

Part A: Request Description

MPR	Reo	uest
TATT TO	ILCY	acor

A	
Request Number:	08
Date Requested:	July 5, 2023
Proposed Duration/ Timing of Use:	Upon approval through October 15, 2023 Daytime hours
Location:	TSP 1b Work Area APN: 305-131-350-000
Attached Map?	🛛 Yes 🗆 No

Proposed Action(s)

PG&E proposes to shift the TSP 1b work area boundary to accommodate adjustments to TSP 1a and 1b pole locations. PG&E would shift the eastern boundary of the TSP work area approximately 10 feet east and south to provide sufficient workspace for foundation construction. The proposed work area shift would not increase the project impact footprint as the revised work area would be offset by a reduction in adjacent tower and pull site work areas.

Purpose(s)

During final engineering, PG&E determined that TSP 1a would conflict with electric distribution lines that will remain on the existing Humboldt Bay-Humboldt #1 60kV poles. To eliminate this conflict, TSP 1a would need to shift 11 feet northeast to maintain sufficient distance between the new Humboldt Bay-Humboldt #1 60kV line and the existing distribution line. This in turn would require shifting TSP 1b 15 feet to the east to maintain a sufficient distance from TSP 1a. The shift in TSP locations necessitates a shift in the work areas so that equipment can remain centered on the TSP location.

Part B: Existing Condition	DIS		
Existing Land Uses:	Coastal Wetland		
Surrounding Land Uses:	Industrial		
Sensitive Receptors within 500 feet:	None		
Environmental Resources within 500 feet:	No special status species, critical habitat, or rare plants were identified. The existing tower work area and proposed work area revision are within a coastal wetland complex.		
Has landowner approval been granted?	□ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A		
Landowner:	PG&E		

Part B: Existing Conditions

Surveys

List any new survey reports under Part D, attach a copy, and describe relevant survey details under the applicable resource category listed in the Part E.

Biological Resources. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for biological resources with the potential to occur in the area? If so, were survey results positive or negative? Were surveys completed during the appropriate timing and season to detect resources? If not, describe under the applicable resource category in Part E.

The shifted tower work area is within the biological resources study area included in the Final IS/MND. No special status species, critical habitat, or rare plants were identified within the existing or shifted tower work areas. Both existing and shifted tower work areas are within emergent coastal wetland.

Cultural Resources. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for cultural resources (records search and pedestrian survey)? If so, were survey results positive or negative?

The shifted tower work area is within the cultural resources study area included in the Final IS/MND. No cultural resources were identified within the existing or shifted tower work area boundary.

Jurisdictional Waters. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for hydrologic resources? If so, were survey results positive or negative?

The existing and shifted tower work areas are within 3-parameter emergent coastal wetland.



Part C: Permits, Agency Approvals, and Environmental Protection Measures

List any new permits or agency approvals under Part D, attach a copy, and describe relevant details under the applicable resource category listed in Part E.

Have all required permits, permit amendments/authorizations, or agency approvals been issued by resource agencies with applicable jurisdiction? Describe if necessary.

Yes

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with permit conditions or agency approvals? Describe if necessary.

No

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with project applicant proposed measures or mitigation measures listed in Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND)? Describe if necessary.

No

Part D: Attached Materials

List any attached materials (e.g. surveys, maps, photos, memos, agency authorizations, etc.) below. Materials should be attached to the end of this form.

Attached: MPR Figure 1

Part E: Final IS/MND Consistency Summary

Complete the Final IS/MND Consistency Summary below and answer the consistency questions for each resource category. Include a description and justification below each resource category as necessary. The consistency questions were developed using the CEQA Checklist provided in the Final IS/MND. Refer to the Final IS/MND for the details on the project impact evaluation.

Would the proposed action(s) result in a new impact, or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on:	No Change	Potentially Significant Change	N/A
Aesthetics (e.g., damage scenic resources or vistas, degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings, or create sources of light or glare)?	\boxtimes		
<u>Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant</u> Approved work is already occurring in the area; therefore, the shifted work area would not result in any impacts to aesthetics that have not already been discussed in the IS/MND. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on aesthetics.			
Agriculture and Forestry Resources (e.g., convert Farmland to nonagricultural use, or create a conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act)? Final IS/MND evaluation: No Impact	\boxtimes		
There are no agricultural or forestry lands in the project area.			

Air Quality (e.g. produce additional emissions, or expose sensitive receptors to additional pollutants)?	\boxtimes		
Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant			
Tower construction was previously analyzed in the IS/MND. As s result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously a			
Biological Resources (e.g., cause an adverse effect to sensitive or special-status species, or impact riparian, wetland, or any other sensitive habitat, or conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources)?	\boxtimes		
Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant			
The shifted TSP 1b work area is located within the biological resources study area included in the Final IS/MND. No special status species, critical habitat, or rare plants were identified within the proposed work area. Both the existing and shifted work area footprint are within areas mapped as 3-parameter wetland. No net increase in wetland impacts would occur as the shifted work area boundary would be offset by reducing a portion of the approved work area that would no longer be needed. APMs and MMs from the Final IS/MND would apply to work at this location and would ensure that impacts on biological resources are less than significant. The following APMs would apply to the refinement: APM BIO-1 requires implementation of the Worker Environmental Awareness Program; APM BIO-2 requires general resource protection measures, including all refueling and maintenance of vehicles will be restricted to designated staging areas located at least 100 feet from any down-gradient aquatic habitat, unless otherwise isolated from habitat by secondary containment; APM BIO-3 requires preconstruction survey(s) for special-status species and sensitive biological resource areas; APM BIO-4 requires the identification and marking of sensitive biological resource areas; APM BIO-5 requires a biological monitor on-site during construction activities in sensitive biological resource areas; APM BIO-6 requires nesting bird avoidance and protection; APM BIO-7 requires special-status plant avoidance and protection. Further, disturbed areas will be restored consistent with the Habitat Restoration Plan and Project SWPPP after use. With implementation of APMs and MMs from the Final IS/MND and BMPs contained in the Project SWPPP, the shifted work area not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on biological resources.			
Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources (e.g., cause adverse change to a historical, archeological, or tribal cultural	\boxtimes		
resource)? Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant			
No known cultural or paleontological resources are located at inadvertent discovery of buried remains during implementation CUL-1, APM CUL-3, APM CUL-4, APM PALO-1, and APM PALEO-2 or destruction to archaeological and paleontological resource result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously a resources.	n of the project, 2, would reduce s, and the shifte	implementati the potentia d work area	on of APM I for damage would not
Geology and Soils (e.g., cause or expose people or structures to geologic or soil hazards, including erosion or loss of topsoil)? <u>Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant</u>	\boxtimes		
The shifted work area would be restored consistent with the Ha and would not result in a new impact or increase the severity o geology and soils.			
Greenhouse Gas Emissions (e.g., generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant	\boxtimes		

The proposed refinement would not result in an increase in the level of equipment use and run time of
equipment and would be consistent with the estimates provided in the IS/MND. The proposed work area
shift would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on
greenhouse gas emissions.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (e.g., create or increase the exposure of people or structures to hazardous materials or wildland fires, involve the use of additional hazardous materials or equipment, or interfere with an adopted emergency plan)? <u>Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant</u>	\boxtimes		
The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or incl analyzed impact on hazards and hazardous materials.	rease the sev	erity of a previ	ously
Hydrology and Water Quality (e.g., degrade water quality, discharge waste or sediment, deplete groundwater, alter the existing drainage pattern, create additional runoff water or polluted runoff, place structures in a 100-year flood hazard area, or expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding)?	\boxtimes		
Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant			
Both the existing and shifted work area footprint are within areas net increase in wetland impacts would occur. Implementation of ensure that any impacts to water quality would remain less than s would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a pre and water quality.	APM WQ-1 o significant. Th	and APM WQ-2 e proposed w	2 would ork area shift
Land Use (e.g., conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, or conflict with a habitat conservation plan)?	\boxtimes		
Final IS/MND evaluation: No Impact	• • • • • • •		
The proposed work area shift would not result in a new impact or analyzed impact on land use and planning.	increase the	severity of a p	reviousiy
Mineral Resources (e.g., result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State or result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan)? <u>Final IS/MND evaluation: No Impact</u>			
The proposed work area shift would not result in a new impact or analyzed impact on mineral resources.	increase the	severity of a p	reviously
Noise (e.g., expose sensitive receptors to additional noise or vibration)? Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant	\boxtimes		
The proposed work area shift would not result in a new impact or analyzed impact on noise.	increase the	severity of a p	reviously
Population and Housing (e.g., induce substantial population growth in an area, or displace substantial numbers of people or housing)? Final IS/MND evaluation: No Impact	\boxtimes		
The proposed work area shift would not result in a new impact or analyzed impact on population and housing.	increase the	severity of a p	reviously

Public Services (e.g., result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities)? Final IS/MND evaluation: No Impact	\boxtimes		
The proposed work area shift would not result in a new impact or analyzed impact on public services.	increase the	severity of a p	reviously
Recreation (e.g., increases the use of, or cause adverse effects to, parks or other recreational facilities)? Final IS/MND evaluation: Less Than Significant	\boxtimes		
The proposed work area shift would not result in a new impact or analyzed impact on recreation.	increase the	severity of a p	reviously
Transportation and Traffic (e.g., increase traffic congestion or degrade performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, or increase hazards due to a design feature)? Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant	\boxtimes		
The proposed work area shift would not result in a new impact or analyzed impact on transportation and traffic.	increase the	severity of a p	reviously
Utilities and Service Systems (e.g., exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board)? Final IS/MND evaluation: No Impact	\boxtimes		
The proposed work area shift would not include the construction of facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, require additional water of waste disposal needs.			

