

BAY AREA WIRELESS ENHANCED BROADBAND (BAYWEB)

FINAL INITIAL STUDY / MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
COUNTY FILE # FM12-0001
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE #2012082045



LEAD AGENCY:
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
30 MUIR ROAD- MARTINEZ, CA 94553



October 30, 2012

I. Introduction:

On August 9, 2012, the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development published a Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) which analyzed potential impacts for the proposed BayWEB project. Pursuant to Section 15073 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) the Draft IS/MND included a 30-day public review period, ending on September 11, 2012.

The Initial Study for the proposed project identified potentially significant impacts in the environmental area of Aesthetics, Biology, Cultural Resources, Geology, and Noise. Environmental analysis determined that measures were available to mitigate potential adverse impacts to insignificant levels.

During the public review period, the Department of Conservation and Development received a five letters and this final document includes all the comments and responses to each letter received.

This Final Initial Study includes edits/corrections made in response to comments. New text is shown in **bold-underline** and deleted text is shown in ~~strikeout~~.

This document constitutes the Final IS/MND for the BayWEB project. The Board of Supervisors will consider the environmental record prior to taking action on the project as a whole.

II. Comments Received and Responses:

Letter- San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District, SRVFPD

Comment: The District states that any fire code related construction permits per section 105.7 CFC (California Fire Code) require plans to be submitted to the SRVFPD.

Response: County staff, with cooperation from Motorola, will work to ensure that not only the San Ramon Valley District, but all of the Fire Districts will be contacted to obtain any permit(s) that may be necessary for the construction of the project.

Letter – Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

The Water Board states that they have the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwater of the state. Their comments provided information on all of the possible permits that the project may trigger:

- Construction Storm Water General Permit
- Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit
- Industrial Storm Water General Permit
- Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit
- Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit- Water Quality Certification
- Waste Discharge Requirements

Response to Comments: The project (combination of 15 sites) is not proposing to disturb an acre or more of soil; however, a Stormwater Pollution Control Plan is required and it would be pursuant to the County's Ordinance. The project will be required to comply with all construction site pollution control requirements contained in the Grading Ordinance and the Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance. This will ensure compliance with the requirements of Provision C.6 (Construction Site Control) of the County's MS4 NPDES Permits. The project does not include industrial sites and does not involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable water or wetlands; therefore, a United States Army Corps of Engineers, USACOE 404 permit or 401 Water Board permit will not be required. If the scope of the project changes, it will be further reviewed to ensure that any required permit is obtained.

Letter –California Department of Transportation (Caltrans):

Comment 1: Encroachment Permit: Caltrans states that any work or traffic control that encroaches onto State right-of-way requires an encroachment permit.

Comment 2: Transportation Permit: Project work that requires movement of oversized or excessive load vehicle on State roadways requires a transportation permit.

Response: The project will not involve work or traffic control that will encroach onto the State right-of-way; however, large sized vehicles may be required to transport the new monopoles proposed for the Turquoise and Pearl Reservoir sites. The County and Motorola will communicate with Caltrans to determine if the size of proposed large vehicles for those sites will require a transportation permit.

Letter Save Mount Diablo (SMD):

SMD's letter confirms their interest within the Kregor Peak, Highland, and Concord Pavilion sites which are within the Mount Diablo Vicinity. SMD restates that the Initial Study proposed mitigations to include silt fencing and nesting survey prior to disturbance within these three sites; however, SMD has stated that the Alameda whipsnake can be found in the habitat adjacent to and near these three sites, and that the Alameda whipsnakes are known to move over one mile, therefore, this leads to the possibility that the Alameda whipsnakes may be found adjacent to these sites. In order to fully protect the Alameda whipsnake during the construction phase, SMD is requesting that we add the exclusion fencing to the Kregor Peak, Highland, and Concord Pavilion sites.

Response: Out of the 15 sites, 8 sites are located within non-urban areas. The Biology Section of the Initial study includes mitigations to install two types of fencing to protect wildlife from entering the site during the construction phase of the project. BIO-2 requires silt fencing, and BIO-3 requires snake proofing fencing (4-foot wall of ¼-inch mesh, galvanized wire). The biology report revealed that out of the 8 sensitive sites, the Turquoise site (located at a high elevation within the open space area of the City of Hercules) was the only site located immediately adjacent to the Alameda whipsnake

habitat; therefore, the snake exclusion fencing was suggested to be installed at the Turquoise site only. The Biology report also concluded that even though there were several recordings of the Alameda whipsnake at other locations (including the sites within the Mount Diablo area of interest) no other site was immediately adjacent to the Alameda whipsnake habitat, except the Turquoise site. Therefore, the installation of silt fencing was suggested to be sufficient to exclude wildlife from crossing the construction area at most of the sites.

The County agrees with SMD when they state that there are several recorded observations of the Alameda whipsnake within the three sites mentioned above, and due to the fact that these snakes can move over one mile, there is the possibility that these snakes may cross the construction site area. The County is in agreement with SMD to add the requirement of installing the exclusion fencing (existing BIO-3) to the Kregor Peak, Highland, and the Concord Pavilion site. The Final Mitigated document has been modified to include snake exclusion fencing for these three sites.

Letter – Mendonza Family of 823 Sean Place, Concord

Mr. Mendonza states that he is the original owner of his residence at 823 Sean Place, and that there are several reasons to be against the project:

Comment No. 1: Studies have shown that wireless devices emit harmful radiation causing cancer and other health hazards,

Response: The County is aware that there have been several studies that have revealed that radio frequency can be harmful to humans. However, there have also been numerous studies that have revealed contradiction to this respect; for this reason, Section 332(c)(7)(B)(iv) of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulation states that an agency shall not regulate the placement, construction and modification of wireless facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emission, as long as such facilities comply with the FCC's regulation on emissions.

The County requires a report to be prepared by a qualified Professional Engineer to ensure that a facility will operate under the FCC approved "Prevailing Exposure Standards". As such, a Radio Frequency- Electromagnetic Energy (RF-EME) report was prepared for the Confire-training station site. The report concludes that there are no modeled exposures on any accessible rooftop-level walking/working surface related to existing equipment in the area that exceed the FCC's occupational and general population exposure limits at the Confire-training station.

Comment No. 2: The project is visible from his backyard which will have an impact to the value of his property

Staff Response: The site is an approximately 12-acre property owned by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District located at 2905 Treat Blvd. The facility is visible from Treat Blvd and also from the surrounding residential properties, which are mainly located

along the north rear portion of the site. The project proposes to collocate two antennas (approximately 4'-5" tall) atop the existing tower, and one 3-foot diameter microwave dish, which will be smaller than the existing one. Two electrical ground cabinets will be installed within the existing shelter and will therefore, will be out of sight.

The County agrees with Mr. Mendonza that the facility is visible from his backyard. The existing wireless facility is visible and will remain visible from Mr. Mendonza's backyard; however, the proposed new equipment will create an insignificant visual impact because the site is located on a 12-acre property surrounded by several large sized structures. As seen from Mr. Mendonza's property, existing mature vegetation will partially screen the view of the proposed project, which is 200 feet away from his backyard.

Comment No. 3: concerns related to structures, trash, and constant noise from the fire station that is caused from by the fire station.

Staff Response: The site is identified as a training station for the Contra Costa Fire Department. The County acknowledges Mr. Mendoza's statements that the fire station includes several structures, and can be a source of noise. The project is to allow upgrade of the existing wireless facility for the purposes of increasing the efficiency of the site to communicate with other local and regional public safety communication sites. The proposed project will not negatively interfere with the facility's duty as a training facility, nor will it exasperate any concerns that relate to the safety, aesthetics, impact to property values, or noise generated from the fire station.

Comment No. 4: Lack of effective standard for rating the proposed devices is bleak, and the project would be very unfavorable to the residents of Sean Place.

Staff Response: The County respectfully disagrees with Mr. Mendonza's statement that the project would not be favorable to the residents of Sean Place. The purpose of the project is to address a complex set of challenge confronted by public safety in the Bay Area. Currently, emergency responders compete with the general public for bandwidth, and public safety personnel's ability to respond adequately using existing broadband network is often hampered during normal daily operations, such as multi-car accident, natural disasters such as wildfires, earthquake, and possible terrorism attacks. Therefore, the purpose of the Project is to provide a regional public safety solution to improve public safety network interoperability during emergency events. For example, the project will enable emergency responder to access dynamic multimedia applications such real-time geo-location, information about the possible dangers of road conditions, and specific location of personnel and vehicles, including the receiving of data files and video, such as photographs associated with Amber Alerts, and allow for the creation of virtual command centers to allow access to critical systems from anywhere. The project will be very beneficial not only to residents of Sean Place, but it will also be part of an enhanced communication system for entire Contra Costa County.

State Clearinghouse:

The State Clearinghouse's letter acknowledges receipt and distribution of Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

III. Edits and Corrections Have Been Made to the Following Sections of the Document:

See attached Revised Final Mitigated Negative Declaration

Biology Section:

- Page 17, 1st and 3rd paragraphs to delete silt fencing and add snake exclusion fencing mitigation to the Highland and Kregor Peak sites.
- Page 18, 2nd paragraph to add snake exclusion fencing mitigation to the Concord Pavilion site.

**COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING
THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**



<jbartusch@srvfire.ca.gov>


08/16/2012 03:42 PM

To <telma.moreira@dcd.cccounty.us>

cc <jbartusch@srvfire.ca.gov>

bcc

Subject San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District: Plan Review Letter

History:  This message has been replied to.

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District: Plan Review Letter

This e-mail has been generated because of a recent inspection or transaction with the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. Please open and review the attachment immediately as there may be some action required on your part. If you have any questions regarding this communication please contact the inspector listed on the letter.



Thank you. letter-plan-review-application-review.pdf



SAN RAMON VALLEY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

08/16/2012

Permit: CP124441593 - Submitted Plan: Planning and site development review

Project: Bay Area Wireless Enhanced Broadband Public Safety - Business: Fire Station 31

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development

30 Muir Road

Martinez, CA 94553

**RE: PLANNING APPLICATION REVIEW AT
800 San Ramon Valley BLVD
Danville, CA 94526
APN: 207012006**

Dear Principal Planner Moreira:

The District has reviewed the planning application for the above noted address. Based upon the information provided, comments and requirements have been made as conditions of approval (see the attached report).

If during the course of the entitlement process the project changes, additional requirements may apply. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed project. If you have any questions please contact me at (925) 838-6684 or jbartusch@srvfire.ca.gov

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Julie Bartusch".

Julie Bartusch
Fire Inspector

1500 Bollinger Canyon Road, San Ramon, CA 94583
Phone: (925) 838-6600 Fax: (925) 838-6696
www.firedepartment.org

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District Planning Application Review

Submittal Information

Permit Number	CP124441593	Submittal Number	SN3331675
Submittal Type	Planning and site development review	Submitted Date	08/16/2012 14:26:51

Condition #	Category	Condition
5065948	General	Any Fire Code related construction permits per section 105.7 CFC require plans to be submitted to the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District.



EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ
SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

11 September 2012

Telma B. Moreira
Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553

CERTIFIED MAIL
7011 2970 0003 8939 2467

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, BAY AREA WIRELESS ENHANCED BROADBAND (BAYWEB) PUBLIC SAFETY WIRELESS NETWORK UPGRADE PROJECT, SCH NO. 2012082045, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 13 August 2012 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration* for the Bay Area Wireless Enhanced Broadband (BayWeb) Public Safety Wireless Network Upgrade Project, located in Contra Costa County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml.

Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits¹

The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/.

Industrial Storm Water General Permit

Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 97-03-DWQ.

For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml.

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACOE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements.

If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACOE at (916) 557-5250.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

If an USACOE permit, or any other federal permit, is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications.

¹ Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.

Waste Discharge Requirements

If USACOE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., "non-federal" waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project will require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation.

For more information on the Water Quality Certification and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/business_help/permit2.shtml.

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4684 or tcleak@waterboards.ca.gov.



Trevor Cleak
Environmental Scientist

cc: State Clearinghouse Unit, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

111 GRAND AVENUE
P. O. BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
PHONE (510) 286-6053
FAX (510) 286-5559
TTY 711

CONTRA COSTA
COUNTY

2012 SEP 11 P 2:25

DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT



*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

September 5, 2012

CCVAR013
SCH# 2012082045

Ms. Telma B. Moreira
Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553-4601

Dear Ms. Moreira:

**Bay Area Wireless Enhanced Broadband (BayWeb) Public Safety Wireless Network
Upgrade – Mitigated Negative Declaration**

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. The following comments are based on the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Encroachment Permit

Please be advised that any work or traffic control that encroaches onto the State right-of-way (ROW) requires an encroachment permit that is issued by Caltrans. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five (5) sets of plans clearly indicating State ROW must be submitted to the address listed in the letterhead above, marked ATTN: Permits Office. Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process. See the website linked below for more information: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits/>

Transportation Permit

Project work that requires movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on State roadways requires a transportation permit that is issued by Caltrans. To apply, a completed transportation permit application with the determined specific route(s) for the shipper to follow from origin to destination must be submitted to: Caltrans Transportation Permits Office, 1823 14th Street, Sacramento, CA 95811-7119. See the following website for more information: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/permits/>

Ms. Telma B. Moreira/Contra Costa County
September 5, 2012
Page 2

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please call Lisa Carboni at 510 622-5491.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Erik Alm', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

ERIK ALM, AICP
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse



1901 Olympic Blvd., # 320
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Tel: (925) 947-3535
Fax: (925) 947-0642
www.SaveMountDiablo.org

September 7, 2012

Board of Directors

Malcolm Sproul
President

Amara Morrison
Secretary

Burt Bassler
Treasurer

Arthur Bonwell
Emeritus

Heath Bartosh
Joe Canciamilla
Charla Gabert
John Gallagher
Claudia Hein
Scott Hein
David Husted
Doug Knauer
Brian Kruse
Marty Reed
Directors

Staff Directors

Ronald Brown
Executive Director

Seth Adams
Land Programs Director

Julie Seelen
Advancement Director

Monica E. Oei
Finance Director

Founders

Arthur Bonwell
Mary L. Bowerman

Proud member of

Land Trust Alliance
California Council of Land Trusts
Bay Area Open Space Council

To: Telma Moreira, Principal Planner

Regarding: File No. FM12-0001 Bay Area Wireless Enhanced Broadband (BayWeb) Public Safety Wireless Network Upgrade, Notice of Public Review and Intent to Adopt a Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

Applicant: Motorola Solutions

Owners: Several

Location: 15 different sites within Contra Costa County

Dear Ms. Moreira,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed BayWeb Public Safety Wireless Network Upgrade. We are mainly interested in the proposed upgrades to the telecommunication sites within the vicinity of Mt. Diablo. These sites are Kregor, Highland, and Concord Pavilion. From review of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), the proposed wireless network equipment at these sites will be added to existing towers and any additional ground equipment will be placed within existing shelters or existing fenced areas. We are pleased that the additional visual impacts on scenic vistas from these telecommunication upgrades will be minimized. In addition to minimizing visual impacts, we are also interested in minimizing other potential impacts, including impacts to biological resources, especially during the construction phase at these sites.

The MND recommends several mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts on wildlife during construction. Below is a summary of staff's proposed mitigation measures. Save Mount Diablo's (SMD's) additional mitigation measures are proposed after staff's proposed mitigation measures.

Kregor Peak:

Staff: Given there are reported observations of Alameda whipsnake and red-legged frog in the area, staff recommends that silt fencing (Mitigation BIO-2) be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound to prevent wildlife from entering the work area. Additionally, due to the proposed work's proximity to adjacent scrubland/chaparral habitats, a reconstruction nesting bird

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
2012 SEP 11 AM 10:59
DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT

survey (Mitigation BIO-1) would be necessary if work were to commence during the nesting season.

SMD: As stated in the "Abbreviated Biological Constraints Analysis for Proposed BayWEB Project Sites in Contra Costa County, California" ¹ (Biological Analysis), the site is bordered by ruderal grassland to the south, a gravel road to the north, and oak woodland to the north.

The Alameda whipsnake habitat includes grasslands and woodlands as stated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in their final ruling regarding the status of the Alameda whipsnake:

The Alameda whipsnake is typically found in northern coastal scrub, coastal sage scrub and chaparral plant communities (Ornduff 1974, Swaim 1994), but may also occur in adjacent grasslands and oak and oak/bay woodlands (Swaim 1994). They demonstrate a preference for open-canopy stands and habitats with woody debris and exposed rock outcrops, and they tend to be found on southeast, south, and southwest facing slopes (Swaim 1994)...Some animals were recorded to have moved over 1.8 kilometers (km) (1 mile (mi)) while crisscrossing their areas (MCGinnis 1992).²

The area adjacent to and near the site is habitat in which the Alameda whipsnake has been found. There are confirmed observations of Alameda whipsnake at Black Diamond Mines. There have also been confirmed observations in nearby parcels as well as East Bay Regional Park District's Clayton Ranch and Chaparral Spring properties. Additionally, as stated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Alameda whipsnakes have been recorded to have moved over 1 mile while crisscrossing their areas. Therefore, snake exclusion fencing (Mitigation BIO-3) should also be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound/facility to prevent snakes from entering the work area.

Highland:

Staff: As stated in the MND, there are several reported observations of Alameda whipsnake. There are also 4 reported observations of the California red-legged frog within one mile of the project. Staff recommends that silt fencing be installed around the perimeter fenced compound to prevent wildlife from entering the work area (Mitigation BIO-2). Additionally, due to the proposed work's proximity to adjacent scrubland/chaparral habitats, a reconstruction nesting bird survey would be necessary if work were to commence during the nesting season (Mitigation BIO-1).

SMD: As stated in the Biological Analysis by Monk and Associates, the site is surrounded by ruderal grassland on all sides, a gravel road to the southeast, and scrubland/chaparral to the south. Alameda whipsnakes have been found in grassland and scrubland/chaparral habitat. The site is adjacent to chaparral on the face of the Blackhills, this chaparral extends from Alamo to Highland Ridge with numerous whipsnake confirmed observations at a number of locations. Given there are reported observations of Alameda whipsnake in the vicinity, and the area adjacent to and near the site is habitat in which the Alameda whipsnake has been found, snake proofing fencing should be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound/facility to prevent snakes from entering the work area (Mitigation BIO-3).

¹ Prepared by Monk & Associates, dated July 26, 2012, and submitted to Telma Moreira of the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development

² 50 CFR Part 17, December 5, 1997 (Volume 62, Number 234), Pages 64306-64320

Concord Pavilion:

Staff: At this site, Alameda whipsnake, California tiger salamander and red-legged frog have been observed within one mile of the site. During construction, trenching is being proposed for 400 feet of underground electrical conduit. The proposed mitigation for these items are the installation of silt fencing around the fenced compound (Mitigation BIO-1) and silt fencing at the top of the bank along the proposed trenching to avoid debris from entering into the drainage area. The project would also be required to perform nesting surveys due to the proximity to the riparian corridor (Mitigation BIO-2).

SMD: Once again, given that there are reported observations of Alameda whipsnake in the vicinity, and the area adjacent to and near the site is habitat in which the Alameda whipsnake has been found, snake proofing fencing should be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound/facility to prevent snakes from entering the work area (Mitigation BIO-3). As stated in the Biological Analysis by Monk and Associates, the site is surrounded by ruderal vegetation and the drainage to the north of the project supports a sparse riparian corridor dominated by many tree species including valley oak (*Quercus lobata*).

In conclusion, the Alameda whipsnake can be found in the habitat adjacent to and near Kregor, Highland and Concord Pavilion sites. Additionally, Alameda whipsnakes have been recorded to move over 1 mile while crisscrossing their areas. Therefore, there is the possibility that Alameda whipsnakes may occur adjacent to the site. To fully protect the Alameda whipsnake during the construction phase of these projects, snake proofing fencing should be installed at each of these sites. Thank you again for giving us the opportunity to provide comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project.

Sincerely,



Nathalie Oram
Land Conservation Associate

Date: September 10, 2012
To: Thelma B. Moreira, Principal Planner
Contra Costa County
From: Resident at: 823 Sean Place, Concord, CA
RE: The Bay Area Wireless Proposed Installation at:
2905 Treat Blvd., Concord, CA – Fire Dept. Station

CONTRA COSTA
2012 SEP 11 PM 3:39
APPLICATION & PERMIT CENTER

This letter is to protest the proposed installation of the Wireless Network Upgrade by Motorola Solutions, antennas, dish and additional equipment.

We are original owners of the property at 823 San Place. Our property is adjacent to the fire department facility where one of the proposed sites is located. Several reasons compel us to be against the proposal. Studies have been shown that these devices emit harmful radiation causing cancer and other health hazards. Another reason is that it could be viewed from our back yard, having an impact on our property value. It would be an eye sore and also contribute to the other junk that's kept by the fire department right behind our property. We are very frustrated with the structures, junk and constant noise that occurs from our neighbor (fire station).

We have complained and documented some the incidents that have emerged. Last year we had our property appraised and the appraiser sited negative adjustments for the view from our backyard due to the numerous old vehicles (junk yard). Photos were included in the appraisal report as detrimental evidence that negatively impacted our property value. We will not agree for additional destructive equipment to be installed.

The fact remains that the lack of effective standards, if any, for rating these devices is bleak. The proposal would be very unfavorable to the residents of Sean Place.

Regrets,

The Mendoza Family

2905
TREAT Blvd
Concord, CA
94518
CONTRA COSTA
FIRE TRAINING
CENTER





EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE of PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT



KEN ALEX
DIRECTOR

September 14, 2012

Telma B. Moreira
Contra Costa County Dept. of Conservation & Dev.
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553

Subject: Bay Area Wireless Enhanced Broadband (Bay Web) Public Safety Wireless Network Upgrade
SCH#: 2012082045

Dear Telma B. Moreira:

The enclosed comment (s) on your Mitigated Negative Declaration was (were) received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period, which closed on September 11, 2012. We are forwarding these comments to you because they provide information or raise issues that should be addressed in your final environmental document.

The California Environmental Quality Act does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments. However, we encourage you to incorporate these additional comments into your final environmental document and to consider them prior to taking final action on the proposed project.

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions concerning the environmental review process. If you have a question regarding the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number (2012082045) when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

2012 SEP 19 P 3:30
CONTRA COSTA
COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT

**REVISED
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Bay Area Wireless Enhanced Broadband (BayWeb)- Public Safety Wireless Network Upgrade
County File #FM12-0001
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Telma B. Moreira
Department of Conservation and Development
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road-Martinez, CA 94553
4. **Project Location:** Project is located at 15 different sites, including incorporated Cities and Unincorporated Contra Costa County. See *"Surrounding Land Use and Setting"* on page No. 2 for details.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Motorola Solutions
c/o Ross Rembac
1001 Bayhill Drive Suite 200
San Bruno, CA 94066
(925) 705-0174
6. **General Plan Designation:** The subject properties are located within urbanized and rural areas at 15 different sites, including incorporated Cities and Unincorporated Contra Costa County. The General Plan designations vary for each site, including but not limited to Agricultural Lands, Water Shed, and Government Facilities. See Section No. 10, *Land Use and Planning* for details.
7. **Zoning:** The subject 15 sites includes a variety of Zoning Districts, including but not limited to General Agricultural and Heavy Agricultural. See Section No. 10, *Land Use and Planning* for details.
8. **Background:** In March of 2010, Motorola filed an application with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) seeking funding for the San Francisco Bay Area Wireless Enhanced Broadband (BayWeb) project. The BayWeb is funded in large by a grant to Motorola from the United States Department of Commerce ("DOC") under its Broadband Technology Opportunities Program ("BTOP"), which is administered by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration ("NTIA"), plus a significant financial match from Motorola.

9. **Description of Project:**

Purpose of the Project:

The Bay Area Wireless Enhanced Broadband System (BayWEB) is an innovative project developed as a collaborative public-private partnership between Bay Area governments and agencies (through the Bay Area Regional Interoperable Communications System [BayRICS] Authority) and Motorola Solutions to build, own, and operate a next-generation wireless broadband network for public safety purposes across the ten Counties* in Bay Area including Contra Costa County.

Specifically, BayWeb will deploy a comprehensive Long-Term Evolution (LTE) wireless broadband network that will support data interoperability and allow participating Bay Area emergency responders to connect on a common dedicated data network.

The BayWeb project directly addresses a complex set of challenge confronted by public safety in the Bay Area. Currently, emergency responders compete with the general public for bandwidth, and public safety's ability to respond adequately using existing broadband network is often hampered during normal daily operations, such as multi-car accident, natural disasters such as wildfires, earthquake, and possible terrorism attacks. The purpose of the Project is to provide a regional public safety solution to improve public safety network interoperability during emergency events. For example, the project will enable emergency responder to access dynamic multimedia applications such real-time geo-location, information about the possible dangers of road conditions, and specific location of personnel and vehicles. The project will also allow for the receiving of data files and video, such as photographs associated with Amber Alerts, and allow for the creation of virtual command centers to allow access to critical systems from anywhere.

Proposed Sites to Be Upgraded: Within Contra Costa County, there are 15 different sites. These sites are divided throughout incorporated Cities and unincorporated portions of the County. With the exception a new monopole that will need to be installed at the Pearl Reservoir (City of Richmond) and another one at the Turquoise site (City of Hercules) the project is mostly to allow collocation. See attached site plan and elevations for each individual site.

Sites Within Unincorporated County:

Bald Mountain

The site is located within a portion of the 355-acre property owned by the East Bay Regional Park District, addressed 2501 Grizzly Peak Blvd, in the unincorporated area of Orinda. The project proposes collocation of the following equipment::

*Note: The Ten Counties in the Bay Area are: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Solano, Sonoma, and Santa Cruz

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	72.2" height 7.1" side 11.9" front	60'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	2'	145'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	4	3'	60' 100' 145'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment within existing shelter, ice bridge, and related electric conduits, within existing fenced area					

Cummings Skyway:

The site is located within a portion of the 0.98-acre property located off Cummings Skyway, \pm 2,500 feet from Highway 4 and \pm 8,000 feet from Crocket Blvd. in the Crocket area. The project proposes collocation of the following equipment:

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	72.7" height 7.1" side 11.9" front	110'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	6'	100'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	2	2'	100'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	2	3'	100'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame with distribution sub-panels, cable tray, and related electric conduits, within existing fenced area					

Highland:

The site is a 0.080-acre privately owned property located within a larger 174-acre property owned by the East Bay Regional Park District. Site is accessed through Morgan Territory Road, in the unincorporated area of Livermore. The project proposes collocation of the following equipment:

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	72.7" height 7.1" side 11.9" front	100'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	4	3'	40'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	1	6'	40'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame with distribution sub-panels, and related electric conduits, all located within fenced area					

Kregor Peak: The facility is located at the end of Nortonville Road in the Black Diamond trail in the City of Clayton unincorporated County area. The facility is owned by the County.

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	72.7" height 7.1" side 11.9" front	65'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	1'	60'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	1	2'	60'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	1	6'	60'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame with distribution sub-panels, roof power, and related electric conduits located inside existing shelter and fenced area					

Sites Within the City of Concord:

Tishman Building:

This is a 2.55-acre site owed by Center Investor. The following is proposed to be collocated atop of the existing Tishman building located 2300 Clayton Road:

Proposed Loading to Existing Building

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	53.3" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	200'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	1'	200'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	2	2'	200'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	1	3'	200'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame with distribution sub-panels, cable tray, and related electric conduits all located atop existing building					

Concord Pavilion:

This is an approximately 59-acre site owned by the City of Concord. Site is addressed 2000 Kirker Pass Road. The project proposes collocation of the following equipment:

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	72.7" height 7.1" side 11.9" front	75'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	3'	65'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame with distribution sub-panels, ice bridge, and related electric conduits, located within fenced area					

Contra Costa Fire Training Station:

The site is an approximately 12-acre property owned by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection Department. Address is 2905 Treat Blvd. The project proposes collocation of the following equipment:

Proposed Loading to Existing monopole

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	53.3" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	65'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	3'	60'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment within existing shelter, cable tray, and related electric conduits					

City of Richmond:Nichol Knob:

The site is an approximately 0.25-acre site owned by the City of Richmond and adjacent to East Bay Regional Parks District property. The site is located at the termination of Marine Avenue. The project proposes collocation of the following equipment on the exiting tower:

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	53.3" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	40'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	2	2'	40'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame with distribution sub-panels, cable tray, dog house, and related electric conduits. The electrical equipment/cabinets will be installed inside existing underground space					

Pearl Reservoir:

This is an approximately 1.75-acre site owned by the East Bay Utility Municipal District. The site is located east of the termination of Monte Cresta Avenue. The project proposes installation of ground equipment within existing facility's fenced area, and a new 60-foot tall monopole.

Proposed Loading to new 60-foot monopole

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	53.3" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	57'-9"	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	3'	58'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	1	2'	59'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	1	1'	25'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame with distribution sub-panels, within existing fenced area, ice bridge will run from existing fenced area to new monopole area, and related electric conduits, and proposed chain link fence will surround new monopole area					

City of Martinez:

County Administration Building-Pine Street:

This site is addressed 651 Pine Street. The Project is proposed is to be collocated atop of the existing building as follows:

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	53.3" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	200'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	1'	180'	LMR 600	1
Microwave-MW	1	2'	180'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: one H-Frame and two electrical equipment and related electrical conduits inside existing cabinet shelter					

Sheriff Dispatch-Glacier Drive:

This is a 22-acre property owned by the County, which houses the County Sheriff dispatch, located at Glacier Drive. The project proposes collocation of the following equipment:

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	53.3" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	75'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	1'	120'	LMR 600	1
Microwave-MW	1	2'	100'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment and related electric conduits inside existing cabinet shelter					

City of Hercules

Turquoise:

This is a 30.5-acre site owned by the City of Hercules. Site is located off of Turquoise Avenue. The project proposes installation of a new ± 50 -foot monopole and collocation of ground equipment/electrical (including new pole) are within fenced/disturbed site.

Proposed Loading to new ± 50 -foot monopole

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	76.1" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	35'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	1'	40'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	1	2'	25'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment and related electric conduits inside existing shelter					

City of Oakley

Delta Station:

The site is a 0.6-acre owned by the County. Site is located at 210 O'Hara Avenue. The project proposes collocation of the following equipment:

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	53.3" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	55'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	2	3'	50'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame with distribution sub-panels, ice bridge, and related electric conduits, proposed chain link fence and 4-foot wide access magnate, and removal of one pine tree					

Town of Danville

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection, Station No. 31:

The site is a 1.2-acre property owned by San Ramon Valley Fire Protection Department, located at 800 San Ramon Valley Blvd. The project proposes the following equipment:

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower

Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	53.3" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	75'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	3'	65'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame, ice-bridge, and related electric conduits					

City of El Cerrito:

El Cerrito Police Department:

The site is a 1.8-acre site owned by the City of El Cerrito and house of the Fire/Police Department, located at 10900 San Pablo Avenue. The project proposes collocation of the following equipment:

Proposed Loading to Existing Tower					
Description	Quantity	Dimension(s)	AGL	Cable	
				Cable size/type	Qty per antenna
LTE -panel antennas	3	53.3" height 3.9" side 11.9" front	40'	7/8"	2
MW microwave dish	1	1'	40'	LMR 600	1
MW microwave dish	1	2'	45'	LMR 600	1
Additional equipment: two electrical equipment, H-Frame with distribution sub-panels, ice bridge, and related electric conduits will be installed within existing shelter					

Construction Phase:

Construction activities for the BayWeb project are planned to start in late fall, early winter 2012. The initial construction period will run through mid-2013, and include site and structure (existing tower) remediation measures, new tower construction (two locations), new electrical service or service upgrades, microwave dish installation, and all associated interior/exterior ground, and/or rack mounted hardware installation. It is anticipated that the second phase, the LTE portion of the work, is planned begin in early 2014. This scope of work will include the installation of the LTE panels on the towers and all related hardware, either inside existing shelters, or on previously installed exterior pads, from the initial construction phase. Typically, it should take two weeks from start to finish for the onsite construction activities for a collocation site (installing equipment on an existing tower at an existing site), and up to four weeks if a new monopole is being constructed, or if an existing tower is being structurally remediated. This does not include any final inspections or approvals by local government or utilities. Hours of construction activities will be typically during normal business hours, 8 am-5 pm, Monday through Friday. For collocation sites, a typical crew will consist of four individuals, and equipment will be limited to personal vehicles, lift gate trucks for equipment delivery, and possible a trenching machine or mini-excavator and a small dump truck. For new monopole sites, a typical crew will consist of five individuals, and equipment required will include that which is needed for a collocation, plus a small crane, a drill rig, concrete truck, and possibly a tractor-trailer for delivery of materials. Equipment and material staging for collocation sites will require approximately 100 square feet, inside the existing tower site. This will consist of pallets, boxes, and wire/cable spools. New monopole sites will require 600-900 square feet of space for equipment and material staging, to accommodate the monopole itself (two 30' sections), and any pre-cast foundation materials. The existing sites include sufficient space for the necessary construction staging area.

Site Lease/Access Agreement:

As part of the access agreement between the County and Motorola, the County is

responsible to ensure that Motorola will have the required access to all of the sites. The County will be reviewing each lease to ensure that the lease agreement/access

for each site is current or that any amendments are made, as necessary, to address access for the BayWeb project.

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Surrounding Land Use: The subject properties are located within urbanized and rural areas at 15 different sites, including incorporated Cities and Unincorporated Contra Costa County.

The following non-urbanized sites are mostly large seized undeveloped parcels belonging to the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) or immediate adjacent to properties owned by EBRPD. They are the following: Bald Mountain, Cummings Skyway, Highland, Kregor Peak, Pearl Reservoir, Concord Pavilion, Nichol Knob, and Turquoise.

The sites located on urban areas are mostly located within the cities jurisdiction. With the exception of Turquoise, they are mostly located at either Fire Stations or Sheriff/Police dispatch sites. The sites which are located within urbanized areas are: 651 Pine Street and Sheriff Dispatch at Glacier Drive (City of Martinez) Tishman Building and Con-Fire Training (City of Concord), Delta Station (City of Oakley), El Cerrito PD (City of El Cerrito) and Fire Station No. 31 (Danville).

The existing facilities include a variety of wireless carriers. Public emergency providers (e.g. equipment used East Bay Municipal Utility District, Sheriff, Medical Emergency Response, and United States Geological Survey, USGS) and private users such as, but not limited to Sprint, Verizon, AT&T, and Cable TV Broadcasting.

11. Other public agencies whose approval may be required, but not limited to (e.g., permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement:

- Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division
- Contra Costa County Health Services Department
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (et. al.)
- City of Martinez
- City of Concord
- City of Oakley
- City of Richmond
- Town of Danville
- City of El Cerrito
- City of Hercules

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services Systems |

Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

Date 8/9/2012

Telma B. Moreira – Principal Planner
Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) Less than Significant: The Contra Costa County General Plan identifies numerous scenic vistas (Mount Diablo, Briones, Cummings Skyway, etc) as a major component of the perception of the County as a desirable place to live and work. The General Plan identifies four kinds of scenic locations in the County: (1) scenic ridges, hillsides, and rock outcropping; (2) the San Francisco Bay/Delta estuary system; (3) Scenic Highways and Expressways; and (4) Scenic Routes. The Cities have also their own scenic resources policy. See Figure 9-1 *Scenic Ridges and Waterways*, Contra Costa County General Plan, Open Space Element.

The sites which are located or within close proximity to scenic ridges are the Highland, Cummings Skyway, Nichol Knob, Pearl Reservoir, Turquoise, Bald Mountain, and Concord Pavilion, and Kregor Peak. With the exception of Pearl Reservoir and Turquoise, all of these sites are existing and the proposed collocation will add equipment which will be attached to existing tower/monopole and equipment will be either within existing equipment shelter or within fenced areas. Since the project includes mostly collocation and the new monopoles will be the same height or smaller the existing facility's tower, they will have a negligible visual impact on scenic vistas. The new monopoles will be located at a considerable distance from residential development. The new monopole at Pearl Reservoir site will be located near the existing lattice tower and mostly screened from view because of the existing Monterey Pine trees. The monopole at the Turquoise site will be located within the existing fenced compound area.

- b) Less than Significant: One of the goals of the Open Space Element is to protect major scenic ridges from the extent possible, from roadways, building of structures, and other activities that would harm the scenic qualities. With the exception of minor grading at the Pearl site, the project does not include disturbance to sensitive ground areas, grading, or vegetation removal. All of the existing road/access are existing to all of the 15 sites. With the exception of the monopoles to be built at the Pearl Reservoir site and Turquoise site, all of the new equipment will be enclosed within existing shelter or within fenced areas. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on state scenic highway.
- c) Less than Significant with Mitigation: As originally proposed, the project included a larger number of equipment which were proposed to be located on tower/monopole. The number of equipment have been reduced and are to the extent possible, designed to provide the needed service with the smaller dimensions available in the manufacturing industry. The goal of the project was to allow equipment to be collocated on existing towers and or monopoles.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Structural calculations were performed to ensure that each facility tower could house additional equipment. The calculations revealed that two of the sites failed the structural capacity to support additional equipment. A new monopole will need to be installed at the Pearl Reservoir (City of Richmond) and Turquoise (City of Hercules) to allow additional antennas and microwave dishes.</p> <p>If not installed appropriately, reflectivity of materials (including material and color used for the monopoles) can be cause of glare. Equipment, especially when attached to a tower, or atop buildings where it could be very visible, may conflict with the natural colors found in the surrounding environment. For instance, if collocation is on the ground of a facility, equipment will need to blend in with the colors where ground color is mostly predominant throughout the year. If located atop of building/existing structures, it should blend in with the color of the structure in which it will be collocated. If equipment is collocated on existing towers, it should have the same color as the tower and have low reflectivity. Below are some mitigations to address potential impacts:</p> <p>AES-1: The proposed antennas sectors and microwave dishes shall be painted with same color and same non-reflective color material as the proposed/existing tower/monopole or structure on which they are proposed to be collocated</p> <p>AES-2: Proposed antenna sectors shall be redesigned to be located closer attached to the legs of tower/monopole or structure proposed for collocation in order to reduce its overall massiveness</p> <p>With these mitigations the project will have a less than significant impact on the visual character of the surroundings.</p> <p>d) <u>Less than Significant with Mitigations:</u> Night lighting could result in potentially significant visual impacts by increasing the ambient light to surrounding areas. Lighting can be present due to construction or for on-going site monitoring of the facility. Even though the project does not include any night time construction hours, permanent lighting could create glare and disturb nocturne wildlife (if within rural areas) and/or neighboring residential development (if within high density urban areas). The following mitigation will reduce this potential impact to less than significant:</p> <p>AES-3: Lighting shall be of minimum necessary brightness consistent with workers safety and as required by the Federal Communication Commission</p> <p>AES-4: Lighting shall be hooded with lights directed downward or toward the area to be illuminated</p> <p>AES-5: Safety/monitoring lights shall be equipped with switches or motion detectors to light the area only when needed or occupied.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</i> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (References:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: No impact. a-e): Review of the existing settings revealed that the sites are no located on prime farmland and the proposed project will not conflict with agricultural uses. The sites are existing and with the exception of one of the site (Pearl reservoir) where a new monopole will need to be built (the second site at Turquoise will be within fenced area), all parts of the project will be within the existing disturbed boundary of the facility. None of the sites are involved with a Williamson Act contract. The project will have no impact to agriculture and forestry resources.				
3. AIR QUALITY – <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</i> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a) Less than Significant: The most recent adopted air quality plan for the Bay Area is the 2010 CAP. The 2010 CAP is an update to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's 2005 Ozone Strategy to comply with State air quality planning requirements. The CAP also serves as a multi-pollutant air utility plan to protect public health and the climate. The project will not disrupt or hinder the implementation of any of the CAP control measures, therefore, it is less than significant.

b) Less than Significant: Neither the operation of construction of the project would result in or contribute to air quality violations. There is only minor grading required for the new monopole at the Pearl Reservoir site and minor clearing/trenching of the ground for the Turquoise site. Except for the ground equipment, there are no proposed construction of structures, or demolition of existing structures. The project is limited to installation of the necessary equipment to upgrade function of existing wireless facility sites. However, even though exhaust emissions from the construction of the project is found to be less than significant, implementation of the following best management construction measures will ensure that all of the temporary emissions, including fugitive dust, would be less than significant. See measures below.

Construction-related activities generate criteria air pollutants including carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀) as well as precursor emissions such as reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and GHGs from exhaust, fugitive dust. The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Guidelines) provides preliminary screening criteria to determine if project construction-related emissions would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Table 2-4 Thresholds of Significance for Construction-Related Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors

Pollutant/Precursor	Daily Average Emissions (lb/day)
ROG	54
NOX	54
PM ₁₀	82*
PM _{2.5}	54*
PM ₁₀ / PM _{2.5} Fugitive Dust	Best Management Practices

* Applies to construction exhaust emissions only.

Notes: CO = carbon monoxide; lb/day = pounds per day; NOX = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{2.5} = fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less; PM₁₀ = respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 10 micrometers or less; ROG = reactive organic gases; SO₂ = sulfur dioxide.

Refer to Appendix D for support documentation.

The following BAAQMD guidelines will ensure that the project impact on temporary construction-related emissions will be less than significant. Note that due to the nature of the project's construction, some of these best management measures below may or not be applicable.

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) will be watered two times per day.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site will be covered. • All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads will be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. Dry power sweeping will not be used. • All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads will be limited to 15 mph. • Idling times will be minimized by either shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes. Clear signage will be provided for construction workers at all access points. • All construction equipment will be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment will be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. • Signs will be posted with the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. Complaints will be corrected within 48 hours. The sign will also include the BAAQMD phone number to ensure compliance. <p>c) <u>Less than Significant</u>: Based on BAAQMD guidance, if a project would result in an increase in POC, NOX, PM10, or PM2.5 or more than its respective average daily or annual mass significance threshold, then it would also be considered to contribute to a significant cumulative impact. If a project would exceed the identified significance threshold, its emissions would be cumulative considerable, and if a project would not exceed the significance thresholds, its emissions would not be cumulative considerable.</p> <p>d) <u>Less than Significant</u>: Construction of the project will temporary increase the concentration of pollutants which could occur during construction but in the long term will not increase pollutants above existing levels. Sensitive receptors include those segments of the population most susceptible to poor air quality such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing serious health problems affected by air quality which are those places such as schools/schoolyards, parks and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential communities. With the exception of the sites located within urbanized areas, most sites are <u>not</u> within close proximity to a high number of sensitive receptor and it will be temporary in nature. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p> <p>e) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The project may create minor temporary objectionable odors due to construction activities; however the exposure to objectionable odors during construction will be minor and temporary. Out of the 15 sites, 7 of them will be within urbanized area closer to residential/commercial areas. The remainder of the sites are not located within high-density or located in areas with a substantial number of people close to the project area. Therefore the project impacts will be less than significant. The already mentioned BAAQMD best management practices will ensure the project will have a less-than-significant impact</p>				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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 wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) Less than Significant with Mitigations: Out of the 15 sites, 8 of them are located on non-urban areas. A biological survey was conducted for Pearl Reservoir, Turquoise, and Concord Pavilion. Out of the 8 sites, the report determined that five sites did not require site surveys since all project equipment is proposed to remain within the disturbed fenced footprint of the facility. Even though not all of the 8 non-urban sites requires surveys, the biology analysis was conservative as it includes preventive mitigations/best management practices to be applied during the construction phases of the project for all of the 8 sites.

Below includes an analysis for each site:

Bald Mountain: The site is located within a portion of the 355-acre property owned by the East Bay Regional Park District, addressed 2501 Grizzly Peak Blvd, in the unincorporated area of Orinda. This site is relatively flat, with elevation of approximately 1910 feet. The site is surrounded by ruderal grassland, a gravel road, and dense oak trees, pines, and shrubs. The project includes installation of electrical equipment, trenching, antennas and microwave dishes to be installed on the existing lattice tower. All ground equipment is proposed to be within the existing shelter. There is not proposed disturbance outside of the fenced/disturbed facility. However, due to the proposed work activities proximity to oaks, pines, the project could impact nesting birds/raptors. See Mitigation BIO-1 below.

Bayloop Highland. The site is a 0.080-acre privately owned property located within a larger 174-acre property owned by the East Bay Regional Park District. Site is accessed through Morgan Territory Road, in the unincorporated area of Livermore. Site elevations vary from 2580 to 2590. This site is surrounded by ruderal grassland on all sides, a gravel road to the southeast, and scrubland/chaparral to the south.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The project includes collocation of antennas and microwave dishes on the existing tower, ground equipment and electrical conduit all within the fenced area and electrical equipment will be able to fit with the existing shelter. No work is proposed beyond the fenced facility area. However, due to the sensitivity of the site area, the construction impact may cause disturbance to sensitive species observed and potentially to be found in the vicinity of the facility. There are several reported observations of Alameda whipsnake which is state and federally threatened in the general project area; however, no suitable habitat were occurs adjacent to the site. There is also 4 reported observations of the California red-legged frogs, which is a California Species of Special Concern and federally threatened, within one mile of the project sites. As a caution, it is recommended that silt fencing be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound to prevent wildlife from entering the work area. See Mitigation BIO-2. snake proofing fencing shall be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound/facility to prevent snake from entering the work area. See Mitigation BIO-3.</p>				
<p>Additionally, due to the proposed work's proximity to adjacent scrubland/chaparral habitats, a reconstruction nesting bird survey would be necessary if work were to commence during the nesting season. See Mitigation BIO-1. With the avoidance of these mitigations, the impact to special species will be less than significant level.</p>				
<p><u>Kregor Peak:</u> The facility is located at the end of Nortonville Road in the Black Diamond trail in the City of Clayton unincorporated County area. The facility is owned by the County. Site elevations vary from 1880 feet to 1895 feet. The site is bordered by ruderal grassland to the south, a gravel road to the north, and oak woodland to the north. The project will include installation of antennas, microwave dish on existing lattice tower, and all equipment will be installed inside of the existing electrical equipment shelter. There are 24 reported observations of Alameda whipsnake in the general project area and redlegged-frog about one mile from the site. As a caution, it is recommended that silt fencing be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound to prevent wildlife from entering the work area. See Mitigation BIO-2. snake proofing fencing shall be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound/facility to prevent snake from entering the work area. See Mitigation BIO-3.</p>				
<p>Additionally, due to the proposed work's proximity to adjacent scrubland/chaparral habitats, a reconstruction nesting bird survey would be necessary if work were to commence during the nesting season. See Mitigation BIO-1. With the avoidance of these mitigations, the impact to special species will be less than significant level.</p>				
<p><u>Cummings Skyway:</u> The site is located within a portion of the 0.98-acre property located off Cuming Skyways in the Crocket area. Site elevation varies from 890 feet to 900 feet. The site is also surrounded by ruderal grassland sparsely vegetated with shrubs. The project includes a collocation of antennas microwave dishes on existing lattice tower, and ground equipment. All equipment and work will take place within the fenced lease area of the site. There has been one reported observation of Alameda whip snake in the general vicinity, one reported observation of the red-legged frog, and one observation report of Suisun song sparrow within one mile of the site. As a caution, it is recommended that silt fencing be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound to prevent wildlife from entering the work area. See Mitigation BIO-2.</p>				
<p>Additionally, due to the proposed work's proximity to adjacent scrubland/chaparral habitats, a reconstruction nesting bird survey would be necessary if work were to commence during the nesting season. See Mitigation BIO-1. With the avoidance of these mitigations, the impact to special species will be less than significant level.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><u>Concord Pavilion:</u> This is an approximately 59-acre site owned by the City of Concord. Site is addressed 2000 Kirker Pass Road. The project proposes collocation of the following antennas and microwave dishes within the existing monopole and electrical ground equipment within the existing shelter. In addition, approximately 400 feet of underground electrical conduit will be installed outside of the existing fenced compound, which will require trenching from the sheltered equipment pad to an existing electrical meter to the northwest. This new trenching will be located along a strip of ruderal vegetation adjacent to the paved parking area but outside of the top of the bank of drainage. Most equipment will either be collocated to the tower or be within the enclosed shelter area, however, due to the trenching that is proposed to take place outside of the enclosed area, impact could occur to ruderal vegetation such as slender wild oat, Mediterranean mustard, common knotweed, bristly ox-tongue, summer cottonweed, sweet fennel, pigweed, tumbleweed, ripgut grass, and yellow start thistle.</p> <p>The unnamed drainage to the north support a sparse riparian corridor dominated by valley oak, eucalyptus, red willow, tree tobacco, and black walnut. The understory supports California coffeeberry and poison hemlock. Wildlife observed includes Anna's hummingbird, red-tailed hawk, western scrub jay, rock pigeon, black-tailed hare, Botta's pocket gopher, California ground squirrel and western fence lizard. Additionally, there are 18 reported observations of the Alameda whip snake in the general vicinity, however, no suitable habitat was present within or adjacent to the site. There was also 3 reported observation of California tiger salamander (state and federal threatened) and red-legged frog within one mile from the site. As a prevention the project will be required to install silt fencing around fenced compound and silt fence to be installed at the top of bank along the proposed trenching to avoid debris from entering into the drainage area. See BIO-2. <u>Snake proofing fencing is also recommended to be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound/facility to prevent snake from entering the work area. See Mitigation BIO-3.</u> The project would also be required to perform nesting surveys due to the proximity to the riparian corridor. See Mitigation BIO-1.</p> <p><u>Nichol Knob:</u> The site is an approximately 0.25-acre site owned by the City of Richmond and adjacent to East Bay Regional Parks District property. The site is located at the termination of Marine Avenue. Site is flat and had an elevation of about 370 feet. The site is surrounded by ruderal grassland, and sparse oaks, pines, and shrubs. All equipment will be installed on the existing tower and within existing underground space. There is no work proposed on the top of the above ground area. There are no anticipated impacts to wildlife and species during construction or operation of the project. However due to the presence of nearby trees, the project will be required to conduct pre-construction survey if instead during the nesting season. See BIO-1</p> <p><u>Pearl Reservoir:</u> This is an approximately 1.75-acre site owned by the East Bay Utility Municipal District. The site is located east of the termination of Monte Cresta Avenue in the City of Richmond. The site is surrounded by Monterey pines and sparsely herbicide-treated ground. The project includes installation of ground equipment, cable tray and ice bridge from the existing facility to the new proposed 60-foot tall monopole. Ruderal vegetation observed includes wild oat, bristly ox-tongue, yellow star thistle, bull thistle, and Italian thistle. Wildlife observed include northern mockingbird, tree toad, and violet green swallow. No special species status plants or animals were observed during the site visit. There are 3 observation of alameda whipsnake; however no suitable habitat occurs adjacent to the site. Out of caution, the project will need to comply with Mitigation BIO-1 and BIO-2.</p> <p><u>Turquoise:</u> This is a 30.5-acre site owned by the City of Hercules. The project proposes installation of a new +50-foot monopole and collocation of ground equipment/electrical (including new pole) are within fenced/disturbed site. This site includes the antennas to be installed on a brand new +50-foot</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>tall monopole; however, the location of the monopole will be with the existing disturbed/fenced are of the compound. Al electrical ground equipment will be within enclosed electrical shelter. However, ruderal vegetation was observed at this site, including Mediterranean mustard, yellow star thistle, California poppy, riggut grass, and prickly lettuce. Native vegetation to the north of the site is dominated by coyote brush, mugwort, poison oak, coast live oak, and bay laurel. Wildlife observed includes Anna's hummingbird, spotted towhee, red-tailed hawk, western scrub jay, ash-throated flycatcher, northern mockingbird, rock pigeon, tree swallow, violet green swallow, black-tailed hare, Botta's pocket gopher, California ground squirrel, and western fence lizard. There are also several observations of the Alameda whip snake in the general vicinity. Even though there is slight chances the project will harm any of these species, the project will be required to comply with Biology mitigation BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3. With the implementation of these mitigations, the project will have a less than significant impact on the species.</p>				
<p>BIO-1 If construction activities occur during the nesting season (February 1- September 1) a nesting survey should be done at least 15 days prior to construction. If the survey indicates the potential presence of nesting birds, a qualified biologist should determine an appropriate sized buffer around the nest in which no work will be allowed until young have successfully fledged.</p>				
<p>BIO-2 Silt fencing shall be installed prior to the construction activities (including trenching/grading) and be left in place upon completion of work to avoid wildlife from entering the site and to avoid debris from migrating downslope of the project site or from entering drainage area.</p>				
<p>BIO-3 Snake proofing fencing shall be installed around the perimeter of the fenced compound/facility to prevent snake from entering the work area. Snake exclusion fencing will consist of 4-foot wall of ¼-inch mesh, galvanized wire (i.e. hardware cloth). The bottom of the fence would be firmly seated in the ground at upland locations. The first 3-feet of fencing above the ground would be anchored to staking with wire. Finally, the top 10-inch or less, would be bent over in a semi-circle towards the outside of the fence to ensure that the fence cannot be climbed.</p>				
<p>b) <u>Less than Significant with Mitigations</u>: The survey conducted at the above mentioned sites indicated that a variety of animal species, birds, and special sensitive vegetation have been observed or have the potential to be within the immediate vicinity of the sites. Unless mitigated, the project could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The mitigation already identified requires preconstruction survey, silt fencing, and special snake fencing to avoid impact to the special species. See BIO-1 through BIO-3 above.</p>				
<p>c) <u>Less than Significant</u>: No wetland were observed within close proximity of the sites. Most of the sensitive non-urban sites are within very high altitude faraway from creeks and other body of waters. The project will not have an impact to any wetland, marsh, vernal pool features, etc. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant. The survey conducted by Monk and Associates revealed an unnamed drainage to the north of the Concord Pavilion site. Silt fencing will be required (already identified BIO-2) to avoid construction debris from reaching that drainage area.</p>				
<p>d) <u>Less than Significant with</u>: The project will not result in permanent</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>disruption to movement of wildlife species. While most of the sites are within close proximity to sensitive habitat areas, already identified mitigation measures will ensure impacts are minimized to less than significant. Therefore, the project will less than significant impact.</p> <p>e) <u>Less than Significant</u>: There is no request to work within the canopy, remove or significantly alter/impact any trees within any of the site. The Delta site (City of Oakley) originally included removal of a pine tree. The applicant has agreed to preserve the pine tree and the project will be installed with no impact to the pine tree. As proposed the project should not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or tree ordinances.</p> <p>f) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The Kregor Peak and Highland, are within the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan. However, due to the fact that no work will be performed outside of the boundaries of the disturbed/fenced facility, installation of the project would not cause concerns or potential conflict with the ECCHCP. The project will be less than significant.</p>				
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u></p> <p>a) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The project will not create a substantial adverse change to historical resources of significance. Potential minor grading to allow the construction of the new shelter and installation of propane tank Neither of these activities should impact historical resources. There are no historic structures/resources involved or that would need to be impacted as part of this project.</p> <p>b) <u>Less than Significant with Mitigation</u>: The likelihood of a archaeological resource being discovered during ground-disturbing Project activities (e.g., demolition, grading, excavation, etc.) is minimal. However, if an inadvertent discovery were to occur, it could result in damage to the resource that would cause a substantial adverse change in its significance, thereby constituting a significant impact. Ohlone cultural materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials in this locale might include shipwreck remains, including wood, iron, and steel-hulled ships as well as smaller ferrous materials such as anchors, iron ballast, chain, iron hull fasteners, rigging, and fittings of various types. Other historic-period materials could include debris scatters of ceramic, glass, or metal containers; household or personal items; privy pits; or building foundations or other structural remains. The</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
implementation of Mitigation CUL-1 would reduce to a less-than-significant level any potential impacts from inadvertent discovery of archaeological resource.				
<p>CUL-1: Project personnel shall be alerted to the possibility of encountering archaeological materials during ground-disturbing activities. If an inadvertent discovery is made of items of pre-contact or historic-period archaeological potential, all work activities shall immediately cease in the area of discovery. After cessation of ground disturbing activity in the vicinity of the find, the contractor shall immediately contact the Project proponent. Archaeological resources inadvertently discovered during Project activities shall be evaluated by a cultural resources specialist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's standards in the appropriate discipline. If the find is determined to be potentially significant as either a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource, the archaeologist, in consultation with the Project proponent and appropriate Ohlone representatives or historical societies, shall develop a research design and treatment plan outlining management of the resource, analysis, and reporting of the find.</p> <p>c) <u>Less than Significant with Mitigation</u>: The likelihood of a unique paleontological or geological resource being discovered during Project ground-disturbing activities is minimal. However, such a discovery could potentially lead to damage or destruction of the resource, which would constitute a significant impact. In the event that such a resource is found, the implementation of Mitigation below would reduce any potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>CUL-2: Project personnel shall be alerted to the possibility of encountering paleontological materials during ground-disturbing activities. If paleontological resources, such as fossilized bone, teeth, shell, tracks, trails, casts, molds, or impressions are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, all such activities within 50 feet of the find shall be halted until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate salvage measures in conformance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Guidelines.</p> <p>d) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The project will not impact any formal or informal cemeteries because none were found to be present within or adjacent to the project location. Construction work will stop if human remains are encountered and the appropriate contacts will be made including immediately contacting the County Coroner, Native American Heritage Commission, and a qualified archeologist to determine how to appropriately deal with the remains in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a 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 Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

The project includes mostly collocation with the exception that a monopole will need to be built at two sites Pearl Reservoir and Turquoise). Most sites include the installation of small equipment, antennas, and electrical conduits. This section includes detailed analysis specifically for the sites of the proposed new monopoles.

a-i) Less than Significant: No faults classified as active pass through the sites, specifically the Pearl Reservoir and Turquoise sites, and no known inactive faults bisect areas planned for development. The nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zone is that associated with the Greenville fault, which passes approximately 3½ miles east of the site (see Figure 4-7-2). Therefore the risk of active faulting to the planned improvements is less than significant.

a-ii) Less than Significant: The development of the project is subject to the provision of the County Grading Ordinance, California Building Code, along with the Mitigation Measures identified in this document. For a conservatively designed and properly constructed project that complies with all applicable regulations, the risk to people or structure to damage from earthquake shaking is less-than-significant.

a-iii) Less than Significant: With regard to liquefaction potential, the Safety Element of the General Plan divides Contra Costa County into three categories: “generally high,” “generally moderate to low,” and “generally low.” This map was prepared by geotechnical consulting firm retained by the County. They analyzed soils maps of the County, reviewed selected geotechnical reports to provide information on the depth of the water table as well as engineering properties of soils, and performed engineering evaluation of the data gathered. The map is used as a screening criteria by Contra Costa County during the processing of applications for construction projects. The County requires rigorous evaluation of liquefaction potential for project located in areas of “generally high” liquefaction potential, and less comprehensive investigations are demanded for project located on sites in the “moderate to low” category. For projects located on sites classified “generally low” liquefaction, the risks are considered so low that further evaluation is not warranted. The map attempts to be conservative of the side of safety, and where geologically recent alluvial and estuarine deposits are shown on soils maps of the County, the map considers the property to be in the “generally high” category. Conversely, bedrock sites in upland portions of the County are all deemed to be in the generally low category

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>because the rock is too well consolidated to liquefy (and often to cohesive to liquefy).</p> <p>According to Liquefaction Potential Map in the Safety Element, the project sites are rated “generally low” liquefaction potential. The Safety Element includes a number of policies indicating that at-risk areas require evaluation of liquefaction potential and effective mitigation of the hazard posed to new development. Those policies are not applicable to the proposed BayWEB sites, because they are rated “generally low” liquefaction potential.</p> <p>a-iv) <u>Less than Significant with Mitigation</u>: With respect to landslide hazards, the BayWEB sites are not within any known landslide areas. However, mapping of the U.S. Geological Survey identifies numerous slides downslope from the Turquoise and Pearl Reservoir sites. In fact, slide are mapped within approximately 100-150 feet of the Pearl Reservoir site, and 300 ft. of the Turquoise site. Because of the concentration of mapped landslides on the flanks of the ridges downslope of the tower sites and the proximity of mapped slides to the sites, it can be inferred that the rock is marginally stable. The building site are conceivably at risk from the headward migration of slide scarps or formation of new slides. There is also the potential for soil creep or rock creep to influence the stability of the tower sites. See Mitigation GEO-1 through GEO-3 to minimize the impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>GEO-1 At least 30 days prior to requesting building permits or installation of utilities, submit a geotechnical report for review of the Peer Review Geologist, and review and approval of the Zoning Administrator. Improvement, grading, and building plans shall carry out the recommendations of the approved report. This report shall provide an assessment of stability, and evaluate potential for seismic settlement and other types of seismically-induced ground failure by recognized methods appropriate to soil conditions discovered during subsurface investigation. It shall also provide recommendations for pad grading, drainage and foundations. The report shall identify any adverse conditions requiring special foundation recommendations (e.g. the cut/ fill transition, differential fill thickness. The geotechnical report shall include provision for observation and testing services to ensure that the geotechnical recommendations are properly implemented during construction. The scope of the required report shall include the following: (a) logging of backhoe test pits adequate to determine the thickness of soils, rock type(s), orientation of bedrock and dominant jointing, severity of weathering, (b) preparation of an original geologic map of the project site and area within 200 ft. of planned improvements that show the details of observed features and conditions, (c) provide a global stability analysis of the natural slopes that are pertinent to evaluation the stability of the building site, (d) if any landslides or areas of heavy erosion are identified in proximity to the building site that require corrective grading, identify the slopes and provide detailed design recommendations for the corrective grading, (d) provide specific standards and criteria for site grading, drainage and foundation design. This shall include recommendations for the gradient of any required engineered slopes. During rough grading, salvage top soils for use during final grading/ erosion control.</p> <p>GEO-2 The final geotechnical report shall outline the monitoring and testing services recommended by the geotechnical engineer during construction</p> <p>GEO3- Hillside graded slopes shall be contour rounded to mimic natural terrain features. Final graded slopes shall be track-walked with salvaged topsoil (typically 3-4 inches deep), and</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
re-vegetated.				
<p>b) <u>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</u> The proposed project (specifically Pearl Reservoir) will require cuts and fills on relatively steep slopes, with a potential to cause significant erosion on unprotected slopes, and downslope/ downstream sedimentation both on and off the site. There are multiple facets to the subject of erosion and sediment control. Erosion control requires use of techniques which prevent displacement of soil particles by raindrops, moving water and wind. Sediment control requires removal of particles that are suspended in moving water, along with requiring knowledge of drainage control.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measures. All of the following mitigation measures are required to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant. Measures (4) and (5) address short-term construction related impacts. Mitigation measure (6) addresses the long-term erosion and sedimentation related impacts.</p>				
<p>GEO-4 Grading activities shall be restricted to the summer construction season (April 15th through October 15th to the extent feasible. Any earthwork done after October 15th shall be limited to activities directly related to erosion control, unless an extension of the grading season is specifically authorized by the Grading Section of the Building Inspection Division.</p>				
<p>GEO-5 Prior to issuance of the Grading Permit the applicant shall submit an Erosion Control Plan and SWPPP to the Grading Section of the Building Inspection Division for their review and approval. The measures employed to control erosion must be based on site-specific needs of the project. Measure employed to control erosion within the project should include the following:</p>				
<p>i. Minimize the areas of exposed, erodible soils, and avoid over-concentration of rapidly flowing runoff on unprotected/ erodible areas. Wherever feasible, isolate runoff from ungraded areas, <i>thereby</i> simplifying erosion control and sediment control measures with the graded areas;</p>				
<p>ii. The erosion control plan to include water bars, temporary (or permanent) drainage ditches and culverts, erosion-control blankets, hydroseeding, silt fences/ straw bales, and sediment trap basins;</p>				
<p>iii. Placement of salvaged topsoil on final-graded 3:1 slopes prior to the on-set of winter rains:</p>				
<p>iv. A comprehensive program for inspection and maintenance of the graded areas throughout the winter rainy season, including provisions for documenting maintenance activities.</p>				
<p>GEO-6 To reduce potential long-term impacts of erosion and sedimentation, provide for appropriate design of facilities that efficiently (a) revegetate graded slopes, (b) provide sheetflow runoff from disturbed areas, (c) minimize the footprint of impervious surfaces, (d) trap sediment on the perimeter of graded pad using biotechnical means, and (e) provide for the inspection and maintenance of the project</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
site over the long term to ensure that erosion is controlled.				
<p>c) <u>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</u> The proposed BayWEB tower sites Pearl Reservoir and Turquoise) are located on the axis of bedrock ridges. Because of the steepness of the natural slope gradient and the concentration of landslides, the ridges are generally regarded as being <i>susceptible</i> to landslides. A geologic reconnaissance of the sites by the County Peer Review Geologist concludes that the projects are feasible. However the reconnaissance investigation was only intended to characterize potential geologic hazards. It not a substitute for a detailed geological and geotechnical investigation of the sites, nor was it was intended to be the basis for issuance of construction permits. In concern with preparation of more detailed grading and drainage plans. It should also be recognized that the reconnaissance report does not include slope stability analysis or provide review comments on the grading plans for the project, nor does it provide performance criteria for the engineered slopes (e.g. safety factors for static conditions and pseudo-static conditions).</p> <p>The project geotechnical engineer will prepare a design-level report. It will provide adequate subsurface and laboratory data to confirm/ refine preliminary conclusions regarding subsurface conditions and potential hazards. Specifically, the design level geotechnical report must evaluate slope stability, including creeping soils and expansive/ corrosive soils on the planned improvements. It will also provide engineering parameters intended to guide the design of the project, including corrective grading of any slide areas that threaten improvements as well as providing design-level recommendations for preparation of building pads, drainage, foundation and erosion control.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> All of the following mitigation measures are required to reduce the impact of landslides and other potential geologic hazards to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>d) <u>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</u> Expansive soils (those with high shrink-swell potential)are described and mapped on the project site by the Soil Survey of Contra Costa County and confirmed by the USGS. Additionally, the fine-grained bedrock is classified as expansive to severely expansive. Normally, geotechnical reports allow use of expansive native soils and bedrock as fill, but their use implies detailed specifications for foundations. Where buildings are sited within an area of expensive soils, special recommendations are required for foundations (either use of drilled pier foundations or equivalent that extend well below the depth of desiccation cracks; or where shallow foundation systems are to be utilized, the importing of non-expansive fill materials is prescribed.)</p> <p>Damage from expensive soils and/or bedrock is one of the most widespread and costly problems in the San Francisco Bay Region. The significant effects of expansive soils can be mitigated by recognition of the and appropriate design. Additionally, the native soils are considered to be corrosive by the Soil Survey of Contra Costa County.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures.</u> The following mitigation measures are required to reduce the impact of expansive soils and/or bedrock to less-than-significant.</p> <p>GEO- 7 The design-level geotechnical report shall provide specific standards and criteria for foundation and pavement design developed in accordance with the California Building Code and County Code requirements on the basis of subsurface data and laboratory testing. The constraints on use of expansive soils near finished grade should be evaluated in the report. It is also anticipated that the design-level geotechnical report with provide CBC seismic parameters, and lot drainage</p>				

	Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	recommendations, along with recommendations for geotechnical monitoring services during foundation-related work on the site.				
GEO-8	The design-level geotechnical report shall also identify cut/fill transition and/or differential fill pads that will require special foundations, and will provide recommendations for grading of these lots.				
GEO-9	Following rough grading the geotechnical engineer shall perform corrosivity testing of building pads to determine which, if any, of the lots require special precautions to avoid damage to improvements that are in contact with the ground (concrete or steel).				
GEO-10	Prior to the issuance of building permits, the geotechnical engineer shall certify that the lot preparation work is in compliance with recommendations in the approved design-level report. During foundation work the geotechnical engineer shall provide observation services to ensure the geotechnical recommendations are properly implemented by the contractor. Prior to requesting a final building inspection, the Building Inspection may require documentation of the geotechnical engineer's observation services during final grading/ foundation work/ project drainage. The intent of such documentation is to ensure that the as-built improvements are in conformance with recommendations in the approved design-level report.				
GEO-11	The design-level geotechnical report is subject to peer review by the Peer Review Geologist, and by review and approval of the Building Inspection Division.				
f)	<u>No Impact</u> : The project does not involve any septic tank therefore it will not have any concern related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.				
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the project:					
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u></p> <p>a) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The construction activities of the project will generate GHG through vehicle exhaust. The BAAQMD does not have an adopted threshold of Significance for construction related GHG emissions, however, to provide a comparison, operational GHG emissions are considered significant at 1,100 metric tons CO₂ equivalent/yr. Additionally, the typical project emissions for NO_x for this type of projects are below the adopted threshold of significance for criteria pollutants. As discussed in Air Quality section (a) the project will implement standard BMPs which include measures to reduce emissions from construction vehicles such as minimizing idling times and requiring properly maintained and tuned equipment. Because project emissions of CO₂ are relatively small and of a temporary nature, potential project impacts are negligible. Once completed the project would generate one to 2 trips per month for the required maintenance of each site would not result in an increased emissions of greenhouse</p>					

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
gases because the project would not increase vehicle trips or vehicle miles traveled on any roadway than the required for maintenance. Therefore, no new regional vehicle emissions would occur. Project impacts are temporary and will not exceed threshold limits therefore project impacts will be less than significant.				
b) <u>Less than Significant</u> : As discussed above and in the Air Quality section, implementation of the air pollution control measures will minimize air quality impacts which are consistent with the BAAQMD air quality plans on achieving GHG reductions. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.				
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
a) <u>Less than Significant</u> : The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because once constructed, the project would not result in routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. There is the potential for a release of hazardous substances from construction equipment operations (e.g., accidental petroleum spills) during construction. Project contract specifications will require that the contractor prepare a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) or Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) if appropriate to identify safety and best management practices (e.g., placement of drip pans				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>under stationary equipment, routine equipment inspections, and on-site spill cleanup materials) to prevent accidental releases of hazardous substances and potential worker exposure. In addition, project contract specifications will require the contractor to contact Underground Service Alert (USA) prior to conducting any work that could potentially impact utilities. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				
<p>b) <u>Less than Significant</u>: As discussed above, once constructed the project would not use or store hazardous materials that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. There is the potential for a release of hazardous substances from construction equipment operations (e.g., accidental petroleum spills) during construction. The preventative measures discussed above will minimize potential impacts to the environment and worker exposure. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				
<p>c) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school because there are no schools located within one-quarter mile. While construction equipment exhaust will generate an increase in air pollutant concentrations, it would be temporary and effects would be negligible due to implementation of air pollution control measures identified in Section III. Air Quality. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				
<p>d) <u>No Impact</u>: County staff reviewed the Environmental Protection Agency website that displayed known locations that store or handle hazardous materials (Environmental Protection Agency 2010). The project is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites and would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment. Therefore, project will have no impact.</p>				
<p>e) <u>No Impact</u>: The project is not located within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p>				
<p>f) <u>No Impact</u>: The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p>				
<p>g) <u>Less than Significant</u> The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because access for emergency vehicles will be provided at all times. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				
<p>h) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The California Department of Forestry Hazard Severity Zones map (2006) identifies most of the sites' areas as in a Local Responsibility Area that is in a Non-Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Some of the sites are within relatively High Fire Hazard areas because of their rural/isolated and highly vegetated locations. However, the project does not include construction of structures that would increase the risk from wildland fires as the purpose of the project is to upgrade already existing wireless facilities. Further, safety and best management practices required for construction of the project will identify proper protocol should a fire occur. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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 level (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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u></p> <p>a) <u>Less than Significant:</u> The project will be subject to Clean Water Act requirements and will adhere to construction provisions, precautions, and stipulations as described in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit that will be complied with under the current Statewide General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity and/or Contra Costa's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS4) NPDES Permits. In accordance with the provisions of the Construction General Permit and/or the MS4 Permits, the CCCPWD will require the contractor to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) or a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) to identify BMPs that will reduce discharge of pollutants from construction activities. Therefore, the project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The project will not establish or intensify land uses that are likely to introduce sources of water pollution that will contribute to any violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project does not create enough impervious surface to trigger the threshold for the requirement to install permanent post-construction storm water treatment and/or hydrograph modification management facilities pursuant to the County's C.3 provision.</p>				
<p>b) <u>No Impact</u>: The project will not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table because the project will not involve any withdrawals from an aquifer or the groundwater table. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p>				
<p>c) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The project will not alter the course of any known stream or river. The overall drainage pattern of the site will not be significantly modified nor will it lead to substantial on-site or off-site erosion or siltation due to the installation of the project. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				
<p>d) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The project will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site because the existing drainage pattern will be reestablished once the project is complete. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant</p>				
<p>e) <u>Less than Significant</u>: A few of the sites are located within the watershed of creeks. For instance, the Danville Fire Station No. 31 site is located within the San Ramon Creek watershed, the Pearl Reservoir is located within the San Pablo Creek watershed, and the</p>				
<p>Concord Con-training site is adjacent to Pine creek. The project does not include a significant amount of impervious surface. If additional impervious surface is added, the project may be required to design and construct storm drain facilities to adequately collect and convey storm water entering or originating within the development to the nearest adequate man-made drainage facility or natural watercourse, without diversion of the watershed, in accordance with Title 9 of the County Ordinance Code. As proposed, the project will not contribute to run-off water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. No additional vehicle trips will occur as a result of the project and appropriate erosion and siltation Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented; therefore no additional sources of polluted runoff are anticipated. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact.</p>				
<p>f) <u>Less than Significant</u>: As previously stated, the project includes temporary construction and best management practices will be utilized during construction to avoid adverse impacts to water quality. Contract specifications will require the appropriate storage, servicing and fueling of construction equipment away from drainage ditches to avoid potentially impacting water quality. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				
<p>g) <u>No Impact</u>: The project will not create or place any housing within a 100-year flood plain, because the project will not create any residential structures. In addition no construction will occur within the 100 year flood plain. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p>				
<p>h) <u>No Impact</u>: The project will not place any structure within the 100-year flood plain that</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
could impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, the project will have no impact.					
i) <u>No Impact</u> : The project does not include the construction or alteration of any levees or dams and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam. The project area is not located within an area that would be inundated from a dam failure (ABAG Dam Failure Inundation Map, 2009), and the project will not result in construction of structures for occupancy. Therefore, the project will have no impact.					
j) <u>No Impact</u> : The project is not located in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (ABAG Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, 2009). Therefore, the project will have no impact.					
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – <i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>SUMMARY:</u>					
<p>The County is serving as the lead agency for this project. Once the County adopts the CEQA document, the applicant needs to meet the requirement(s) of each City. Since the County does not have a wireless facility ordinance, the County's conducts its review of wireless facility based on the existing 1998 Telecom Policy Act. While a land use permit/development plan is required for the processing of wireless facilities, the purpose of the County's Telecom Act is to restrict the establishment of commercial facilities. Due to the governmental, non-commercial nature of this project, most Cities' ordinances allow for an exemption. While a land use permit will be required for the City of Hercules, most cities have exempted both discretionary and required administrative process of the project.</p> <p>Below is summary which includes the ownership, parcel number, zoning, and general plan designation for each site:</p>					
Ste Name	Jurisdiction	Property Owner	General Plan	Zoning	Parcel Number
Kregor	County	County	Agricultural Land (AL)	A-4	075-160-009
Bald Mountain	County	EBRPD	Parks and Recreation (PR)	A-80	267-010-009
Cummings Skyway	County	John A. Ran Demartine	Agricultural Land (AL)	A-4	354-300-008
Highland	County	Scott Bryant Tre	Agricultural Land (AL)	A-80	006-090-003

Environmental Issues				Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Ste Name	Jurisdiction	Property Owner	General Plan	Zoning	Parcel Number		
Tishman Building	City of Concord	Center Investor	Downtown Mixed Use	Downtown Business	126-103-027		
Concord Pavilion	City of Concord	Concord	Open Space	Planned District	118-040-039		
Con-Fire Training	City of Concord	CCC Fire Protection	Public/Quasi Public	Single-family Residential R-8	145-070-042		
Nichol Knob	Richmond	City of Richmond	Open Space- Recreation Lands	Community and Regional recreation District	556-101-028		
Pearl Reservoir	Richmond	EBMUD	Open Space- Preservation/Resource Area	Community and Regional recreation District	419-180-005		
Pine Street	Martinez	Contra Costa County	Governmental	Civic	373-262-004		
Glacier	Martinez	Contra Costa County	Government	Governmental facility	155-280-011		
Turquoise	Hercules	Hercules	Public Open Space	Public Open Space	407-062-014		
Delta	Oakley	Contra Costa County	Public-Semi Public	Downtown Specific Plan	035-131-003		
S.R. Fire Station No. 31	Town of Danville	San Ramon Valley Fire Protection	Limited Office	Limited Office District	207-012-006		
EL Cerrito PD	City of El Cerrito	City of El Cerrito	Institutional and Utility	Public-Semi Public & Plan. Development Overlay	502-411-007		

LAND USE SUMMARY CONTINUED:

- a) No Impact: The project will not physically divide an established community. The proposed upgrade to the wireless facilities would allow a more reliable service to the public safety sector. Therefore, the project will have no impact. This will be a beneficial impact.
- b) No Impact: The project will not result in an alteration of the present or planned land use of the area. The facilities are existing and are mostly collocation. Therefore, the project will have no impact. Above is a summary of the zoning and general designation for each site.
- c) Less than Significant Impact: Two of the sites, Highland and Kregor Peak are within the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan area; however, since there is no ground disturbance proposed within these sites, the project would conflict with this plan. The remainders of the 13 sites are outside of the plan area. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. MINERAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u></p> <p>a) The project will not impact the availability of mineral resources that would be of value to the state or region. A review of Contra Costa General Plan map F-8 revealed no mapped mineral resources in the project area. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>b) There are no mapped mineral resource areas in the project's site area. As such, the project will not adversely affect the availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or land use plan. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p>				
12. NOISE – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><u>SUMMARY OF NOISE CONTINUED:</u></p> <p>The noise element of the County General Plan provides goals, policies, and implementation measures for consideration. Contra Costa County does not have a noise ordinance and therefore, does not specify construction or operational noise level limits. However, the Contra Costa County General Plan (2005-2020) specifies that construction activities shall be concentrated during the hours of the day that are not noise-sensitive for adjacent land uses.</p> <p>a) <u>Less than Significant:</u> The construction of the project involves mostly collocation of antennas and microwave dishes on existing tower/monopole and a few ground equipment along related electrical conduits. Only a couple of sites will require the installation of a monopole. However, short-term project construction activities for the proposed shelter will temporarily increase the noise level in the project area. Construction noise activities for this project is expected to fall within a typical range between 74 to 90 dBA (A-weighted decibels are abbreviated dB(A) or dBA). This is a temporary activity that would not exceed acceptable noise levels on a permanent basis.</p> <p>b) <u>Less than Significant:</u> Once constructed, ground borne vibration levels are expected to return to current levels that already exist. During project construction periodic, temporary generation of ground borne vibration may occur. Some ground borne vibration may result from equipment used during construction but will not be excessive based on the types of construction equipment that will be used. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p> <p>c) <u>Less than Significant:</u> The project will not result in a significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels because the project construction will be temporary and it will be an unmanned facility. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact.</p> <p>d) <u>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</u> As discussed in the above section a, construction activities will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels above what exists currently. However, due to the sensitive surroundings, construction noise, even temporary, can cause an impact to hikers and other animal species (within sensitive rural areas) and potentially disturb residential/commercial and other sensitive receptor within the urban sites. To ensure that this temporary noise disturbance will be minimized to a less than significant level, the applicant will have to comply with mitigation NOI-1 through NOI-3 below.</p> <p>e) <u>No Impact:</u> The project will not impact an airport land use plan because the project is not located within two miles of an airport. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>f) <u>No Impact:</u> The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>NOI-1 Construction activities will be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. with noise-generating activities in excess of 65 dBA further restricted to between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. (Monday through Friday).</p> <p>NOI-2 Use equipment with enclosures and high-performance mufflers to the extent feasible</p> <p>NOI-3 Within urbanized area, place construction equipment at locations to maximize the distance to nearest residences and other sensitive receptors.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u></p> <p>a) <u>No Impact:</u> The project will not increase population in the region because it will not build any new homes or extend a road or other infrastructure. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>b) <u>No Impact:</u> The project will not result in the displacement of any homes or residents because no homes will be demolished or removed by the project. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>c) <u>No Impact:</u> The project will not displace residents because as stated above no residences will be removed or demolished. Therefore, the project would have no impact.</p>				
14. Public Services – <i>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 of the public services:</i>				
a) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact</p> <p>a)-e): <u>No Impact:</u> The purpose of the project is to upgrade several existing wireless facilities. Installation of the project will allow the facilities to not only meet safety requirements, but also upgrade the site to a more advanced wireless technology. The project would be a beneficial impact because the services will improve a needed public safety system. The site would not require or impact any facilities such as need for fire, water police services, etc. No schools are in the vicinity and the project would not impact such facilities.</p>				
15. RECREATION				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u></p> <p>a) <u>No Impact</u>: The project will not impact the use of the recreation system beyond what currently exists. No aspect of this project would impact the access, parking or use of any recreation facility. Therefore, the project will not have an impact.</p> <p>b) <u>No Impact</u>: The project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. In addition, the project will not result in population growth. As such, no construction or expansion of recreational facilities is necessary. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p>				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in general policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternate transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
<p>a) <u>No impact:</u> The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy affecting the circulation system. The construction phase is temporary and any additional traffic generated by the construction activities will not add to permanent traffic being generated by the required maintenance of project. Therefore, the project will cause no impact.</p> <p>b) <u>No Impact:</u> The project does not include elements that could increase traffic on roadways. As such, no long term impacts will occur. Therefore, the project has no potential impacts.</p> <p>c) <u>No Impact:</u> The project will not create a change in air traffic patterns, as there will be no increase in air traffic levels due to this project. The project would pose no substantial safety risk to air traffic, and is not located within the vicinity of an airport. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>d) <u>No Impact:</u> The project would not increase design feature hazards. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>e) <u>Less than Significant:</u> The project will not create inadequate emergency access because traffic control measures will ensure that there is no interference with passing emergency vehicles (where applicable). Construction activities for the project are expected to start in late fall or early winter 2012. Typically, it should take a few months from start to finish for the onsite construction activities. Hours of construction should be limited to day time, Monday through Friday. The construction equipment will be located within the disturbed flat area immediately adjacent to the proposed project site area.</p> <p>f) <u>Less than Significant:</u> The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation because according to the Transit Network Plan (Contra Costa County 2005) the project is not within a transit corridor and no High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV), Bus or BART lanes routes are currently planned. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.</p>				
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u></p> <p>a) <u>No Impact</u>: The project will not exceed wastewater requirements because the project would not result in the need for wastewater treatment. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>b) <u>No Impact</u>: The project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities because the completed project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>c) <u>No Impact</u>: The completed project would not affect the existing stormwater drainage facilities. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>d) <u>No Impact</u>: The project will have minimal impacts on water supplies in the project area; therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>e) <u>No Impact</u>: The completed project will not require wastewater treatment services. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>f) <u>No Impact</u>: Solid waste generated by the project would be limited to construction debris, including concrete, asphalt, and woody debris. Solid waste disposal will occur in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. Disposal of these materials will occur at permitted landfills. The project will not generate the need for a new solid waste facility. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p> <p>g) <u>Less than Significant</u>: The project specifications will require that the contractor dispose of solid waste generated from construction in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact.</p>				
<p>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</p> <p>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>				
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) Less than Significant with Mitigations: The County has determined that the impacts to the County's resources and residents will not degrade the quality of the environment, nor will it substantially reduce the habitat or affect populations of any fish or wildlife species or eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory. However, some potential impacts have been identified in the areas of Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Biology, Geology, and Noise. Project impacts will be less than significant with the already identified mitigations measures in the Sections of Aesthetics (AES-1 through AES-5) Biology (BIO-1 through BIO-3), Cultural Resources CUL-1 and CUL 2, Geology GEO-1 through GEO-11, and Noise mitigation NOI-1 through NOI-3.
- b) Less than Significant: No other projects in the area should result in cumulative effects either currently or planned in the near future. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact.
- c) Less than Significant: The County has examined the possible impacts that are associated with the project; using research materials, maps, and the reports listed in the source section of this document to analyze the potential impacts to County resources and residents. After evaluating the purpose of the project and the value that it will bring to the public safety of Contra Costa County, the impacts would be only temporary in nature and less than significant with the recommended mitigation measures.

REFERENCES

- 1) Project Plans and Application submitted in February of 2012 and revised project July 3, 2012
- 2) Contra Costa County Ordinance (Title 8)
- 3) Contra Costa County Geographic Information Systems Data Layers
- 4) Contra Costa County General Plan (2005 - 2020)
- 5) 2008 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map (website)
<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/con08.pdf>
- 6) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines
- 7) Hazardous Waste and Materials Site List (Cortese List)
http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm
- 8) Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (December 13, 2000)
- 9) Abbreviated Biological Constraints Analysis for Proposed Bayweb Project Sites in Contra Costa County (Monk and Associates, July 26, 2012).
- 10) Bay Area Air Quality Management District, California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (May 2011)
http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_May%202011_5_3_11.ashx

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) Mitigated Negative Declaration – Notice
- 2) Vicinity Map showing the 15 sites
- 3) Table including parcel number, Zoning, General Plan, latitude and Longitude, and property owner
- 4) Plans, including elevations and photo of each facility