Appendix A -- No. 17

PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Site name: Stockton ILA

Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission

Prepared by
Level 3 Communications, LLC

Table of Contents

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

Tables

Figures

Photo Plates

Attachments

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Facility Title:
Level 3 Long-Haul Network, Stockton ILA

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, 2079 Miner Avenue, is located in Stockton, San Joaquin County, CA. The parcel is approximately 1.0 acre in size and contains a 25,000 square-foot concrete building. Access is provided from Miner Avenue to the south (See Figure 1, Regional Map; Figure 2, Vicinity Map; Figure 3, Parcel Map; Figure 4, U.S.G.S. Quad Map; Figure 5, Surrounding Land Use Map; and Figure 6, Photo Key Map and referenced photos).

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

6. General Plan Designation: Heavy Industrial

7. Zoning: Light Industrial (M-1)

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

The Stockton ILA will be constructed within an existing building located on a developed 1.0-acre site at 2079 Miner Road. The building encompasses approximately 25,000 square feet of the parcel and retrofitting of finished office space is required. The shell will remain intact with the new electronics installed within. A separate generator structure will be constructed at the east side of the property utilizing a new engineered concrete pad.

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

The proposed ILA station will be engineered for the utilization of the available building space. No prefabricated ILA huts will be used at this location.

No additional buildings will be constructed. Control and maintenance functions will occur within the proposed facilities. Parking space and a driveway providing access from Miner Road exists to support site maintenance activities. Fencing around the ILA facility will be of chain link construction and will be eight feet tall. A locked gate will restrict access to the site.

The Stockton ILA will require electricity and telephone. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are present. Normal electrical power will be provided, consisting of 400-amp, 480-volt, three-phase service. Water and sewer hookups are in place, although not required because the site will not be permanently staffed. Site grading is not anticipated nor will there be any net change in impervious surfaces. Thus, no changes in storm water drainage characteristics are anticipated. Fire protection equipment will be installed per local codes.

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

There will be no site development, including no grading for placement of the generator shelter or for access and parking. Upgrading of the generator foundation will be engineered and completed prior to delivery of prefabricated components (i.e., shelter placement), placement of the fiber optic cable line, and installation of utility connections. Erection of any additional perimeter fencing will occur prior to all improvements.

The fiber optic cable feed to the ILA will be from the railroad right-of-way (ROW), located one block west of the site (Figure 7). The running line will enter the southern portion of the property from the railroad ROW via Miner Road. The connection to the ILA facility will be installed at a depth of approximately 42 inches either by plowing in the conduit (which does not require a trench) or by digging a trench, laying the conduit, and back-filling.

The offices within the building will be retrofitted. Retrofitting debris from the building in addition to some asphalt removed for the generator pad upgrade will require disposal. The estimated volume of demolition debris is 265 cubic yards. During construction, no offsite areas will be required for mobilization or parking of construction or worker vehicles.

One 300-kilowatt (kW), 449-horsepower (hp) diesel-powered generator will provide emergency power. The pre-cast concrete generator housing or shelter will be approximately 12 feet wide, 24 feet long (288 square feet), and 10 feet high. It will arrive pre-assembled and will be installed on an improved concrete foundation. Insulation will be provided as needed for noise abatement. The generator will be mounted on a 1,000-gallon, double-walled, aboveground storage tank that is 13 feet long by 8 feet wide by 1 foot 9 inches 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). The tank system design incorporates a high fuel alarm (local) and a tank rupture alarm (remote).

During operation at 100-percent load, the 449-hp generator consumes approximately 22 gallons of diesel fuel per hour (gph). At 75 percent load, fuel consumption rate is 16.5 gph. During most of the 30 minutes of testing and maintenance run time each week, the generators will run at 50-percent load. However, for the purpose of this "worst-case" calculation, Level 3 assumes a 75-percent load and 30 hours of run time each year (i.e., 1/2-hour/week times 52 weeks, plus 4 hours contingency). Therefore, 30 hours per year multiplied by 16.5 gph equals 495 gallons of diesel fuel consumption per year for testing and maintenance. Testing of the emergency generator will be controlled remotely, and will not be part of site maintenance activities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The project is located in a developed industrial area. Surrounding development is industrial in nature and similar in character to the project site.

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The site is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Stockton.

The zoning designation for the project site is Light Industrial (M-1). The proposed project is a permitted use in the M-1 zoning district and would not require land use permits. The project site is located in a City-designated Enterprise Zone. This zone entitles the project to a discount on building permit fees and an expedited permitting process.

Under San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) Rule 2010, installation and operation of an emergency standby generator requires an authority to construct permit and a permit to operate. The construction and operation of the standby generator must be in accordance with SJVUAPCD's Rule 2201 which requires Best Available Control Technology ("BACT") to minimize nitrogen oxide ("NO_x") and volatile organic compound ("VOC") emissions, precursors to ozone.

Specific local policies relevant to each of the 16 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 Stockton ILA site. All potential impacts can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of Level 3's Environmental Commitments.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

Setting

The project site is approximately 1 acre in size and is developed with a 25,000 square foot industrial warehouse building. The building covers the majority of the site; the area surrounding the building is paved. There is no landscaping or other vegetation on the site.

The project site fronts on Miner Avenue. A loading area with four rollup doors is located at the front (south face) of the building, and an access driveway runs along the eastern edge of the site.

The project is located in a developed industrial area. Surrounding development is industrial in nature and similar in character to the project site. The project site is visible from Miner Avenue directly in front of the site and approaching the site from the east and west from approximately 150 yards. The site is not visible from any other roadways due to surrounding industrial development. Miner Avenue is not designated as a State or Local Scenic Highway.

The visual character of the site is not proposed to change with implementation of the proposed project. All improvements to the building for the ILA use would be to the interior of the building. Because only interior improvements to an existing industrial building are proposed, no local policies for aesthetics would apply.

Evaluation

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

The project site is located on a developed parcel in a developed industrial area. There are no scenic vistas in the project area.

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

The project site is not visible from a state scenic highway. There are no scenic resources on the site or within the surrounding area.

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 proposed project involves the reuse of an existing building for an ILA station. No changes to the visual character of the site or the surrounding area are proposed.

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 proposed project involves the reuse of a developed industrial site for an ILA station. No new sources of light or glare are proposed.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is located in an urbanized area, characterized by industrial development. The site is presently developed with a 25,000 square foot industrial warehouse building. The site is not currently in agricultural use, nor has it been used for agriculture recently. The site is not located on Prime Farmland (Larrouy, 1999), nor is it under a Williamson Act contract (Larrouy, 1999). There are no local policies for agricultural resources which apply to the project site.

Evaluation

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

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

b)	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	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 Stockton. 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 ILA site would not result in growth-inducing effects or other off-site changes to the environment which would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY

Throughout California, the fiber optic cable line will be installed along existing utility corridors in support of the Long-Haul network. In the City of Stockton, an Inline Light Amplification (ILA) station referred to as the Stockton ILA will be constructed outside of a utility corridor in support of the Long-Haul network. To minimize potential environmental impacts, the ILA facility will be constructed in an existing building at a previously developed site. The ILA facility is the subject of this air quality checklist analysis.

The ILA facility will tie into the fiber optic line along the ROW. The connection to the ILA facility will be installed via direct boring or trenching which will extend approximately 540 feet to tie into the line running along the railroad ROW.

The Stockton ILA Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately 1.0 acres. Project activities include site preparation to construct the generator pad, construction of the ILA equipment supports in the existing 25,000 square foot building, installation of equipment, automated testing of the emergency generators, trenching onsite for innerduct, and approximately weekly trips of one vehicle to the site for maintenance and data logging. Site development will not be required as this site will have the equipment installed in an existing building (except for the emergency generator) and utilize existing parking areas.

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

- Estimate of one-way commuting distance (miles) that members of the demolition and construction crews will travel to the construction site and numbers of such trips.
- Equipment (e.g., graders, dump trucks, excavators, and water trucks) that will be used at the site. Included are the size (in gross horsepower (hp)) and number of units of each type of equipment, and the numbers of hours per day and days that each piece of equipment will operate.
- Material delivery vehicles (e.g., concrete trucks) are represented in terms of number of trips per day, total number of trips, and number of one-way miles traveled.
- The amount of material (soil) that will be disturbed during trenching operations at the proposed site as well as during installation of the innerduct between the ROW and the site.

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

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

Table 3 shows the emission factors and other parameters used to calculate exhaust and fugitive PM_{10} emissions for mobile equipment (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1996). Construction and operation emission thresholds for NO_x, VOC, PM_{10}, SO_x, and CO are listed in Table 3, as provided by the San Joaquin

Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD). This agency is responsible for management of air emissions in the San Joaquin Valley where the Stockton ILA site resides. In addition to the Stockton ILA, 3 other PEA facilities (Hanford, Fresno, and Bakersfield) are located in the San Joaquin Valley and are under the jurisdiction of the SJVUAPCD.

Setting

The project site is located in the City of Stockton in San Joaquin County. The county is within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin and is currently designated as a nonattainment area for state and national one-hour average ozone standards and for state and national respirable particulate matter ("PM_{10}") standards (California EPA, 1998). There are a number of commercial establishments and residences located adjacent to the site (Figure 8). The distance of the closest sensitive receptor to the nearest boundary of the site is 464 feet.

Based on monitoring data collected within San Joaquin County during the 3 -year period of 1995-1997, maximum ozone concentrations exceeded the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone (0.12 parts per million for one hour) on an average of approximately 1 day per year. The same maximum concentrations exceeded the more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standard (0.09 parts per million for one hour) on an average of 34 days per year (California EPA, 1996-1998). The ozone problem in San Joaquin County is primarily due to stationary sources, mobile sources (motor vehicles), agricultural sources, and occasionally from transport of pollutants from the San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento Valley Air Basins (California EPA, 1996-1998).

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

The Federal Clean Air Act and California Clean Air Act require plans to be developed for areas designated as nonattainment of the national and state ozone standards, including strategies for attaining the standards. No plans are required for areas designated as nonattainment of state PM_{10} standards. There are 3 applicable air quality plans for the project area, two related to the state and national ozone standards, and one related to the national PM_{10} standard.

The applicable ozone air quality plans are the Federal Ozone Attainment Demonstration and the State Ozone Air Quality Attainment Plan (SJVUAPCD, December 1998). The state ozone plan identifies the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin as both a source and receptor of transported ozone. The applicable PM_{10} air quality plan is the Federal PM_{10} Attainment Demonstration Plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation

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

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

Since the site will use an existing building and associated paved access roads and driveways, grading activities and travel of heavy equipment over temporary roads will not be necessary; as such, fugitive dust will not be generated in a significant amount during the construction phase (Table 3). The only expected construction activity at this site is the preparation of a 300 square foot area for the emergency generator enclosure. Any fugitive dust generated will vary in amount from day to day, depending on the level and type of activity (e.g. trenching and vehicular traffic bringing materials to the site), the silt content of the soil (during trenching activities), and the weather. Any fugitive dust generated will be controlled in a manner consistent with the applicable air quality plans by implementing effective dust control measures throughout the construction phase, as required by Regulation VIII. Long-term fugitive dust emissions associated with facility operation will be negligible.

The project will include use of existing on-site paved roads and driveways to provide access directly to the building and equipment.

Generator testing and the visiting technician vehicle will contribute operational air emissions as shown in Table 3. The generator will be constructed and operated in a manner consistent with existing air quality plans by fully complying with the requirements of Rule 2010, and particularly meeting the BACT requirements of Rule 2201. Operation of the emergency standby generator will be in compliance with the offset requirements of Rule 2201 because it will be operated less than 200 hours per year, will not be used in con-

junction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program, and will be fully documented with regard to duration of use.

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

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

- Obtain an authority to construct and permit to operate the emergency standby generator under SJVUAPCD Rule 2010;
- Construct and operate the generator under BACT in accordance with SJVUAPCD's Rule 2201 to minimize NO_x and VOC emissions. Based on SJVUAPCD guidance, BACT for NO_x emissions will include a turbocharger with intercooler/aftercooler and engine timing retard by a minimum of four degrees from the manufacturer's standard timing, or a maximum emission rate of 7.2 grams of NO_x per horsepower-hour (Paul, 1999). BACT for VOC emissions will include positive crankcase ventilation and use of fuel satisfying reformulated diesel specification established by the Air Resources Board; and
- Obtain an offset exemption for the emergency standby generator as provided by Rule 2201and document that the generator will not and does not operate more than 200 hours per year and will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program.

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

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

As discussed above, the Stockton ILA Site lies in an area designated as nonattainment of the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and PM_{10}.

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

The ILA site would be a permanent building facility occupying approximately 1.0 acre. Site development would be limited to installation of the standby generator in a new enclosure and the installation of the ILA equipment inside in an existing building. The access road/parking already exists and is paved. Construction activities will require up to two months to complete. Construction of the project would generate fugitive dust (including PM_{10} but also larger-diameter particulate), and other criteria air pollutants from exhaust emissions basically limited to trenching and grading activities and material delivery (such as cement) by truck. Air quality impacts from fugitive dust emissions during construction will be temporary and intermittent.

Estimates of construction-related engine emissions are shown in Table 3. For pollutants with annual numerical thresholds (i.e., $NO_x$and VOC), these total project emissions will be less than two percent of the regulatory limit. Based on the assumption that only one piece of heavy equipment will be used at any one time during the construction phase, maximum daily emissions of PM10, SO_x, and CO (associated with the most polluting piece(s) of equipment) were also small compared to the numerical thresholds (see Table 3).

Fugitive dust emissions during site construction activities are shown in Table 3. There are no numerical thresholds for fugitive dust (PM_{10}) from construction activities. Instead, SJVUAPCD Rule 8020 requires dust control measures to be implemented during construction. As discussed under III(a) above, Level 3 will implement a comprehensive series of dust control measures to manage fugitive dust during construction.

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

Daily emissions estimates for operation of the proposed 300 kW emergency standby engine are shown in Table 3. Estimated annual operation emissions for this generator, assuming a total annual run time of 30 hours for testing and maintenance, are also shown in Table 3. Because the emergency standby generator will operate for less than 200 hours annually, it is exempt from compliance with numerical thresholds associated with offset requirements (Table 3). Additional VOC emissions from the aboveground diesel storage tank will be negligible because of its integral construction, infrequent filling, and strict adherence to procedures to avoid spillage during tank filling.

Additional operation emissions associated with weekly site visits of one vehicle will be minor (Table 3).

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

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

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

- Dust emissions from all disturbed areas, including storage piles that are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, will be effectively stabilized using water, chemical stabilizer or suppressant or vegetative cover.
- Dust emissions from all on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads will be effectively stabilized using water or chemical stabilizer or suppressant.
- Fugitive dust emissions from all land-clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land-leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities will be effectively controlled by watering during these activities or presoaking.
- When materials are transported off-site, all material will be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or kept below at least 6 inches of freeboard space from the top of the container.
- All operations will limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. Dry rotary brushes will not be used except when preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Blower devices will not be used.
- Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, fugitive dust emissions from the piles will be effectively stabilized utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer or suppressant.

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

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

Simultaneous construction at all 4 sites will not exceed the annual or daily numerical thresholds (Table 4), and therefore, the potential impact of the four sites on air quality in the SJVUAPCD will not be significant.

Because construction of the enclosure to the emergency generator will affect an area of only 300 square feet within the 1.0 acre site, surrounding uses will be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 9 for the "development window"). This buffer will help minimize the possibility that the project will cause a cumulatively significant short-term PM_{10} impact from simultaneous and unrelated construction projects taking place within the same general area.

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

The project's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect of additional emissions sources on the regional ozone and PM_{10} concentrations will not be cumulatively considerable because ozone impacts are the result of the cumulative emissions from numerous sources in the region and transport from outside the region. All but the largest individual sources emit VOCs and NO_x in amounts too small to make a measurable effect on ambient ozone concentrations.

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

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities that house children, elderly, and ill members of the population, such as schools, day-care centers, hospitals, retirement homes, hospices, and residences. The nearest sensitive receptors to the ILA site are residences (Figure 8) which qualify as sensitive receptors. The distance of the closest sensitive receptor to the nearest boundary of the site is 464 feet.

Project construction would affect an area of about 0.1 acre within the larger 1.0 acre site; therefore, receptors associated with surrounding uses would be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "conceptual plot plan"). This buffer, along with the low levels of construction emissions, would prevent substantial pollutant concentrations from reaching sensitive receptors. Through application of fugitive dust control measures outlined above, these emissions will be kept below a level of significance.

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

the vicinity of the sensitive receptors will be minimal.

The emergency generator will produce operation emissions during testing and power outages. Two factors prevent these emissions from significantly affecting sensitive receptors. First, the generator will not be located in close proximity to sensitive receptors due to the establishment of buffer zones where development will be excluded (see Figure 7 for the "conceptual plot plan"). Second, generator usage will be restricted to one-half hour per week or less and not more than 30 hour per year. These measures will assure that sensitive receptors are not exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Setting

A 25,000 square foot warehouse (Sulivan Construction Co.) currently occupies the project site. The site includes a building and parking lot surrounded by a chainlink fence. The site is surrounded by similar warehouse development.

The site is heavily disturbed and supports no native habitat.

Evaluation

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

A list of sensitive species that potentially could occur on the project site was created based upon a California Natural Diversity Database search and knowledge of the project area. Table 5 includes these species and their potential for occurrence onsite (Stockton West Quadrangle, California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999).

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

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

This site does not support any riparian vegetation or other sensitive natural habitat. No sensitive habitat has been identified by local or state agencies.

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

The site and project vicinity are not characterized by containing any jurisdictional waterways or vernal pool habitat (See Figure 9; Vista Information Solutions, Inc., 1999).

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 this site is located within a wildlife movement corridor or provides any significant nursery resources.

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 biological resources onsite that would likely be protected under any local policy or ordinance.

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

There are no biological resources onsite that would likely be protected under any habitat conservation plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The property is located in the northern San Joaquin Valley on level terrain. The property is in the eastern part of the City of Stockton. The property contains a recently built commercial/warehouse structure and the rest of the parcel is paved.

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

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

Evaluation

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

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

Level 3 archaeologists requested a records search for the proposed Stockton ILA site, and the lands within a one mile radius, from the Central California Information Center at California State University, Stanislaus, in Turlock. 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 Facility. The records search was conducted by Information Center staff who also checked the OHP Historic Property Data File for San Joaquin County, which includes the National Register of Historic Places (listings and eligibility determinations), California Register of Historical Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, and Historic Property Directory, as well as the Caltrans Local Bridge Survey, Survey of Surveys, GLO Plats, and other historic data available at the Center.

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 San Joaquin County, notifying them of the Level 3 project activities, and requesting information they might have on sacred lands. Any response indicating the possible presence of Sacred Lands will be followed up with a detailed, site-specific evaluation utilizing the expertise of the relevant

Native American contacts. The results of this effort are fully documented, as appropriate, in the supporting technical report (Mason, 1999b).

The results of the records search (File No. 3546 L) showed that the parcel had not been previously surveyed for historic resources (California Historical Resources Information System, Central California Information Center, 1999). There is no exposed ground surface on the parcel where a field survey could be undertaken.

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

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

The records search from the Central California Information Center showed that the parcel had not been previously surveyed for archaeological resources (California Historical Resources Information System, Central California Center, 1999). There is no exposed ground surface on the parcel where a field survey could be undertaken. There are no archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources present on the property.

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 Rogers (1966), the project site is underlain by Quaternary basin deposits (unit Qb) which include the Modesto Formation. Although no fossil sites have been recorded in the immediate vicinity of the project site according to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Section, the University of California Museum of Paleontology, and Jefferson (1991a, -b), elsewhere in the northern San Joaquin Valley previously recorded late Pleistocene continental vertebrate fossil sites are reported from areas underlain by basin deposits, including the Modesto Formation (Firby and Schorn, 1993; Jefferson, 1991b; Strand and Koenig, 1965; Wagner and others, 1981). These fossil occurrences indicate that there is a potential for Pleistocene continental vertebrate fossil remains being encountered by construction-related earth-moving at the project site.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3's environmental commitment to performing paleontological monitoring during construction will allow for identification and recovery of any fossils that might be unearthed. As part of the monitoring plan, a preconstruction field survey of the project site will be conducted by a qualified paleontologist, construction-related earth moving will be monitored by the paleontologist or a qualified paleontologic construction monitor to allow for the recovery of larger fossil remains at newly discovered fossil sites, and a small rock sample will be submitted for microfossil analysis. All recovered fossil remains will be fully treated (prepared, identified by knowledgeable paleontologists, curated, catalogued) and, along with associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data, placed in a recognized museum repository. The paleontologist will prepare a final report of findings that includes an inventory of recovered fossil remains. These measures would be in compliance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995, 1996) guidelines for mitigating construction-related impacts on paleontologic resources and for the museum acceptance of a monitoring program fossil collection.

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

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Setting

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone (California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG), 1999). The Stockton area is noted for low groundshaking associated with faults that may rupture with sufficient magnitude to affect Stockton. There are no active faults within 20 miles of the City of Stockton (i.e., displacement occurred within the last 11,000 years).

The site is not within a landslide, subsidence, liquefaction, or erosion geologic hazard area. However, the County of San Joaquin contains highly expansive soils (CDMG, 1973). The soils in the site vicinity are highly expansive. Also, due to groundwater withdrawal in the site vicinity, the site is within a subsidence area.

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 would not be inhabited, and is not located in an Alquist-Priolo earthquake zone (CDMG, 1999). The site is not subject to ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides (CDMG, 1973). A 10% probability of peak ground accelerations of 10 to 20% g in 50 years is expected in the site vicinity (CDMG, 1996). Any potential seismic hazard would be mitigated 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 and paved, 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.

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

The area in which the site is located has highly expansive soils. The Proponent would mitigate any potential impacts associated with these soils through compliance with structural and design regulations. The project would comply with the Uniform Building Code, and all local design, construction, and safety standards. Thus, no impacts would occur.

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

Because the ILA facility would not be occupied and does not require water or sewer service, septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal is not required.

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

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

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

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

No schools are located within one-quarter mile of the site. The equipment enclosure would be a nondescript prefabricated and secured building and would not represent an attractive nuisance.

d)	Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact ☐	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 groundwater recharge area (San Joaquin County General Plan, 1992). The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (Vista Information Solutions, FEMA floodplain map, NEPA Checklist, 1999). The site would be subject to inundation if either the Camanche Dam or New Hogan Dam were to fail (San Joaquin County General Plan, 1992). The site is not located within an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (see Section VIII (j) for a full explanation).

The ILA site in Stockton is not anticipated to significantly modify drainage of stormwater from the site. The site includes a 25,000 square foot building while the remainder of the site is paved. Construction proposed herein will not increase impermeable surface or alter existing drainage. However, any additional stormwater drainage measures that may be included in the ILA facility will be installed in accordance with County of San Joaquin 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 Stockton ILA site.

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

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

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

Although the area of disturbed ground on the Stockton ILA site will be less than 5 acres, and will therefore be less than the minimum size requirement for a SWPPP, the cumulative area of the total ILA, 3R, Terminal, and Distribution Node sites associated with this project is greater than five acres. Accordingly, an NOI will be submitted, and a SWPPP will be prepared.

Evaluation

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

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

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

The project will not extract groundwater, therefore, groundwater supplies will not be depleted, nor will the project interfere with groundwater recharge. The site is not located in an area of substantial groundwater recharge as defined in the *San Joaquin County General Plan, July 29, 1992*.

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 area will be returned to its original condition and ILA electronics 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 area will be returned to its original condition and ILA electronics 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 run-off water because the ILA will be placed inside an existing building. Existing site drainage will not be altered.

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

No impacts to water quality are expected as a result of this project. 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 (Vista Information Solutions, FEMA floodplain map, NEPA Checklist, 1999).

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

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

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

The site would be subject to inundation if either the Camanche Dam or New Hogan Dam were to fail (San Joaquin County Plan, 1992). The General Plan acknowledges that the risk of flooding from dam failure is considered very low, because the likelihood of dam failure is low. The San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services has prepared a Dam Failure Plan which provides direction of flood waters, responsibilities, and actions of individual jurisdictions and evacuation plans. In the event of dam failure, the site would be inundated within approximately three hours (Table III.B-1, General Plan, 1992). Installation of the ILA would not expose people to a significant risk because the facility would not be occupied.

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

Since the site would be subject to inundation if either the Camanche Dam or the New Hogan Dam were to fail, (San Joaquin County Plan, 1992), it is subject to impact if a seiche was released from these dams. In the event of a seiche, personnel within the facility will comply with the Dam Failure Plan cited in (i) above. The facility will not be permanently staffed. A person will be in the facility only once per week and for a short period of time to perform maintenance. The probability of impact to human life from a seiche is therefore, minimal. The site is too far from the ocean to be impacted by a tsunami. Since the site is located on flat, developed land and is surrounded for several miles by flat land, the potential for impact by a mudflow is minimal.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

Setting

The City of Stockton General Plan land use designation for the project site is "Heavy Industrial". This land use category provides for a wide variety of industrial uses, including offices, retail sales, service businesses, public and quasi-public uses, and other similar and compatible uses. Residential uses are prohibited in the heavy industrial land use category. The surrounding properties are also designated for heavy industrial uses.

The zoning designation for the project site is Light Industrial (M-1). The M-1 zoning district includes most industrial uses, including heavy industry. The proposed project is a permitted use in the M-1 zoning district and would not require land use permits. Building permits would be required prior to construction (Larrouy, 1999).

The project site is located in a City-designated Enterprise Zone. This zone entitles the project to a discount on building permit fees and an expedited permitting process. There are no other City Enterprise Zone policies which apply to the proposed project.

Evaluation

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

The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing industrial site for an ILA facility. 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 Stockton designates the project site for industrial use. The proposed project is a permitted use under the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The project would conform to all applicable land use plans and policies and the only permitting required by the City would be a building permit.

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 ☒

The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing warehouse building in an established industrial area. No vegetation is present on the site. There are no habitat conservation plans or community conservation plans which apply to the project site.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is not in an area designated by the State or the City of Stockton for known mineral resources (San Joaquin County, 1992). There are no local policies for mineral resources which 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 site is not designated as having locally important mineral resources.

XI. NOISE

Setting

The Stockton ILA Site is located in a developed industrial/commercial area of the City of Stockton in San Joaquin County (Figure 2). The area is designated "heavy industrial" in the City of Stockton General Plan. The zoning designation is Light Industrial (M-1). An existing 25,000 square foot building is present on the site, and will be utilized to house the ILA facility. Approximately 60 percent of the 1-acre site is covered by the building. The nearest receptors are industrial uses located on the adjacent parcels to the north and east (Figure 8). Other industrial uses are located adjacent to the west and east, and 100 feet to the south. The nearest sensitive receptor (a residence) is located 464 feet from the facility.

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

The Stockton ILA Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately 0.6 acre. Project activities include limited site preparation to construct the generator pad outside the building, removal of some building materials, construction of the ILA pads within the building, installation of equipment, trenching onsite for innerduct, automated testing of the emergency generators, and a weekly trip of one vehicle to the site for maintenance and data logging. The standard shelter for an ILA generator housing is a pre-cast concrete building measuring approximately 12 feet wide, 24 feet long and 10 feet high placed on a concrete pad.

Noise will be generated from both construction and operation of the ILA facility. Noise from off-site construction activities, associated with personnel vehicles and material delivery and 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.

Table 3 provides relevant information on construction and operation activities and equipment contributing to noise. Included is the size, in gross horsepower (hp), of each type of heavy construction equipment and the numbers of hours per day that each piece of equipment will operate. A key assumption implicit in the evaluation of noise impacts is that only one piece of heavy equipment will operate at a time. Therefore, maximum construction noise level at each site was based on the loudest piece of construction equipment. This maximum potential noise (at full engine power) for normally-muffled diesel-powered construction equipment of up to 200 hp, measured at 50 feet, is 84 dBA (U.S. EPA, 1971). Detailed methodologies, algorithms, and assumptions associated with the noise analysis are provided as Attachment A.

San Joaquin County (1992) restricts construction activities to the period 7 am to 7 pm on days except for Sunday. There are no numerical thresholds for noise from construction sites set by San Joaquin County or the City of Stockton. The City of Stockton limits operation noise levels to a CNEL of 80 dBA or less as measured at the property line of an industrial or commercial noise source.

Operational parameters related to noise include the size/gross hp, placement, and period of operation (30 minutes/week) of the emergency standby generator (Table 3). The generator will be installed at least 5 feet from the property line. It will be automatically tested weekly. Level 3 will install the generator in a specially-insulated shelter that limits noise levels to 85 dBA at a distance of 5 feet from the enclosure.

The noise level at the property line closest to the generator was estimated to be 68 dBA CNEL. This will comply with the applicable noise ordinance.

Evaluation

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

The project would not generate noise levels in excess of local standards during construction because no numerical standards apply. Therefore, no regulatory-based threshold will be exceeded. Level 3 will comply with the local construction-related noise ordinance by restricting construction activities to the period 7 am to 7 pm. Because the facility will utilize prefabricated and existing structures, the construction period will be less than one month as shown in Table 3.

The estimated operational noise level at the property line closest to the generator will be 68 dBA CNEL. This level is well below with City of Stockton limits for noise in industrial areas (80 dBA CNEL). Because construction and operation of the facility will comply with all local noise standards, there will be no significant impact.

Site Specific Environmental Commitments:

- Level 3 will comply with local construction-related noise ordinances by restricting construction activities to the period 7 am to 7 pm; and
- Level 3 will install the generator in a noise-insulating shelter that reduces noise levels to 85 dBA at a distance of 5 feet from the enclosure, and will set the shelter back at least 5 feet from the nearest property line.

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 of groundborne vibration and noise generated during construction will be short term in nature, and generally will not extend more than a few feet from the active work area. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact from groundborne vibrations.

The 300 kW generator is the only potential source of excessive groundborne noise or vibration from the site operations. The generator will be mounted on rubber isolators that effectively reduce groundborne vibration (Ace Mountings Company, Inc., 1999). Additionally, the vibration isolator reduces structure-borne noise by interrupting noise transmission paths caused by "sounding-board" effect. Hence, groundborne noise and vibration are reduced to levels less than significant.

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

Construction noise will be temporary, lasting less than 2 months. Operation noise, emitted during 30 minutes each week to test the generator, and during power outages, would be temporary and below the regulatory threshold.

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

Temporary increases in ambient noise levels will occur during the short construction period. These increases would comply with the local construction noise ordinance, and hence, would not be significant. Temporary (30 minutes) and periodic (weekly) noise will be generated during testing of the emergency generator, and during power outages and periodic maintenance. These temporary, periodic noises would comply with the noise ordinance limits for operation noise from an industrial source. Hence, the temporary noise would not be a substantial increase in ambient noise levels.

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

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

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

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

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Setting

The project site is located in the City of Stockton, with a population of 242,445 as of 1995 (Larrouy, 1999). The project site is developed with one industrial warehouse building and is located in a developed industrial area. The nearest housing is located near the corner of Lindsay Street and D Street, approximately 0.25 mile from the project site. There are no local policies for population and housing which 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 reuse of an existing industrial warehouse building. The project would be unmanned, and would not induce new employment. 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 reuse of an existing warehouse building in a developed 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 reuse of an existing warehouse building and would not displace any people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The project is located within the City of Stockton. Fire and police protection are provided by the City of Stockton. The nearest fire department is approximately 0.5 mile away on Marsh Street, near its intersection with Laurel Street. The nearest police station is the police headquarters at Market Street and El Dorado Street.

Public facilities within one mile of the project include several schools (Fremont Middle School, Fillmore School, Martin Luther King School, and two private schools) and parks (Stribley Park, Sousa Park, and Constitution Park).

There are no local policies for public services which apply to the proposed project or project site.

Evaluation

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

The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing warehouse building in a developed industrial area. The proposed ILA facility would be unmanned and would be visited approximately weekly by one or two employees for maintenance. The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities nor affect response time or other performance objectives.

XIV. RECREATION

Setting

Three parks are located within approximately one mile of the project site. Stribley Park is located approximately 0.5 mile south of the project site, near the intersection of Hazelton Avenue and B Street. Sousa Park is located approximately 0.5 mile east of the project site, near the intersection of Yellowstone Avenue and David Avenue. Constitution Park is located approximately 0.5 mile west of the project site, near the intersection of Pilgrim Street and Lindsay Street. There are no local policies for recreation which 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 ☒

The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing warehouse building for an unmanned ILA facility. The proposed project does not involve residential uses and would not cause an increase in the population of the City of Stockton. No increase in the demand for, or use of, existing parks or recreational facilities would result from implementation of the proposed project.

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

The proposed project involves the reuse of an existing warehouse building for an unmanned ILA facility. The proposed project would not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Setting

Miner Avenue borders the project site on the south. The nearest cross street to project site is A Street. Miner Avenue is designated as an Urban Collector in the City of Stockton General Plan (Larrouy, 1999). Urban Collectors provide local service to arterial highways. Collectors are generally two-lane roads with a 60'-70' ROW. The Stockton General Plan does not provide existing or projected Average Daily Traffic (ADT) for collector streets.

Evaluation

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

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

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

The proposed project is the reuse of an existing warehouse building as an unmanned ILA facility. One to two service personnel would visit the site approximately weekly for maintenance. The project would not result in a permanent increase in traffic load or daily trips because the project site would not be occupied on a daily basis.

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

The project would not affect air traffic patterns.

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

The proposed project is the reuse of an existing warehouse building as an unmanned ILA facility. Access to the site would be via the existing driveway. No changes to the site design are proposed, and the current design has no hazardous design features.

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

The project would not affect emergency access routes.

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

The project site has a small off-street parking area along Miner Street, and a paved parking and drive area along the eastern edge of the site. The project will be unmanned and visited approximately weekly by one to two service personnel. On-site parking capacity is adequate for the proposed use.

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 City of Stockton General Plan contains policies supporting pedestrian and bicycle transportation. These policies do not apply to the proposed project. The project does not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Setting

The project site contains an industrial warehouse building and is located in a developed industrial area. All utilities and service systems are available on-site. The project would involve the reuse of the existing building as an unmanned ILA facility.

A utility corridor with overhead power lines runs along the south side of Miner Avenue. No other utility facilities are visible from the street.

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 proposed project would be unmanned and would be visited by one or two service personnel approximately weekly for maintenance. The existing building has restroom facilities which could be used by service personnel during site visits. The project site will not be occupied on a daily basis and would not generate a significant amount of wastewater. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable 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 proposed project would be unmanned and would be visited by one or two service personnel approximately weekly for maintenance. The existing building has restroom facilities which could be used by service personnel during site visits. The project site will not be occupied on a daily basis and would not generate a significant amount of wastewater. The project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

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

The project would involve the reuse of an existing warehouse building on a developed industrial site. The project would not increase the burden on existing stormwater drainage facilities.

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

The proposed project would be unmanned and would be visited by one or two service personnel approximately weekly for maintenance. The existing building has restroom facilities which could be used by service personnel during site visits. The project site will not be occupied on a daily basis and would not demand a significant amount of water. The project would have sufficient water supplies from existing resources.

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

The proposed project would be unmanned and would be visited by one or two service personnel approximately weekly for maintenance. The existing building has restroom facilities which could be used by service personnel during site visits. The project site will not be occupied on a daily basis and would not generate a significant amount of wastewater. The project would not affect the wastewater treatment provider's existing commitments.

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 two landfills. The Austin Road Landfill, operated by the City of Stockton has a permitted capacity of 1,200 tons per day and an average daily intake of approximately 575 tons per day (Miller, 1999). The Forward Landfill, operated by Allied Waste Industries, has a permitted capacity of 4,100 tons per day (Miller, 1999). Information on the average daily intake at the Forward Landfill is unavailable. Both landfills have sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. The project would involve the reuse of an existing warehouse building as an unmanned ILA facility. The project would not generate solid waste on a daily basis. A small amount of construction-related solid waste (265 cubic yards or 180 tons) may result from the modification of the interior of the building.

The City of Stockton has an adopted Source Recycling and Reduction Element which contains policies to divert as much waste as possible from landfills. The City encourages the recycling of concrete during any construction within the City, and will require the project proponent to recycle as much construction-related waste as possible (Miller, 1999).

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 will involve the reuse of an existing warehouse building as an unmanned ILA facility. The project would not generate solid waste on a daily basis. A small amount of construction-related solid waste (265 cubic yards) may result from the modification of the interior of the building. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste.

Analysis Team

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

Technical Coordination:

Gary Finni Ph.D., Aquatic Entomology (22 years experience)
Charles 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/Analysis

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

Biological Resources: Field/Analysis

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

Biological Resources: Field

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

Noise/Air Quality

Steve Huvane, BS, Civil Engineering
Eric Walther, Ph.D., Atmospheric Science (32 years 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 '99, Geography, (5 years experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services
505 South Main, Suite 900, Orange, CA 92868
Phone: (714) 973-4918 Fax: (714) 973-0358

Sources

40 CFR Part 93. *Determining Conformity of Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans,* July 1993.

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

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

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

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

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

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

California Historical Resources Information System, Central California Center. *Records Search for Fiber Optic Cable In-Line Amplifier Station Site on the Stockton West and Stockton East 7.5-minute Quadrangle Maps in San Joaquin County,* File No. 3546 L, , Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, September 1, 1999.

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

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

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

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

Caterpillar Corp. *Generator Emissions Guarantee*, 1999.

Compass Maps, Inc. *Stockton*, 1998 Edition.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). *Standard Flood Hazard Determination, Stockton ILA Site,* 2079 Miner, Stockton, CA, 1999.

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

Jefferson, G.T. *A Catalogue of Late Quaternary Vertebrates from California: Part One, Nonmarine Lower Vertebrates and Avian Taxa*, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Technical Reports Number 5, 1991a.

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

Larrouy, Richard, Senior Planner, City of Stockton (209) 937-8266. Interviewed by Cheryl Kuta, Chambers Group Inc., August 25,1999, and September 3, 1999.

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

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

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

Miller, Mike, City of Stockton Public Works Department. Solid Waste Division (209) 937-8826. Interviewed by Cheryl Kuta, Chambers Group Inc., September 3, 1999.

Paul, Darren, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD). Interviewed by Mark Hagmann, ESA, April 1, 1999.

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

Rice, Tim, Caterpiller Dealer. Interviewed by David Agusutine, TRC, December 27, 1999.

Rogers, T.H., Compiler. *Geologic Map of California, San Jose Sheet*, California Division of Mines and Geology, 1966.

San Joaquin County. *General Plan 2010*, Volume I: Policies/Implementation, 1992.

San Joaquin Development Title Ordinance No. 3675, Chapter 9.1025.9, 1992.

-----. PM_{10} Attainment Demonstration Plan. 1997.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD). *PM_{10} Attainment Demonstration Plan*, 1997.

-----. *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts*, August 1998.

-----. *California Clean Air Quality Attainment Plan*, December 1998.

-----. *Rules & Regulations,* 1999.

Schomer and Associates. *Proposed Revisions to Property-Line-Noise-Source Measurement Procedures* Report No. ILENR/RE-EA-91/10, June 1991.

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

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

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

Stockton, City of. *General Plan Policy Document*, Adopted January 22, 1990.

-----. *General Plan Background Report*, Adopted January 22, 1990.

-----. *Summary of Zoning Classification*, Revised July 6, 1999.

Strand, G.G., and Koenig, J.B., Compilers. *Geologic Map of California, Sacramento Sheet,* California Division of Mines and Geology. 1965.

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, 1996.

Vista Information Solutions, Inc. *California Site Assessment Plus Report: Stockton,* August 11, 1999.

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

Vu, Grace, Engineering Technician, South Coast Air Quality Management District. Interviewed by Mark Hagman, ESA, May 4, 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.

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

Figures

Tables

.

Photo Plates

Photo A View Across Miner Avenue of South Face of Building
Photo B View Across Miner Avenue Showing South and East Face of Building and Access Driveway

Attachments

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