site.

Evaluation

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

The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. The project would consist of the reuse of an existing industrial building. The proposed project would not create new housing nor extend roads or other infrastructure that would indirectly induce population growth.

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

No displacement of existing housing units would result from implementation of the proposed project. The project would involve the reuse of an existing industrial building as an unmanned 3R station.

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 consist of the reuse of an existing industrial building and would not displace any people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The site is located in the city of Fresno. Fire protection is provided by the Fresno Fire Department and Police protection is provided by the Fresno Police Department. The nearest school to the site is Fresno High School, located three-quarters of a mile north of the site. The nearest park is Roeding Park, approximately one-quarter mile north of the site. The UP railroad ROW is located adjacent to the site on the south. There are no local policies for public services which apply to the proposed project or the project site.

Evaluation

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

The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing industrial building. The proposed 3R facility would be unmanned and would be visited approximately once per week for maintenance. The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities nor affect response time or other performance objectives.

XIV. RECREATION

Setting

The nearest park is Roeding Park, located approximately one-quarter mile north of the site. This facility provides passive and active recreational uses. There are no local policies for recreation which apply to the proposed project or the project site.

Evaluation

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

The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing industrial building for an unmanned 3R facility. The proposed project does not involve residential uses and would not cause an increase in the population of the City of Fresno. This project would not increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated.

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

The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing industrial building for an unmanned 3R facility. The project would not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreation facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Setting

The site is located on the south side of W. Napa Avenue, a two-lane, east/west local street (See Photo D). Traffic on W. Napa Avenue is relatively light, with uses contributing to traffic including the Light Industrial uses along its southern edge and some residential uses along its northern edge. There are intermittent sidewalks, but no bus stops, bicycle lanes, or other pedestrian facilities on W. Napa Avenue. Access to the site is currently provided by a driveway at the site's north-central edge along W. Napa Avenue (See Photo A).

Arthur Avenue is located directly across the site, which is a two-lane, north/south local street. Traffic is very light on Arthur Avenue, with mostly residential uses. There are no sidewalks, bus stops, bicycle lanes, or other pedestrian facilities on Arthur Avenue.

Both W. Napa Avenue and Arthur Avenue are designated as local streets in the City of Fresno General Plan Circulation Element. Local Streets are defined in the Circulation Element as "minor streets which function primarily to provide access to residential land with generally two lanes carrying volumes of 1,000 to 2,000 vehicles per day".

There are no local policies in the City of Fresno General Plan Circulation Element or the Fresno County Regional Transportation Element which apply to the proposed project, the project site, or the adjacent local 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 ☐

Construction workers will be commuting to the site for approximately three months. The average number of commuting workers is expected to be seven. The workers will commute during off-peak traffic hours (usually 6 a.m. and 3 p.m.) and park on the site. Occasionally, trucks will deliver equipment and materials to the site and haul construction debris from the site to recycling centers or landfills. These truck trips will be in-frequent 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 ☒

Traffic associated with construction would be temporary. There would be no permanent increase to levels of service associated with the project because the site would not be occupied on a daily basis. The County has not identified this local street as one with a congested level of service (Fresno, County of, 1982). Thus the project would not individually or cumulatively exceed an acceptable level of service.

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

The site is not located within an airport land use or safety zone.

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

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

Construction and operation of the project would not involve blocking a street lane or substantially increasing traffic to W. Napa Avenue or Arthur Avenue such that emergency access would be impeded. Thus, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

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

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

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

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

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Setting

The site is currently wired to electricity and telephone via overhead lines along W. Napa Avenue. Sewer service is available, with an eight-inch main line in W. Napa Avenue. Wastewater flows to the Fresno-Clovis Wastewater Reclamation Facility, which currently treats 70 million gallons per day (MGD), and has a daily capacity of 94 MGD (Phillips, 1999). Water service is also available, with a four-inch secondary line in W. Napa Avenue. The Fresno Water Division provides 100-percent well-drawn water service to the area, with an estimated 134 MGD in 1999, and an estimated 217 MGD peak service level (Dunn, 1999). Existing water and sewer hook-ups are also present up to the existing building. The solid waste service that serves the Fresno area utilizes the Orange Avenue Landfill. This landfill has a permitted daily capacity of 400 cubic tons, and receives approximately 299 daily cubic tons (Caglia, 1999).

There are no local policies for utilities and service systems which apply to the proposed project or the project site.

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 ☒

During construction, portable chemical toilets will be used on-site. During operation the project would be unmanned and would be visited by service personnel approximately once per week for maintenance. The existing building has restroom facilities which could be used by service personnel during site visits. Wastewater service demand would be minimal, and would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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 proposed project would be unmanned and would be visited by service personnel approximately once per week for maintenance. The existing building has restroom facilities which could be used by service personnel during site visits. Wastewater service and water demand would be minimal. Thus, the project would not result in the construction of new water of wastewater treatment facilities of the expansion of existing facilities.

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

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

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

The proposed project would be unmanned and would be visited by service personnel approximately once per week for maintenance. The existing building has restroom facilities which could be used by service personnel during site visits. The project site will not be occupied on a daily basis and would only require enough water for landscaping and a minimal amount for on-site restrooms. Thus, the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing resources.

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

Currently, the wastewater treatment provider, Fresno-Clovis Wastewater Reclamation Facility, has determined that wastewater capacity is not being exceeded. The project would require minimal wastewater treatment because it would not be occupied on a daily basis.

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

The Orange Avenue Landfill would serve as the project landfill, and currently receives less solid waste than its determined capacity. The project would involve the reuse of an existing industrial building as an unmanned 3R facility. The project would not generate solid waste on a daily basis, but would generate 191 cubic yards (approximately 130 tons) of demolition debris during remodeling. The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

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

Initial clearing of remaining equipment and debris on the site, which would equal an estimated two tons, would be the project's largest source of solid waste. During project operation the site would not generate solid waste on a daily basis. Orange Avenue Landfill's current intake is less than its permitted intake capacity. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Analysis Team

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

Technical Coordination:

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

Engineering:

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

Hydrology/Geology/Hazardous Materials:

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

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

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

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

Biological Resources: Field

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

Biological Resources: Field

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

Noise/Air Quality

Eric Walther, Ph.D., Atmospheric Science
TRC Environmental Corporation
21 Technology Drive, Irvine, CA 92618

Phone: (949) 727-7315 Fax: (949) 727-7399

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

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

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

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

Sources

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

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

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

Brock, Sandy, Planner, City of Fresno Development Department. Interviewed by Derek Ross, Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS), September 1, 1999, and by Cheryl Kuta, Chambers Group Inc., September 10, 1999.

Caglia, Frank, Owner, Orange Avenue Landfill. Interviewed by Cheryl Kuta, Chambers Group Inc., September 1999.

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

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

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). *California Scenic Highway Program – Officially Designated State Scenic Highways*, Accessed at http://www.dot.ca.gov, January 11, 1999.

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

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

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

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

California Environmental Protection Agency (California EPA), Air Resources Board. *California Air Quality Data.* 1996-1998.

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

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

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

California Historical Resources Information System, Southern San Joaquin Valley Center. *Records Search for Project #8219-003H; Fresno 3R, 249 West Napa, Fresno*, File No. 99-324, Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, September 1, 1999.

Caterpillar Corporation. *Generator Emissions Guarantee*, 1999.

Dunn, Bill, Fresno Water Division. Interviewed by Derek Ross, Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services

(PBNS), September 8, 1999.

Firby, J.R., and Schorn, H.E. *Paleontological Characterization of the Mojave Pipeline Northward Expansion Project, California,* Prepared for Mojave Pipeline Company, 1993.

Fresno, City of, Development Department. *City of Fresno General Plan,* 1984.

-----. *Roosevelt Community Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)*, City of Fresno Environmental Impact Report No. 10113, Updated 1991.

-----. *General Plan Land Use Map Update,* Amended March 30, 1998.

-----. *Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 12 of the Municipal Code),* Revised October 20, 1998.

-----. *Zoning Map,* Revised 1999.

Fresno, County of. *Fresno High-Roeding Community Plan,* Fresno County Planning Commission, Revised September 21, 1993.

Koo, Sun Chi, Planning Department, City of Fresno, Interviewed by Chambers Group, September 1999.

Lewis, Robert, Planner, Fresno Development Department. Interviewed by John Clecker, Chambers Group, September 8, 1999.

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Phillips, Chad, Fresno-Clovis Wastewater Reclamation Facility. Interviewed by Derek Ross, Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS), September 7, 1999.

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

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

Geology, 1966.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). *Rules & Regulations,* 1998.

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.

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: Fresno,* August 11, 1999.

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

Wahlenmeier, Art, Senior Planner, City of Fresno Redevelopment Agency. Interviewed by Derek Ross, Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS), September 2, 1999.

Wallace, W. J. Northern Valley Yokuts, In: Robert F. Heizer (Editor), *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California*, pp. 462-470, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 1978.

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Photo A Overall View of Site
Photo B View of Site Building
Photo C Typical Residence in Site Vicinity
Photo D View of W. Napa Avenue

Attachments

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