

5.19 Utilities and Service Systems

5.19.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed project corridors for the proposed project are located along Shasta County roads, many of which accommodate existing utility easements with aerial electrical distribution lines and buried telecommunications and water lines. Wired Internet service in the proposed project area is limited to dial-up. Cellular data service (3G, 4G, and 4GLTE) from Verizon, AT&T, and T-Mobile is available in portions of the proposed project area, as is HughesNet satellite Internet service.

Water Supply

The Clear Creek Community Services District (CCCSD) supplies water to the proposed project area. CCCSD was formed in 1961 and began operating in 1967. It encompasses approximately 14,314 acres and is located approximately 10 miles southwest of Redding and 6 miles west of Anderson in southern Shasta County. CCCSD's service area includes the rural areas of Olinda and Cloverdale. The general area served by CCCSD is commonly known as Happy Valley.

The source of CCCSD water is Whiskeytown Lake; water from the lake is treated and diverted to service connections via the Muletown Conduit, a facility of the Whiskeytown Reservoir, approximately 6.5 miles north of the proposed project area. The distribution system within CCCSD's boundaries consists of about 75 miles of pipe ranging in size from 2 to 45 inches.

CCCSD has one storage tank along the aqueduct, with a capacity of 1 million gallons. A control tank with a 250,000-gallon capacity regulates the pressure at the higher elevation of the district. Another 32,000-gallon storage tank is located outside of the district boundary at a booster station facility.

CCCSD currently provides municipal and industrial water to approximately 2,300 connections in the communities of Happy Valley, Olinda, and Igo (CCCSD 2018).

Wastewater

Wastewater in Shasta County is treated using one of several technical methods with either community or individual onsite disposal systems. All residential, commercial, and recreational developments located in the proposed project area use onsite septic tank/leachfield systems for wastewater treatment.

Other wastewater treatment systems in use elsewhere in the County include communal collection, treatment, and disposal, such as a treatment plant, which discharges treated effluent to a storage and irrigation system or, diluted, to a surface watercourse. Treatment plant systems are operated by the cities of Anderson, Redding, Red Bluff, and Shasta Lake. Several unincorporated communities in the county have community wastewater systems that are operated by community service areas; however, no community service area is established in the vicinity of the proposed project.

Stormwater

Drainage facilities in the proposed project area near developed communities include gutters, swales, ditches, culverts, storm drain inlets, catch basins, storm drainage pipes, and detention basins. Roads also channel stormwater drainage from residences and commercial and industrial facilities to adjacent lands and stormwater drains. Most drains have a single large exit at their point of discharge into a canal, river, lake, reservoir, sea, or ocean. Other than catchbasins, there are no treatment facilities in the piping system.

Solid Waste Disposal

The Shasta County Department of Public Works is responsible for providing solid waste management in unincorporated areas of the county, including Happy Valley, Igo, and Olinda. Shasta County currently has three landfills (West Central Landfill, Anderson Landfill, and Twin Bridges Landfill) and 10 transfer stations. In 2016, Shasta County disposed of approximately 177,337 tons of solid waste (CalRecycle 2018).

Waste Management, Inc., located at 8592 Commercial Way in Redding, California, provides solid waste collection and recyclable material processing services for the proposed project area (Waste Management, Inc. 2017). Table 5.19-1 provides information about the two closest landfills to the proposed project area.

Table 5.19-1 Landfills Serving the Project Area

Landfill	Max. Throughout (Tons/Day)	Max. Capacity (Cubic Yards)	Remaining Capacity (Cubic Yards/Date Recorded)	Expected Closing Year	Location	Wastes Accepted
Anderson Landfill	1,850	16,840,000	11,914,025 / March 16, 2008	2093	Approximately 2 miles southeast of proposed project area.	Agricultural, asbestos, friable, ash, construction/demolition, industrial, mixed municipal, sludge (BioSolids), tires, and wood waste
West Central Landfill	700	13,115,844	6,589,044 / December 1, 2013	2032	Approximately 2 miles southwest of proposed project area.	Agricultural, construction/demolition, industrial, mixed municipal, sludge (BioSolids), and tires.

Source: CalRecycle 2017.

The county adopted a Source Reduction and Recycling Element in 1991, which addresses the county’s waste generation characteristics, source reduction, recycling, composting, education, public information, funding, and integration of solid waste management. In addition, the County adopted a Household Hazardous Waste Element that supplements and supports the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (Shasta County 2004).

Electricity and Natural Gas

Pacific Gas and Electric Company provides the majority of the proposed project area with electrical and natural gas services. Some rural residences rely on propane gas deliveries.

5.19.2 Regulatory Setting

Federal

There are no federal regulations applicable to the proposed project with respect to utilities and service systems.

State

California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989. California's Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill [AB] 939) requires cities and counties to divert 50 percent of all solid waste from landfills as of January 1, 2000, through source reduction, recycling, and composting. AB 939 requires each city and county to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element to be submitted to the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), in an effort to meet the goal of at least 15 years of ongoing landfill capacity, as defined by the act. CalRecycle is a department within the California Natural Resources Agency and administers programs formerly managed by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and Division of Recycling.

Senate Bill 1016, which established a per capita disposal measurement system, amended AB 939 in 2007. The per capita disposal measurement system is based on a jurisdiction's reported total disposal of solid waste divided by the jurisdiction's population with a CIWMB target per capita rate of disposal. Each jurisdiction is responsible for submitting an annual report outlining its progress in implementing diversion programs and its current capital disposal rate.

California Public Utilities Code. The California Public Utilities Code has broad regulatory authority over public utilities in California, which include electrical utilities, municipal water companies, private energy producers, telephone corporations, and railroad corporations. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) is the government body that administers the California Public Utilities Code. CPUC's Communications Division is responsible for licensing registration, and processing tariffs of local exchange carriers, competitive local carriers, and non-dominant interexchange carriers. It is also responsible for registration of wireless service providers and franchising of video service providers. The Communications Division tracks compliance with commission decisions and monitors consumer protection and service issues and CPUC reliability standards for safe and adequate service (CPUC 2018).

Local

Shasta County General Plan. The following objectives, policies, and programs from the water resources, and public facilities sections of the Shasta County General Plan (2004) are applicable to the proposed project:

- *Objective W-9: Institute effective measures to protect groundwater quality from potential adverse effects of increased pumping or potential sources of contamination.*
- *Policy W-a: Sedimentation and erosion from proposed developments shall be minimized through grading and hillside development ordinances and other similar safeguards as adopted and implemented by the County.*
- *Policy W-b: Septic systems, waste disposal sites, and other sources of hazardous or polluting materials shall be designed to prevent contamination to streams, creeks, rivers, reservoirs, or groundwater basins in accordance with standards and water resource management plans adopted by the County.*

- *Objective PF-1: Development of a comprehensive, long-term plan for wastewater treatment within the County, coordinated with community development objectives and designed to provide this service in a manner making the most effective use of public resources.*
- *Policy PF-h: Public uses (e.g. schools, parks, waste disposal sites) and public utilities (e.g. substation, transmission lines) whose site-specific locations often cannot be identified in advance by the General Plan may be permitted throughout the County to serve the public need. Appropriate zoning on site-specific locations will be determined in response to the identified need as it occurs. Solid waste disposal facilities shall be conditionally permitted to ensure that the site is compatible with adjacent land uses. Surrounding land uses, to the extent feasible, shall be regulated to avoid incompatibility with the solid waste disposal facilities.*

5.19.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

The impact analysis below identifies and describes the proposed project’s potential impacts to utilities and service systems within the proposed project area. Potential impacts were evaluated according to significance criterion based on the checklist items presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and listed at the start of each impact analysis section below. Both the construction and maintenance/operations phases were considered; however, because the construction phase could result in physical changes to the environment, analysis of construction phase effects warranted a detailed evaluation.

Applicant Proposed Measures

The applicant would implement the following APMs into the proposed project to minimize or avoid impacts on utilities and service systems. Mitigation Measure (MM) GEN-1 requires implementation of all APMs, including those identified to minimize impacts on utilities and service systems. A list of all project APMs is included in Table 4-2 in Chapter 4.

APM PSU-1: TDS and/or their contractors will recycle solid waste generated during construction, to the extent practicable.

Significance Criteria

Table 5.19-2 includes the significance criteria from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines’ utilities and service systems section, which the CPUC used to evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

Table 5.19-2 Utilities and Service Systems Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Table 5.19-2 Utilities and Service Systems Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1
2 **a. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water,**
3 **wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication**
4 **facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**
5

6 The nature of the proposed project itself would be an expansion of telecommunication facilities within
7 Shasta County and is analyzed within this IS/MND. The proposed project components do not include
8 construction of residential, commercial, or other land uses that would directly increase population.
9 Construction of the project would be complete within 60 to 120 days and include approximately 22
10 construction workers; therefore, it is expected that construction activities would generate only a small
11 amount of wastewater from portable toilet use during the construction period. The wastewater generated
12 would be pumped by qualified contractors and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations and
13 codes. Operation and maintenance associated with the proposed project would require few personnel.
14 Occasional visits by TDS technicians to the Digital Loop Carrier (DLC) sites would be required in order
15 to check on equipment and connect or disconnect customers, but would not require access to municipal
16 services during a site visit. The project components would not increase land use intensities; therefore,
17 would not require the installation of storm water drainage facilities, construction of new water or
18 wastewater treatment facilities, extension of electric power, telecom, or natural gas facilities. As
19 described in Section 5.14, Population and Housing, while the proposed project is meant to serve existing
20 residents, an extension of infrastructure could indirectly accommodate future growth by providing new
21 telecom infrastructure to an area that previously did not have access, which could eventually lead to
22 extension of other municipal services. Accordingly, the impact would be less than significant under this
23 criterion.
24

25 **Significance: Less than significant.**
26

27 **b. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably**
28 **foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**
29

30 Construction activities would incorporate standard Shasta County Air Quality Management District
31 construction measures specified in Shasta County Rule 3:16 to reduce fugitive dust emissions, including
32 the use of water for dust suppression. Water needed for dust suppression would be provided by the project
33 contractor by using local municipal water resources, such as those found in Anderson, Olinda, Happy
34 Valley, or Igo. The contractors would obtain the quantity of water needed for a day's operation prior to

1 arriving onsite. Because there would be minimal ground disturbance associated with the proposed project,
2 only a small amount of water (between 500 to 1,000 gallons per week) would be required. Operation and
3 maintenance of the proposed project would not require water or need to use any water entitlements or
4 resources. There would be sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing resources.
5 Thus, the proposed project would not increase demand for new or expanded entitlements to provide
6 sufficient water supplies. Therefore, the potential impact would be less than significant.

7
8 **Significance: Less than significant.**
9

10 *c. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or*
11 *may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in*
12 *addition to the provider's existing commitments?*
13

14 Construction crews would use portable toilets during construction activities; therefore, wastewater would
15 be generated during the proposed project's 60 to 120 day construction period. The wastewater generated
16 would be pumped by qualified contractors and disposed of at existing wastewater facilities for treatment.
17 Operation and maintenance would not result in any new wastewater generation. The wastewater generated
18 as part of the project would be temporary during the construction period; thus the wastewater treatment
19 provider would have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project in addition to its other
20 commitments. The impact would be less than significant.

21
22 **Significance: Less than significant.**
23

24 *d. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the*
25 *capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*
26

27 Following the telecommunications line and DLC installations, the applicant and/or its contractors would
28 promptly perform site clean-up and surface restoration. Clean-up would include removing all construction
29 debris, and surface restoration would involve returning the surface contours of disturbed areas to their
30 pre-construction condition. Recyclable materials including glass, metal, and most plastic food containers;
31 wood and cardboard packaging; and high-density polyethylene (HDPE) conduit remnants would be
32 collected daily in appropriately labeled containers. Once in operation, potential solid waste generated may
33 consist of replaced parts and equipment, plants and planting materials cleared during routine maintenance,
34 and minimal domestic trash (e.g., glass, paper, plastic, packing materials, etc.) from maintenance workers,
35 which would be removed and taken offsite for disposal. These are the same types of wastes that are
36 currently generated by operation and maintenance of current service lines, and it is reasonable to expect
37 they would be generated in similar small quantities.

38
39 Although landfills in the proposed project area would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the
40 proposed project's solid waste disposal needs, the applicant would implement **APM PSU-1**, which
41 requires the applicant and/or its contractors to recycle solid waste generated during construction, to the
42 extent practicable. Solid waste generated during construction activities of the proposed project include
43 non-recyclable items, such as treated wood and foam packaging, fiber-optic cable remnants, and coated
44 paper products. The generated waste would be collected in labeled containers on a daily basis. It is
45 anticipated that 80 percent of the solid waste generated during construction would be recyclable; the
46 remaining 20 percent would be disposed of in a local landfill.

47
48 Proposed project construction activities would be served by landfills in the area (refer to Table 5.17-1).
49 The Anderson Landfill, located approximately 2 miles southeast of the proposed project area, would
50 receive some of the proposed construction debris. In addition, the West Central Landfill, located
51 approximately 2 miles southwest of the proposed project area, may also receive some of the proposed

1 project's construction debris. Both landfills have adequate capacities well through completion of the
2 proposed project to accommodate anticipated waste. Therefore, impacts under this criterion would be less
3 than significant.

4
5 **Significance: Less than significant.**

6
7 g) *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and*
8 *regulations related to solid waste?*

9
10 As described above, proposed project area would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed
11 project's solid waste disposal needs. **APM PSU-1** would ensure that the applicant and/or its contractors
12 would recycle solid waste generated during construction to the extent practicable. The proposed project
13 would comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.
14 Therefore, there would be no impact under this criterion.

15
16 **Significance: No impact.**

17
18 **Mitigation Measures**

19 Because impacts on all utilities and service systems for the proposed project would be less than
20 significant or nonexistent, no mitigation measures are required.

21

This page left blank intentionally