Appendix A -- No. 6

PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Site name: Sacramento Terminal

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, Sacramento Terminal

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

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

4. Facility Location:
The project site, 1075 Triangle Court, is located on a 1.48 acre parcel between Triangle Court and Yolo Shortline Railroad in the City of West Sacramento, Yolo County. The nearest cross streets are Jefferson Boulevard to the east and Triangle Court to the north. The facility will be located in a business building that has four industrial suites. Three suites are currently occupied, the fourth is proposed to be occupied by Level 3. There are two businesses on site in the suites west of the project site, Air Express and Diamond Chain. The suite east of the project suite is occupied by Team Tube, a tube manufacturing company. The building is set back approximately thirty-six yards from Triangle Court. (See Figure 1, Regional Map; Figure 2, Vicinity Map; Figure 3, Parcel Map; and 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: M-1 Light Industrial

8. Description of Facility:
This checklist evaluates the design, construction, and operation of the Sacramento Terminal, which would be constructed in an existing building outside of existing utility corridors in support of the long-haul network.

The Sacramento Terminal will be constructed on a developed 1.48-acre site with a concrete building approximately 51,000 square feet in size. The terminal equipment will be placed in approximately 17,300 square feet of the building. The existing building will require minor demolition of interior walls and windows and replacement of the roof. An equipment yard will be constructed adjacent to the building to contain an emergency generator and six to eight mechanical coolers.

The long-haul fiber optic network is connected to local communication systems through terminals. The facility also provides signal amplification capabilities similar to those of an ILA. The terminal hardware needed to connect the fiber optic network to the local communication systems will be located in the terminal building.

One 2,000-kilowatt (kW), diesel-powered generator will provide emergency power to the terminal. The

size of the pre-cast concrete generator enclosure will be based on local noise restrictions but will be approximately 13 feet wide and 38 feet long (494 square feet) and 14 feet high. The generator shelter will be assembled at the site and installed on a concrete foundation. This generator will be sufficient to handle the standby power requirements of the terminal facility. The generator will be mounted on a 4,200-gallon, double-walled, aboveground belly storage tank that is approximately 41 feet long by 13 feet wide by 15 feet high. 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). Tank system design incorporates a high fuel alarm (local) and a tank rupture alarm (remote).

During operation at 100% load, each generator consumes approximately 136 gallons of diesel fuel per hour (gph). At 75% load, fuel consumption rate is approximately 102 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 conservatively 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 102 gph equals 3060 gallons of diesel fuel consumption per year for testing and maintenance.

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 emergence 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 cannot be managed by Level 3 personnel, a contractor will be called to respond.

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

The Sacramento Terminal site will be permanently staffed by three employees. A driveway providing access from Triangle Court and adequate parking will be provided. No additional buildings will be constructed. Control and maintenance functions will occur within the proposed facilities. Fencing around the equipment yard will be of chain link construction and will be nine feet tall. The Sacramento Terminal will require electricity, telephone, sewer, and water hookups.

Utility lines supporting these capabilities are located on utility poles along the south side of the property. Telephone service would be provided at the site by either hard-wired, cellular, or satellite-link service. Normal electrical power will be provided, consisting of 2000-amp, 480-volt, three-phase service. All onsite utility lines will run underground. Water and sewer connections to municipal systems would be provided per local code. Stormwater drainage and fire protection equipment would be installed per local codes.

The fiber optic cable, to which the facility will be connected, is located in the UPRR ROW, which is adjacent to, and south of, the terminal property. The connection to the Terminal facility will be in-

stalled at a depth of approximately 42 inches either by plowing in the conduit (which does not require a trench) or by digging a trench, laying the conduit, and then back-filling the trench.

Demolition debris from replacement of the roof, interior walls and windows, and a removal of a minimum amount of asphalt prior to placement of the generator pad is estimated to be 600 cubic yards.

Current and potential cumulative projects in the vicinity of the proposed Sacramento Terminal site that meet the following criteria are shown in Table 1:

- Projects within two miles of the site. In some cases these projects are in more than one jurisdiction;
- Projects which would be constructed within one year before and one year after the "construction window" for the Level 3 facilities, or between March 1999 to March 2003;
- For "current projects," projects that have been approved by the lead agency and have had their environmental document signed, approved, and/or certified; and
- For "potential projects," projects which 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 properties are occupied and well maintained. There is one vacant parcel at the west end of Triangle Court and is not adjacent to the project site. The vicinity is primarily light industrial with the exception of the Yolo County Services Department. The development in the surrounding area is fairly new, less than five years, with the exception of the older adjacent buildings that are between ten to fifteen years old. (See Figure 5, Surrounding Land Use.)

There are a number of businesses surrounding the project site:

North
- Sierra Hart, a car leasing company, is located in a small building with a parking lot and car storage area; and
- Beyond Sierra Hart and the railroad berm is a mobile/pre-fabricated home community. The site is not visible from these residences because of the intervening railroad berm.

Northeast
- Yolo County Services Department, a county service office building with parking lot.

Northwest
- The Horizon Company consists of a light industrial complex with one building, a loading facility, and a parking lot.

East
- Two industrial buildings contain the following businesses: Stockton Bumper Service, Capitol Plating Company, and HB Covey, Inc. (Petroleum Systems).

West
- M&M Lightweight Concrete, Inc. consists of a small business building.

South
- Yolo Shortline Railroad;
- Apartment buildings; and
- Church and church's parking lot.

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:
The site is located within the jurisdiction of the City of West Sacramento and the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD).

The M-1 Industrial zoning designation allows for the construction of electrical equipment and an administrative office in conjunction with fiber optic cable support services as a permitted use. No land use permits are necessary.

Rule 201 of the SMAQMD requires that installation of an emergency diesel generator be permitted (i.e., Level 3 will obtain a permit to 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 Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) (Decision No. 98-03-066). That CPCN was supported by a Mitigated Negative Declaration that included mitigation measures to be implemented in the design, construction, and operation of the previously approved telecommunications facilities within existing utility rights-of-way. Level 3 has incorporated all mitigation measures outlined in the previous Decision into its design of the project addressed in this Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA). Therefore, the actions previously imposed as mitigation measures in the CPCN Decision are now Environmental Commitments for the facility addressed herein. In summary, these Environmental Commitments include:

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

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

Mitigation Measures
No Mitigation Measures are recommended for the Sacramento Terminal 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 project site consists of an existing light industrial building with four suites located at 1075 Triangle Court within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of West Sacramento. One of the four suites would contain the proposed project. The site abuts the southerly railroad tracks of the Yolo Shortline Railroad directly behind the building within an approximate distance of 75 feet. The closest cross street is Jefferson Boulevard (State Highway 84).

The site is located on a rectangular shaped parcel totaling 1.48 acres. The site is partially occupied with three existing users: Air Express, an air freight trucking company; Team Tube, a custom cut pipe manufacturer; and Diamond Chain Company, a chain manufacturing and shipping company. Each suite within the building has an adjacent loading bay. Currently, one of the four suites is vacant and proposed for use by the project proponent. The building was constructed within the last three years according to City standards with curb, gutter, sidewalks, streetlights, and landscaping. Electricity and telephone lines serving the users of the light industrial park has been installed underground. Overall, the site is in good repair and appears to be regularly maintained. Because the site was recently constructed in accordance with all City requirements, and because the proposed project would be installed entirely within an existing building, it would comply with all local policies for aesthetics.

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 ☒

Triangle Court is not designated as a State or local scenic roadway. The project site is not visible from any streets designated as Scenic Roadways. The proposed project would be located within an existing structure and would not conflict with any scenic vistas.

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 ☒

None of the streets in the project area are designated as State scenic highways (Thomas Brothers, 1999). Development of the proposed project will not change the exterior appearance of the existing light industrial use that is similar in character to development in the surrounding area and would not damage any scenic resources.

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

The project will not modify the exterior of the existing structure.

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 project does not propose the installation of additional lighting. The visual character of the existing building exterior will remain unchanged.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is located in an urbanized area, characterized by industrial and commercial land uses. The site is presently developed with an approximately 51,000 square foot building containing four suites, three of which are presently in use. The site, and the surrounding area, is not currently in agricultural use, nor has it been used for agriculture recently. The site is not within an area designated as Prime Farmland, nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. There are no local policies for agricultural resources that apply to the project site (Rikala, 1999).

Evaluation

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

The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The proposed use would not convert any such farmland to non-agricultural use.

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

The project site is not zoned for agricultural use. The site is located in a Light Industrial zoning district, as designated by the City of West Sacramento. In addition, the project site is not covered by a Williamson Act contract.

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

The project site is located in an urbanized area on a developed industrial site. Development of the site would not result in growth-inducing effects or other off-site changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY

Setting

The Sacramento Terminal is located in the City of West Sacramento, Yolo County. The facility will be primarily located within an existing 51,000 square foot light industrial building on a 1.48 acre parcel. A paved parking area is located on the north side of the building. Surrounding land uses are primarily industrial and commercial. However, a church common area and an apartment complex are located approximately 90 feet south of the site. The site will be permanently staffed by three employees. An auto leasing business is located to the north of the terminal site.

The project will generate air emissions during construction of the terminal and during operation of the facility. Installation of project components will largely be confined to the interior of the existing building. However, minor site preparation will be required for the construction of an equipment yard to the north of the existing structure, which will house the emergency standby generator and mechanical coolers. In addition, trenching approximately one foot wide by four feet deep will be required for installation of the fiber optic innerduct, and the roof of the existing building will be replaced during the construction of the terminal. Construction activities will generate emissions from heavy equipment and worker vehicles, both on site and during travel to and from the site, and from fugitive dust emitted from area sources.

Operations phase activities emitting criteria air pollutants include weekly testing of the emergency generator and emissions from worker vehicles commuting to and from the site (assumed to be 30 one-way trips per week). Emissions rates for the 2000 kW emergency standby generator, as guaranteed by the manufacturer (Caterpillar), are included in Attachment A.

Yolo County is located in the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) and is within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), which also includes Shasta County, Glenn County, Colusa County, Sacramento County, Butte County, Sutter County, Yuba County, and portions of Placer and Solano Counties. Total emissions of criteria air pollutants in Yolo County, as estimated in 1996, are as follows: reactive organic gases (ROG), 20 tons per day (tpd); carbon monoxide (CO), 120 tpd; nitrogen oxides (NO_x), 18 tpd; sulfur oxides (SO_x), 0.7 tpd; and respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}), 32 tpd (California EPA, 1999). Yolo County is also impacted by transport of air pollutants from urbanized areas to the south and southwest.

The SVAB is currently designated as a serious nonattainment area for California Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and PM_{10} (*ibid.*). The southern region of the SVAB, including Yolo, Solano, Sacramento, and Placer counties, and the southern portion of Sutter County, is designated as a severe nonattainment area for the federal one-hour ozone standard (*ibid.*). The Sacramento Urbanized Area, which includes West Sacramento, is currently classified as a nonattainment region for federal CO standards. However, the California Air Resource Board (CARB) has requested that the U.S. EPA reclassify the area as being in attainment of federal CO standards (YSAQMD, 1996).

In the period from 1996 to 1998, ambient air quality at monitoring stations in Yolo County did not exceed the federal standards for CO, PM_{10}, or one-hour average ozone, or the state standards for NO_x and CO. One-hour average ozone concentrations exceeded state standards an average of six days per year, and eight-hour average ozone levels were above the federal standards three days per year. PM_{10} concentrations violated state standards a total of 19 days during the three-year period (California EPA, 1999).

The federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act require air quality plans to be developed and implemented in areas that exceed standards for criteria air pollutants, with the exception of areas that exceed the state PM_{10} standard. The applicable plan for Yolo County and the City of West Sacramento is the *1994 State Implementation Plan for Ozone* (California EPA, 1994).

The YSAQMD is charged with implementing the attainment plan for state and federal air quality standards in the City of West Sacramento. The YSAQMD requires that new stationary sources of air pollutants obtain an Authority to Construct and a Permit to Operate from the district (YSAQMD Rule 3.1.301-302). The District also issues formal rules for New Source Review (NSR), including requirements for the implementation of Best Available Control Technology and offsets from new pollutant sources at ratios of greater than one-to-one (YSAQMD Rule 3.4), and sets emissions standards for stationary internal combustion engines (YSAQMD Rule 2.32).

The YSAQMD has established significance threshold guidelines for construction of new facilities as well as for the long-term operation of new projects, and specifies mitigation measures for projects with the potential to exceed the significance threshold. For grading operations ("Phase I"), facility construction ("Phase II"), and long-term operations, emissions of NO_x, ROG, or PM_{10} exceeding 82 lbs./day each are considered potentially significant (YSAQMD, 1996).

Emissions from project construction and operations are calculated in Table 3. The methodological assumptions underlying the analysis are provided in Attachment A. Included in Table 3 are estimates of the following construction-related items:

- Estimates of one-way commuting distances (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) represented in terms of number of trips per day, total number of trips, and number of one-way miles traveled; and
- The amount of material (soil) that will be disturbed during trenching operations on the proposed site for installation of the fiber optic between the property line and the building.

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.

Operations-phase emissions are also summarized in Table 3. Emissions from the emergency generator are estimated from manufacturer emissions guarantees (Caterpillar Corporation, 1999). The generator is assumed to operate for 30 hours per year (i.e., one-half hour per week, conservatively estimated).

General Conformity requirements (40 CFR Part 43, July 1978) will not apply because no federal action will be required for approval of the project.

Evaluation

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

The *State Implementation Plan for Ozone* (California EPA, 1994) is enforced through the YSAQMD Rules (YSAQMD, 1999) and through the guidelines established in the YSAQMD Air Quality Handbook (1996).

Table 3 compares construction emissions to YSAQMD significance thresholds. Using the methodology outlined above and described in further detail in Attachment A, which is more conservative than recom-

mended by YSAQMD (1996), construction emissions will nonetheless be well below significance thresholds. PM_{10} emissions will remain well below significance thresholds in the absence of dust control measures.

Emissions from operations-phase activities (the emergency standby generator and daily commuting to and from the site by three employees) are also include in Table 3. Emissions of NO_x, ROG, and PM_{10} do not exceed significance thresholds during normal facility operations.

The emergency standby generator will require Authority to Construct and a Permit to Operate from the YSAQMD. Because the terminal is located in a serious nonattainment area for state ozone standards, most new sources of air emissions require offsets against existing emissions at a ratio of greater than one-to-one. However, the generator will be exempt from emissions offset requirements under the YSAQMD New Source Review process per YSAQMD Rule 3.4.110. The generator will also be exempt from YSAQMD notification requirements under YSAQMD Rule 3.4.112 based on the emissions estimates in Table 3, which are far below the specified threshold for exemption (3.75 tons per quarter (tpq) ROC and NO_x, 6.825 (tpq) SO_x and PM_{10}, and 24.75 (tpq) CO). In addition, the generator will not be subject to YSAQMD performance standards for stationary internal combustion engines based on YSAQMD Rule 2.32.110, provided the reporting requirements of YSAQMD Rule 2.32.503 are met.

Emissions from daily travel to and from the site during operations will be minimal. Daily emissions from one-half hour generator tests will be less than 0.2 percent of county-wide stationary source emissions based on 1996 estimates for all criteria air pollutants (California EPA, 1999) (and are zero on days when the generator is not operating).

The Sacramento Terminal will comply with all local air quality regulations and will not significantly change countywide emissions of criteria air pollutants. There will be no significant impact on the ability to meet regional air quality goals.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments:

- Level 3 will obtain Authority to Construct and a Permit to Operate the emergency standby generator from the YSAQMD; and
- Level 3 will comply with the requirements for exemption from stationary internal combustion engine emissions limits (per YSAQMD Rule 2.32.110); for exemption from new source offset requirements (per YSAQMD Rule 3.4.110); and for exemption notification requirement (per YSAQMD Rule 3.4.112) by taking the following actions as specified in YSAQMD Rules 2.32.100, 2.32.503, 3.4.110 and 3.4.500:
  - operating the generator no more than 50 hours per year for maintenance purposes and for a total of no more than 200 hours per year;
  - maintaining a log documenting the hours of engine operation during failures of utility power and maintenance, and retain all records for two years; and
  - providing supporting documentation to the YSAQMD as required by Rule 2.32.503.1.

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 ☐

Construction of the terminal will produce emissions of criteria air pollutants from mobile sources and PM_{10} from fugitive dust. Emissions from mobile sources (construction equipment) will not have permanent or temporary significant effects on regional air quality because they are too small to measurably change ambient levels of criteria pollutants or ozone precursors.

Daily total PM_{10} emissions (engine emissions plus fugitive dust) during construction will be less than 0.1 percent of daily values for construction and demolition in Yolo County (California EPA, 1999). Construction will be of short duration, and peak emissions are small relative to county- or basin-wide levels. Operations phase emissions will also be small compared to countywide levels and will be infrequent. Grading, facility construction, and long-term operations emissions are well below significance thresholds established by the YSAQMD (YSAQMD, 1996). Effects on ambient air quality from the project will be less than significant.

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

As discussed above, emissions from construction (both engine and fugitive dust emissions) and operation of the Sacramento Terminal will be small relative to countywide inventories of criteria air pollutant emissions, including ozone precursors. There will be no other facilities located outside of utility right-of-way within the YSAQMD.

Although Yolo County is not in compliance with state PM_{10} and state and federal ozone standards, short- or long-term air quality impacts from site development will be minimal. Construction and long-term emissions will be well below established significance thresholds (See Table 3).

YSAQMD considers a project to have a "cumulatively significant" impact when the project (1) requires a change in existing land use designation; *and* (2) incrementally increases emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} relative to typical emissions from uses consistent with the current land use designation (YSAQMD, 1996). The terminal will be compatible with current zoning and general plan designations and will not require any zoning change or a general plan amendment (See Checklist Section IX). In addition, staffing levels are low and facility operations are of limited scope, given the size of the facility. Neither of the necessary conditions for cumulatively considerable impact to regional air quality is met. Therefore, cumulative air quality impacts are less than significant.

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

Sensitive receptors (a church common area and an apartment building) are located approximately 90 feet from the south boundary of the terminal site (Figure 8). A mobile home park is located more than 200 feet north of the facility on the opposite side of a railroad berm.

Terminal electronics will be located inside the existing building. During construction, dust and exhaust emissions will be generated by remodeling of the building interior, replacement of the roof of the existing building, and construction of the maintenance yard. The maintenance yard will be placed on the opposite (north) side of the terminal building from nearby sensitive receptors. Because of the location of the maintenance yard, the distance to the sensitive receptors, and the fact that construction is unlikely to generate substantial pollutant concentrations, sensitive receptors will not be significantly affected by air emissions from construction.

The largest concentrations of pollutants produced by facility operations will occur during generator testing

and emergency operations. These activities are infrequent, limited to 30 minutes per week of scheduled maintenance and operation during interruptions of utility power service. The generator will be located on the opposite side of the terminal building from the sensitive receptors (Figure 7). The short duration of the tests and the substantial distance from sensitive receptors will ensure that operations-phase activities do not expose sensitive receptors 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 source associated with construction and operation of the Sacramento Site will be the exhaust of diesel-fueled heavy-duty equipment and the emergency generator. Construction activities will be of limited scope and short duration, and generator operations will be limited to 30 minutes per week except during interruptions of utility service. Construction will be primarily located on the north side of the terminal building and inside the building itself. The generator will also be located on the north side of the terminal building, at a distance of at least 120 feet from any receptor. It is unlikely that diesel fumes will be generated at such a concentration or dispersed in such a manner so as to result in odor that will affect a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Setting

The site is located in a heavy industrial and business area of West Sacramento. The property is limited to warehouse space within a larger building. The building is believed to be less than two years old. Neighboring space is leased and operated by other companies. The building is located on a street dominated by industrial and business development. Development is found to the north, east, and west of the property.

The southern edge of the warehouse faces the railroad. Along this boundary, vegetation has been cleared to the property fence. The area between the fence and the rail is dominated by non-native annual grasses (*Avena* sp.). This area also supports a row of oak trees (*Quercus lobata*). These trees are approximately 40 ft. tall. No raptor-like nests were observed. These trees could potentially provide nesting habitat for raptor species, including Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*).

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 sensitive plant and wildlife species likely to occur within the site and/or vicinity was compiled prior to and during the site visit. This list was formulated based upon a search of the California Natural Diversity Database, California Department of Fish and Game (Sacramento West Quadrangle, September 1999), knowledge of the area, and the onsite assessment. The list of species including the likelihood of occurrence at the site is included in Table 4.

The site is heavily disturbed and does not provide significant native habitat for any sensitive species. The site does not provide elderberry habitat for Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*).

A row of oak trees is located approximately 40 feet from the southern boundary of the property, between the parcel and the railroad right-of-way. These trees provide potential nesting habitat for raptor species, including Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), a California State Threatened species. No raptor-like nests were observed during a reconnaissance survey of the site. However, previous records describe a Swainson's hawk nest within 1 mile of the site. Preconstruction nest surveys should be performed within 2 weeks of disturbance activities during the breeding season (March 1 to July 30). The site does not provide the sufficient aquatic resources associated with rose-mallow (*Hibiscus lasiocarpus*), California brackishwater snail (*Tryonia imitator*), Sacramento splittail (*Pogonichthys macrolepidotus*), California clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*),double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*), California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*), tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*), and salt-marsh harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*).

Site Specific Environmental Commitments: Because Level 3 has committed to avoid or minimize all potential impacts and to acquire all required local, state, and federal permits, the impact of this project will be less than significant. The specific measures that will be implemented at the Sacramento Terminal ILA site include the following:

- No trees will be removed or otherwise disturbed as a result of construction to this site; and
- If construction activities (outside the existing structure) coincide with the breeding season (March 1 to September 15), pre-construction raptor nest surveys will be performed within 2 weeks of disturbance activities. If an active raptor nest is found within 500 feet of the work site a determination will be made by a qualified biologist in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game whether or not construction activities will impact the active nest or disrupt reproductive behavior.

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 ☐

There is no riparian or any other significant sensitive habitat onsite or within the site vicinity. The area is characterized by industrial development. A row of oak trees lines the southern bounds of the property.

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

There is no aquatic habitat onsite or within the immediate site vicinity. The area is characterized by heavy industrial development.

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

The site and vicinity are characterized by heavy development. It is unlikely that the area is a part of any wildlife corridor. The site contains no aquatic resources for migratory fish species. If a raptor does establish a nest in the oak trees adjacent to the property, the impact would be considered less than significant because of the previously-stated Environmental Commitments, (See Section IV (a)).

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

There are no trees or other biological resources onsite. A row of oak trees exists along the southern bounds of the property between the building and the railroad. Construction will be limited outside the drip-line of these trees. West Sacramento does have a tree ordinance that would include the oak trees between the rail and the proposed terminal site. The West Sacramento Planning Department would have to be contacted prior to any disturbance to these trees.

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 ☒

No significant biological resources were identified onsite. West Sacramento has drafted a Habitat Management Plan but it has not yet been adopted. It is unlikely that any Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other conservation policies would apply to this property.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is located in West Sacramento, Yolo County, and is about one mile from the Sacramento River. The parcel contains a recently built commercial/warehouse structure and the rest of the parcel is paved.

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

The Sacramento Terminal site is in territory that was nominally Patwin on the west side of the Sacramento River, but was closer to Nisenan territory on the east bank of the Sacramento River. There were several

Nisenan villages in the Sacramento area on the east bank of the river. The nearest known Patwin village was about 20 miles to the west. Nisenan political organization, subsistence, and technology were similar to what is described here for the Patwin.

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

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

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

After the Spanish arrived in the area in the late eighteenth century, Patwin were taken to the San Francisco Mission and San Jose Mission. Later, Mission Sonoma was built in 1823 closer to Patwin territory. Patwin population was severely reduced (up to 75 percent) as a result of a malarial epidemic in 1833 and a small-pox epidemic in 1837. Mexicans and Americans took over much of Patwin territory in the 1830s and 1840s. The few surviving Patwin in the American period after 1848 worked on ranches as laborers and became partly assimilated into Euro-American culture (Johnson, 1978).

Evaluation

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

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

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

the National Register of Historic Places (listings and eligibility determinations), California Points of Historical Interest, and California Historical Landmarks.

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

The results of the CHRIS records search showed that the property had not been previously surveyed for historic resources (File No. 99-572, California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Center, 1999). Currently, there is no exposed ground surface on the parcel where a field survey could be undertaken. 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 results of the CHRIS records search showed that the property had not been previously surveyed for prehistoric archaeological resources. The results also indicated that there are no archaeological sites recorded within one half mile of the project area (California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Center, 1999). Currently, 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 Wagner and others (1981), the project site is underlain by Quaternary basin deposits (alluvium; unit Qb). No fossil site is recorded in the archives of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Section or the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) as occurring in this rock unit at the project site or elsewhere in the Sacramento West 7.5-minute quadrangle. However, at least some previously recorded late Pleistocene continental vertebrate fossil sites in the Sacramento Valley have yielded late Pleistocene land mammal remains (Jefferson, 1991) in areas mapped as being underlain by basin deposits (see Saucedo and Wagner, 1982). Bison remains were recovered from 4 feet below current grade at UCMP vertebrate fossil site V-3915 (Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation, 1979; Jefferson, 1991). Although there is a potential for late Pleistocene continental vertebrate fossil remains occurring in the subsurface at the project site, it is unlikely construction-related earth moving would extend to a depth sufficient to encounter remains old enough to be considered fossilized.

Site Specific Commitments: Level 3 will initiate palentological monitoring where earth-moving extends to a depth of greater than 5 feet below current grade. Below 5 feet, 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, and rock samples will be processed to allow for the recovery of smaller fossil remains. All recovered fossil remains will be fully treated (prepared, identified by knowledgeable paleontologists, curated, catalogued) and, along with associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data, placed in a recognized museum repository. The paleontologist will prepare a final report of findings that includes an inventory of recovered fossil remains. These measures will be in compliance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995, 1996) guidelines for the management of paleontologic resources and for museum acceptance of a monitoring program fossil collection.

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

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Setting

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone (CDMG, 1999). The Sacramento area is noted for low groundshaking associated with any faults that may rupture with sufficient magnitude to affect Sacramento. There are no active faults within 15 miles of the proposed terminal site (i.e., displacement occurred within the last 11,000 years). The site is not within any landslide, subsidence, liquefaction, expansive soils, or erosion geologic hazard area (CDMG, 1973).

Evaluation

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

The site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo earthquake zone. The site is not subject to ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides. A 10% probability of peak ground accelerations of 10 to 20% g in 50 years is expected in the site vicinity (CDMG, 1973). Any potential seismic hazard would be avoided through design, and compliance with the California Building Code Zone 4 Seismic Standards and applicable local building and seismic codes. The project would not expose persons to potential substantial adverse effects related to these geologic hazards.

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, so soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be minimal. During construction, best management practices to control stormwater runoff would be used to minimize erosion at the site.

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

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

The site is not located in an expansive soils area.

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 ☒

The terminal facility will be permanently staffed by three persons and will discharge sanitary waste to the sewer system. A septic system will not be used.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Setting

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

Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed structure would be located in an urbanized area zoned Light Industrial (M-1). 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 not located in a 100-year flood zone (Vista Information Solutions, NEPA Checklist, 1999). The site is located in Folsom and Nimbus Lake dam inundation areas. The site is not within an area subject to inundation by tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

The Sacramento Terminal facility will be placed in an existing building, therefore, the presence of this facility is not anticipated to significantly modify existing drainage of stormwater from the site. However, any stormwater drainage measures that may be included in the Terminal facility will be installed in accordance with County of Yolo 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 Sacramento Terminal facility.

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 Regional Water Quality Control Board and the State Water Resources Control Board for construction of the Sacramento Terminal 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 site will be less than five acres, and will therefore be less than the minimum size requirement for a SWPPP, the cumulative area of the total ILA, 3R, and Distribution Node sites associated with this project is greater than five acres. Accordingly, an NOI will be submitted, and a SWPPP will be prepared.

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 project would not discharge substances that could contaminate water. Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in a 4,200 gallon, double-walled, above-ground storage tank, with monitoring and leak containment features. The tank would provide hazard containment against reasonably foreseeable upset and accidents. Wastes generated by equipment maintenance would be disposed of off-site in accordance with all applicable regulations.

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

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

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

The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because the surface of the trench will be returned to it's original condition and the Terminal facility 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 the surface of the trench will be returned to it's original condition and the facility 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 Terminal facility will be placed inside an existing building.

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. The project would not produce contaminated runoff, generate wastewater, nor discharge substances that could contaminate water.

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

The project would not include housing. The project is not located within a 100-year floodplain (Figure 9, Vista Information Solutions NEPA Checklist, 1999; City of Sacramento General Plan, 1988).

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

The project would not include housing. The project is not located within a 100-year floodplain (Figure 9, Vista Information Solutions NEPA Checklist, 1999; City of Sacramento General Plan, 1988).

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

The project is located within the area that would be inundated if the Folsom or Nimbus dams were to fail (U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Inundation Map of Folsom and Nimbus Dams, 1975). In the event of dam failure, personnel within the facility will comply with appropriate county or city evacuation plans.

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 ☒

Folsum, Shasta, and Oroville dams have the potential to inundate the City of Sacramento and the site if a major seiche were to occur. However, the probability of flooding of the site from a seiche is low. The site is too far from the ocean to be affected by a tsunami. The potential for mudslides is minor due to the flat topography of the site and the surrounding area (City of Sacramento General Plan, 1988, Sec. 8-9).

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

Setting

The City's General Plan land use designation for the project site is "Light Industrial". This land use category includes industrial parks, warehouses, light manufacturing, public and quasi-public uses, and similar and compatible uses (West Sacramento General Plan, 1996) The surrounding properties are also designated as Light Industrial. The zoning designation is Light Industrial (M-1). The purpose of the Light Industrial M-1 zoning designation is to provide area in which sound industrial development of non-nuisance type uses will be protected from incompatible uses (West Sacramento General Plan, 1996).

The M-1 Industrial zoning designation allows for the construction of electrical equipment and an administrative office in conjunction with fiber optic cable support services as a permitted use. No land use permits are necessary. Building permits would be required prior to construction (Rikala 1999).

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 proposed project involves the use of a portion of an existing structure for a Terminal facility. The project site and surrounding land uses are all Light Industrial in nature and are separated from any residential areas or established communities by Yolo Shortline rail berms. The project would not result in physical or visual division of 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 City of West Sacramento municipal code designates the project site for M-1 Industrial use. The project site will be used for electrical equipment and a small, associated administrative office in conjunction with fiber optic cable support. Such uses are allowable under the M-1 zoning designation and are not subject to a land use permit. The project would not conflict with any other plans, policies, or regulations. A City issued permit would be required prior to construction.

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 ☒

No significant biological resources were identified onsite. West Sacramento has drafted a Habitat Management Plan but it has not yet been adopted. It is unlikely that any Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other conservation policies would be relevant to this property.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is not located in an area designated by the State or the City of West Sacramento as a mineral resources zone (Rikala, 1999). There are no local policies for mineral resources that apply to the proposed project or 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 ☒

The proposed project would be located within an existing building on a developed industrial site. No impacts to mineral resources of value to the region or the residents of the State would result.

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

The proposed project would be located within an existing building on a developed industrial site. The project site is not located in an area designated by the State or the City of West Sacramento as a mineral resources zone.

XI. NOISE

Setting

The Sacramento Terminal is located in the City of West Sacramento, Yolo County. The facility will be primarily located within an existing, 51,000 square foot light industrial building on a 1.48 acre parcel. The site will be permanently staffed by three employees.

Surrounding land uses are primarily industrial and commercial. However, a church common area and an apartment complex are located approximately 90 feet south of the site (Figure 8). Industrial buildings abut the site to the east and west. A car leasing facility is located 200 feet north of the terminal site, and a mobile home community is located to the north of the car leasing facility. A railroad berm forms a barrier between the terminal site and the mobile homes. The dayime and nighttime ambient noise levels in the area are estimated to be 52 and 47 dBA, respectively, typical values for "quiet commercial and industrial areas" (Schomer and Associates, 1991).

Both construction and operation of the terminal will generate noise. Terminal electronics will be installed wholly within the existing building, providing a substantial buffer against construction noise impacts. However, an equipment yard will be built on the north side of the building, and an emergency standby generator and mechanical coolers will be installed to support terminal operations. In addition, the roof of the existing building will be replaced prior to the installation of the terminal equipment.

Noise from weekly, 30-minute tests of the standby generator and operation of the generator during interruptions of utility power service will be the primary source of noise from terminal operations. Travel to and from the site by three employees will not be a significant source of noise.

The City of West Sacramento regulates noise levels through the Noise Element of the West Sacramento General Plan (1996). Temporary impacts from construction are permitted without quantitative restrictions on

construction noise levels. However, construction is usually restricted to "normal working hours" as a condition of building and/or grading permit approval (White, personal communication, 1999).

Equipment required for the construction of the terminal is listed in Table 3. Maximum noise levels for normally-muffled diesel-powered construction equipment are estimated to be 84 dBA at a distance of 50 feet (U.S. EPA, 1971). Exterior construction using heavy equipment will be confined to the installation of the equipment yard on the northern portion of the parcel and trenching for installation of the fiber optic cable.

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 noise sources (i.e., the emergency standby generator) are subject to Noise Level Performance Standards for non-transportation noise sources (West Sacramento General Plan*,* 1996, Table II-4). Exterior noise level criteria are applied only to noise levels affecting residential properties, as measured at the property line of the affected parcel. Daytime (from 7 am to 10 pm) noise levels are restricted an hourly-average L_{eq} of 50 dBA, and a maximum level of 70 dBA.

The 2000 kW emergency standby generator will be located on the northern side of terminal building at least 275 feet from the nearest residential receptor and approximately 120 feet from adjacent properties to the east and west. The generator will be installed in a noise-insulating enclosure that reduces noise level to 85 dBA at a distance of five feet from the shelter. The resulting noise level was calculated to be 50 dBA which does not exceed the 70 dBA limit and is below the assumed ambient noise level at the nearest residential receptor.

The L_{eq} limit at 50 dBA was found to be non-applicable due to the conservative assumption of a daytime ambient noise level of 52 dBA, which exceeds the L_{eq} limit without additional noise from the generator. Calculation of the L_{eq} with the additional generator noise results in an insignificant increase of 1.2 dBA over ambient for the one half-hour per week that the generator will run. Also, because the generator will only operate for one half-hour, an hourly L_{eq} calculation for a weekly event is considered to be highly conservative.

The above calculations are based only on the attenuation of noise intensity by the atmosphere (See Attachment A). For sensitive receptors to the south of the site, actual noise levels are likely to be lower because of the sound-insulating effect of the terminal building.

Evaluation

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

The City of West Sacramento has no codified noise ordinance and does not quantitatively limit noise levels from temporary, construction-related impacts. However, the city generally limits construction to "normal working hours" as a condition of building and/or grading permits (White, personal communication, 1999). The City of West Sacramento General Plan (1996) limits hourly-averaged long-term noise, as measured on any affected residential property, to 50 dBA L_{eq} or less, and limits maximum noise intensity on residential properties to 70 dBA at any time.

The L_{eq} limit at 50 dBA was found to be non-applicable due to the conservative assumption of a daytime am-

bient noise level of 52 dBA, which exceeds the L_{eq} limit without additional noise from the generator. Calculation of the L_{eq} with the additional generator noise results in an insignificant increase of 1.2 dBA over ambient for the one half-hour per week that the generator will run. Also, because the generator will only operate for one half-hour, an hourly L_{eq} calculation for a weekly event is considered to be highly conservative.

The primary source of operational noise will be the 2000 kW emergency standby generator. The generator will be tested for 30 minutes per week and enclosed in a noise-insulating generator shelter that reduces noise levels to 85 dBA at a distance of five feet from the shelter building. This is sufficient to reduce instantaneous noise levels to 50 dBA at the nearest residential parcel and will therefore comply with standards set by the City of west Sacramento General Plan.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments:

- Level 3 will restrict construction to normal working hours, as defined by the City of West Sacramento; and
- Level 3 will locate the emergency standby generator on the north side of the terminal building and will house the generator in a noise-insulating enclosure that reduces noise levels to 85 dBA at a distance of five feet from the shelter building.

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 low level groundborne vibration and noise generated during construction will be short term in nature, and generally will not extend more that a few feet from the active work area. It will not affect adjacent properties.

The 2,000 kW generator is the only potential source of groundborne noise or vibration from site operations. The generator will be mounted on spring isolators that effectively reduce groundborne vibration by more than 95 percent (Ace Mountings Company, Inc., 1999). Additionally, the vibration isolator reduces structure-borne noise by interrupting noise transmission paths caused by "sounding-board" effect. Hence, groundborne noise and vibration are reduced to levels of insignificance. The distance to the nearest receptor (more than 120 feet) provides additional assurances that no excessive groundborne noise or vibration will be detected.

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

The terminal generates only temporary and periodic noise. There will be no permanent source of noise at the facility.

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 noise will be generated during construction. The reuse of an existing building will result in construction activities that are of limited scope and duration, and the location of much of the exterior construction activity is relatively isolated from adjacent parcels (See Figure 7). The temporary effects of construction noise will be less than significant.

Periodic noise will result from emergency standby generator testing and by generator operations during interruptions of utility power. Testing will be restricted to 30 minutes per week and will comply with the City of West Sacramento Noise Element. The generator will be located more than 120 feet from the nearest noise receptor and will be enclosed in a noise-insulating shelter as described in Section III (a). Effects on ambient noise levels will be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Setting

The project site is located in the City of West Sacramento, with a population of 30,431 as of January 1999 (White, 1999). The project site is developed with one commercial/industrial building and is located in a developed industrial and commercial area. The nearest housing is located approximately 90-feet south of the project site, along Manzanita Way. There are no local policies for population and housing that apply to 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 use of a portion of an existing industrial building for a Terminal facility with three permanent staff. No new housing or extension of major infrastructure would result.

b)	Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	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 use of a portion of an existing industrial building in a light industrial area.

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 use of a portion of an existing industrial building and would not displace any people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The project is located within the City of West Sacramento. Fire and police protection are provided by the City of West Sacramento. Fire station #44 is located at 905 Fremont Boulevard less than a half mile from the proposed terminal. The closest police station is at 550 Jefferson Boulevard less than 500 feet from the project site. The closest hospital is Sutter General Hospital at 2801 L Street within 2.7 miles of 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 project site is located in a developed industrial/commercial area on a previously developed site. 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

Several parks are located in the vicinity of the project site. Elkhorn Park is approximately 0.8 of a mile north of the site on Hardy Drive. Yolo County Park is approximately 1-mile northeast of the site. The Old Sacramento State Historic Park and California Railroad Museum are located approximately 1 mile east of the site. The Discovery Park is located approximately 1.8 miles northeast of the site. There are no local policies for recreation that would apply to the proposed project or 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 ☒

This proposed project does not involve residential use but could cause an increase in the population of the City of West Sacramento if three people who will staff the facility come from outside West Sacramento. A

small increase in demand for, or use of, existing parks and recreational facilities could result from the addition of three people or families.

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 would not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Setting

The site is bordered on the north by Triangle Court, on the east by a commercial/industrial building, on the west by a commercial industrial building, and the south by the southerly railroad tracks of the Yolo Shortline.

Regional access to the Triangle Court cul-de-sac will be provided via State Highway 84, Jefferson Boulevard. Jefferson Boulevard is designated in the general plan as a "major arterial". Triangle Court is designated as a "local street". No policies with regard to these designations apply to the proposed project.

Evaluation

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

During construction at the site, construction workers will be commuting to the site for approximately three months. The average number of commuting workers is expected to be seven. The workers will commute during off-peak traffic hours (usually 6 a.m. and 3 p.m.) and park on the site. Occasionally, trucks will deliver equipment and materials to the site and haul construction debris from the site to recycling centers or landfills. These truck trips will be infrequent and off-peak from area traffic flows. The offsite impacts from construction are therefore expected to be less than significant. During operation, the project will employ three permanent staff. Because the proposed project would involve only three persons commuting to and from the site each day, it would not add a significant number of trips to area roadways and would not cause a substantial increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

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

There is no adopted Congestion Management Plan (CMP) which covers the roadways in the project area (White 1999).

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

The project would not affect air traffic patterns.

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

No new design features or incompatible uses are proposed.

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

The project would not affect emergency access routes.

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

The existing structure has associated parking on-site. Permanent staff will park onsite. The remaining parking spaces will be adequate for visitors.

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

The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Setting

The project site is developed with a commercial/industrial structure in place. All utilities and service systems are available on-site. There is a fire hydrant at the northeast corner of the site. Water, gas, and sewer already serve the building. Electricity and telephone lines serving the structure have been installed underground. Policies contained in the West Sacramento General Plan regarding utilities and service systems do not apply to this project as service already exists.

Evaluation

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

The project would require wastewater services for on-site restroom facilities that would only be used by the three permanent staff members. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB.

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

The project involves the use of an existing light industrial structure and will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment 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 project involves the use of an existing light industrial structure and will not require or 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 project involves the use of an existing light industrial structure. The project would require water services for on-site restroom facilities resulting in minimal water use. The project would require water services for on-site restroom facilities that would be used by the three permanent staff members. No significant effects on current water supplies are anticipated.

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

The project involves the use of an existing light industrial structure that is already served by municipal wastewater services. The project would continue to be served by municipal wastewater treatment services and would not require expansion of these services.

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

The project is served by the Yolo County landfill in Woodland, California. The permitted daily capacity of the landfill is 1,800 tons. The average daily intake is approximately 500 tons (Nelson 1999). The project would be permanently staffed by three people who would generate a very small quantity of waste on a daily basis. The proposed project would generate an estimated 600 cubic yards (approximately 400 tons) of solid waste over the course of several days during construction of the facility. Solid waste generated on-site during both construction and operation could be accommodated in the designated landfill.

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

The project would not generate significant amounts of solid waste and will comply with all 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 Comiskey, Ph.D., Ecology (23 years experience)
BHE Environmental, Inc.
11733 Chesterdale Road, Cincinnati, OH 45246
Phone: (513) 326-1500 Fax: (513) 326-15650

Engineering:

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

Hydrology/Geology/Hazardous Materials:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Noise/Air Quality:

Christopher Jensen, S.M., Atmospheric Science (1 year experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
5052 Commercial Circle, Concord, CA 94520
Phone: (925) 688-1200 Fax: (925) 688-0388

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, 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.

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

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

California Department of Transportation. Accessed at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/ scenic/1.htm, Updated November 11, 1999.

California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG). *Urban Geology, Master Plan for California*, Bulletin 198, 1971.

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

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

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

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

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

-----. *Emissions, Air Quality, and Modeling Data*, Accessed at http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/ aqe&m.htm, Updated September 7, 1999.

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

Caterpillar Corporation. *Generator Emissions Guarantee*, 1999.

Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation. *Locality Record for Fossil Site V-3915,* On file at University of California Museum of Paleontology, Berkeley, 1979.

Jefferson, G.T. *A Catalogue of Late Quaternary Vertebrates from California: Part Two, Mammals,* Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Technical Reports Number 7, 1991.

Jennings, C.W., and Strand, R.G., Compilers. *Geologic Map of California, Ukiah Sheet,* California Division of Mines and Geology, 1960.

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

Mason, R.D., Chambers Group. 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: Sacramento Terminal, in the City of West Sacramento, Yolo County, California,* Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, for Level 3 Project Office, Pleasanton, CA, November 1999b.

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

Nelson, Wendy, Operations Manager, Yolo County Landfill. Interviewed by Lisa Chen, Chambers Group Inc., Irvine, CA, September 2, 1999.

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

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

Rikala, Steve, Senior Planner, City of West Sacramento. Interviewed by Lisa Chen, Chambers Group Inc., Irvine, CA, September 2, 1999.

Sacramento, City of. *General Plan*, January 19, 1998.

Saucedo, G.J., and Wagner, D.L., Compilers. *Geologic Map of the Chico Quadrangle*, *1:250,000*, California Division of Mines and Geology, Regional Geologic Map Series, Map No. 7A, 1982.

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.

Thomas Brothers Maps, Inc. *The Thomas Guide, Sacramento and Sacramento County*, 1999 Edition.

United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. *Inundation Map of Folsom and Nimbus Dams*, 1975.

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

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

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

-----. *NEPA Checklist*, Sacramento ILA, 1999.

Wagner, D.L., Jennings, C.W., Bedrossian, T.L., and Bortugno, E.J., Compilers. *Geologic Map of the Sacramento Quadrangle*, *1:250,000*, California Division of Mines and Geology, Regional Geologic Map Series, Map No. 1A, 1981.

West Sacramento, City of. General Plan, 1996.

-----. *Zoning Code,* 1996.

White, Sandra, Planner, City of West Sacramento. Interviewed by Lisa Chen, Chambers Group Inc., September 3, 1999 and by Christopher Jensen, TRC, November 23, 1999.

Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD). *Air Quality Handbook*, 1996.

-----. *YSAQMD Rules*, Accessed at http://arbis.arb.ca.gov/DRDB/YS/CURHTML/, 1999.

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Photo A South Face of Building and Railroad Berm at Southern Boundary of Site
Photo B Portion of the Building to be Occupied by Level 3
Photo C View of the North Face of Building Looking Southwest

Attachments

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