II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

This Executive Summary provides a brief description of the proposed project, areas of known controversy, and unresolved issues. The executive summary also identifies which environmental impacts associated with the proposed project are significant, what specific mitigation measures have been identified to reduce or avoid each significant impact, and the level of significance of the impact after mitigation. This Executive Summary is intended as an overview and should be used in conjunction with a thorough reading of the Draft SEIR. The text of this Draft SEIR, including figures, tables, and appendices serve as the basis for the Executive Summary.

B. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The Marin Emergency Radio Authority (MERA) proposes the Next Gen Communication System (Next Gen System, Next Gen, or proposed project), an upgrade to Marin County's existing emergency radio communications system that will improve the County's emergency communication capabilities during daily public service and critical emergencies. The proposed project would replace equipment at currently operating communications sites as well as install telecommunications facilities at new sites where public and private infrastructure already exists. In total, 10 existing sites would be upgraded, eight new sites would be introduced, and five sites would be decommissioned.

In 1999, MERA prepared an Initial Study (IS) for the original public safety and emergency radio system. The IS found that the original project could result in possible aesthetic, biological and radio frequency emission impact. In 2000, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) further expanded the site-by-site evaluation outlined in the IS regarding the project's potentially significant environmental impacts. As the presently proposed project builds upon and modifies the previously analyzed project, the original IS and EIR are incorporated into this Subsequent EIR (SEIR) by reference and the SEIR has been structured to mirror the subject matter and format of the 2000 Final EIR, taking into consideration changes and developments to the CEQA Guidelines and case law that have occurred since the publication of that document. Accordingly, this SEIR analyzes similar environmental issues to the 2000 Final EIR and includes a general analysis of the project's potentially significant environmental impacts as well as a site-by-site analysis.

C. AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY/ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and issues to be resolved. On May 17, 2018 MERA published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Subsequent EIR (SEIR) for the MERA Next Generation Project. The NOP informed Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, the public, and other interested parties about the proposal and its environmental effects, so they could be prepared to provide input on the scope and content of the SEIR. The

NOP also gave notice of a public scoping meeting and a 30-day public comment period to provide interested members of the public an opportunity to present oral or written comments on the issues to be evaluated in the Draft SEIR. The scoping meeting was held on May 31, 2018, and no members of the public attended. The 30-day public comment period ran from May 17 to June 18, 2018, and five written comment letters were received. The stamped NOP, a full transcript of the scoping meeting, as well as all comments received from the public or other agencies, can be viewed in Appendix E.

Additional stakeholder outreach meetings addressing site-specific environmental concerns were held throughout 2018. Public meetings to identify environmental issues of concern are outlined in Table II-1 below, which provides the stakeholder name, primary site(s) of interest, and date of outreach.

Table II-1. Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder	Site	Date
General Public	Project-wide CEQA Scoping Meeting	May 31, 2018
Marin Managers Association	Project-wide	April 26, 2018
Marin County Office of Education Land Owner	Coyote Peak	May 9, 2018 and June 19, 2018, November 13, 2019
General Public	Tomales	June 22, 2018
General Public	Skyview Terrace Water Tank	August 23, 2018
Golden Gate National Recreation Area	Muir Beach	August 29, 2018
Mill Valley City Council	Mill Valley	June 4, 2018
Muir Beach Community Water District	Muir Beach	December 12, 2018
Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR)	Big Rock Ridge, Mt. Tamalpais, Mt. Barnabe, Point Reyes Hill, Dollar Hill, San Pedro Ridge, Mt. Tiburon, Sonoma Mountain, Stewart Point, Tomales, Coyote Peak, Skyview Terrace Water Tank, Muir Beach	July 31, 2018 and Letter dated February 1, 2019

Environmental concerns raised during the meetings outlined in Table II-1 include:

- Aesthetic changes associated with modifications to existing towers
- Aesthetic changes associated with the construction of new towers
- Impacts to biological resources while improving the existing road to Coyote Peak
- Alterations to the significance of historic resources at three sites
- Possible alterations to tribal cultural resources at 13 sites
- Radio frequency emissions within controlled spaces with worker access
- Radio frequency emissions in uncontrolled spaces with public access
- Consistency with coastal development standards

D. SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to identify each significant effect on the environment, recommend mitigation measures, and evaluate a range of feasible alternatives that would reduce or avoid identified impacts while still meeting the Project's objectives. Refer to Chapter VII (Alternatives to the Proposed Project) of this Draft SEIR for an analysis of the alternatives to the proposed project. The alternatives presented include:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alterative – 16 Sites, Two Zone Simulcast System (400 MHz)
- Alternative 2: Upgrade Existing Sites – 16 Sites, Two Zone Simulcast System (700 MHz)
- Alternative 3: Original Motorola Solutions Proposal – 15 Sites, Two Zone Simulcast System (700 MHz)
- Alternative 4: Revised Project Design – 16 Sites, Two Zone Simulcast System (700 MHz)

Alternatives 1 and 2 would meet zero and one of MERA's five project objectives, respectively. These alternatives would not create any additional environmental impacts, but they also would not increase reliability or improve radio coverage. It has been determined that Marin County requires a more reliable communications network for emergency situations, to provide first responders the resources they need to keep the citizens of Marin County safe, but Alternatives 1 and 2 would leave coverage and reliability gaps in the system.

Alternative 3 has a reduced physical footprint, with less potential for environmental impacts than the Proposed Project because it has one fewer new sites. However, the power required to boost radio signals in order to compensate for the smaller number of tower sites would cause the MERA system signal to extend beyond the geographic boundaries established to limit conflicts with radio systems in surrounding areas.

Alternative 4 has a reduced physical footprint as well, with less potential for environmental impacts than the Proposed Project due to the elimination of the Tomales site. This alternative would also reduce aesthetic impacts by removing the Tomales Site and by finding alterative locations for the Mill Valley Water Tank and Skyview Terrace Water Tank Sites. However, these benefits to aesthetics in some areas are achieved only by creating more significant visual impacts at the alternative locations, potentially affecting nearby residences.

E. APPROVAL CONSIDERATIONS

This Draft SEIR was prepared to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project (State Clearinghouse No. 199092073) and was completed in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.), and Marin County policies, standards, and procedures. The purpose of this Draft SEIR is to inform decision makers, representatives of affected and responsible agencies, the public, and other interested parties of the potential environmental effects that may result from implementation of the proposed project. This Draft SEIR describes potential impacts related to a wide variety of environmental issues and methods by which these impacts can be mitigated or avoided. As described above, this Draft SEIR also describes various alternatives designed to reduce or avoid identified significant environmental impacts.

After considering this Draft SEIR, along with any changes to the Draft SEIR made in written response to public comments received on the Draft SEIR, MERA's Governing Board will determine whether to certify the Final SEIR. If certified, a Final SEIR will become a guidance document to the MERA Governing Board and other entities with discretionary approval over the project. Following certification, the Governing Board will then decide whether to approve the proposed project or an alternative to the proposed project. The Governing Board will also determine which mitigation measures can feasibly reduce the significant impacts of the project.

F. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table II-2 on the following page lists and summarizes the significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project (in the order in which they appear in this document), lists the mitigation measures recommended to reduce or avoid the identified impact, and identifies the level of impact remaining after mitigation implementation. The sites where an impact or mitigation measure apply are noted in the first column. Project-wide impacts are discussed by impact area in further detail in Chapter IV, while site-specific impacts are discussed in Chapter V.

Table II-2
Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Environmental Impact	**Mitigation Measures**	**Level of Impact After Mitigation**
AESTHETICS		
a) Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	**Mitigation Measure AES-5***	***Significant and Unavoidable***
Impact AES-5: The project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. *Site:* Skyview Terrace Water Tank	*Mitigation Measure AES-5:* The public trail that extends southward from the access road shall be reconstructed to allow pedestrians to access the open space area south of the site where views to Mt. Tamalpais and Big Rock Ridge would be unobstructed by the project. After implementation of mitigation the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
b) Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	**Mitigation Measure AES-2**	***Significant and Unavoidable***
Impact AES-2: The project would substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. *Site:* Tomales	*Mitigation Measure AES-2:* A six-foot tall, dark or earth-tone colored, opaque fence shall be incorporated into the perimeter fence on the north and west sides of the MERA facility to screen views of the equipment shelter from State Route 1 and from Whitaker Road. The fence shall also screen the same views of the existing cellular equipment structure, with permission from the owner/operator of that facility. Painted wood, permanently colored composite material (Trex or similar), or black vinyl chain-link with dark vinyl slats are material options suitable to screen views of the equipment structures. MERA shall maintain the proposed galvanized grey color of the 75-foot monopole at the Tomales site to minimize contrast with the sky on the hilltop location.	*Significant and Unavoidable*

* *Impacts and mitigation measures are numbered sequentially in subsequent chapters based on the order in which individual sites are addressed.*

c) Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings in a non-urbanized area; or in an urbanized area, conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	**Mitigation Measures AES-3 through AES-9**	***Significant and Unavoidable***
Impact AES-3: The project would substantially degrade the existing character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings in a non-urbanized area. *Site*: Tomales, Coyote Peak	*Mitigation Measure AES-3:* Upon completion of tower and structure construction, MERA shall remove all debris from the site, define all vehicular access points and turnarounds, and complete finish grading including road surfacing where needed and soil preparation for planting. Vehicular areas shall be graded to drain. Areas outside of vehicular zones shall be loosened or scarified if compacted, amended as needed and prepared to facilitate native seed germination. Hydroseed/mulch or hand-broadcast seeding and mulch shall complete site restoration. For sites steeper than 3:1 restored areas shall also include installation of straw waddles perpendicular to the slope at 20-foot intervals. The equipment shelter, fuel tank, and emergency generator shall be painted dark earth tone colors to minimize contrast in the landscape and chain link fencing shall be black vinyl-coated.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
Impact AES-4: The project would substantially degrade the existing character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings in a non-urbanized area. *Site:* Coyote Peak	*Mitigation Measure AES-4*: MERA shall screen close up views of the Coyote Peak site by including opaque fencing in the perimeter fence around the project site to to screen the generator and fuel tank. The fence shall be at least ten feet away from any structure.	*Significant and Unavoidable*

Impact AES-6: The project would substantially degrade the existing character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings in a non-urbanized area. *Site:* Skyview Terrace Water Tank	*Mitigation Measure AES-5:* Please see above. *Mitigation Measure AES-6*: A combination of berms, opaque fencing and native grassland hydroseeding shall be installed to screen views of the equipment shelter from points east and west of the ridgeline. Equipment on the site shall be aligned to maximize space for the berm construction and the trail (Mitigation Measure AES-5). The top of the berm and the six-foot tall fence shall be contoured to mimic the broad naturalized landform of the ridgeline and shall be high enough to screen the shelter (but not the monopole) from lower elevation views such as Highway 101 to the east and Park Ridge Road to the west. Berms shall be mulched and hydroseeded to minimize erosion potential and to allow for germination during winter rains. Any erosion of the berm shall be immediately repaired.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
Impact AES-7: The project would substantially degrade the existing character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings in a non-urbanized area. *Site:* Muir Beach	*Mitigation Measure AES-7:* The monopole shall be painted the same rusty-brown color as the restroom and shall blend with the adjacent water tank, as shown in Figure V.O-7. The back side of microwave dishes, and other equipment on the top of the water tank (to the extent feasible) shall be painted to match the tower. Front surfaces of microwave dishes cannot be painted and shall remain grey. Landscaping and opaque fencing are provided as part of the project to screen views of the equipment structure.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
Impact AES-8: The project would substantially degrade the existing character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings in a non-urbanized area. *Site:* Mill Valley Water Tank	*Mitigation Measure AES-8*: The monopole shall be painted a dark color on the bottom to blend with the adjacent water tank and vegetation. Above the top of the tank the tower shall be galvanized steel to minimize contrast with the sky.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
d) Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	**Mitigation Measure AES-1**	***Less than Significant***

Impact AES-1: The project would create a new source of light which could adversely affect nighttime views. *Site:* All sites with an exterior 'porch' light	*Mitigation Measure AES-1:* The outdoor 'porch light' specified at most of the Next Gen Sites will include a shield around the top of the light source to stop upward glare and to protect dark nighttime skies. A timer will also prevent the light from staying on all night.	*Less than Significant*
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	**Mitigation Measure CULT-1**	***Less than Significant***
Impact CULT-1: The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as identified in Section 15064.5. *Site*: All	*Mitigation Measure CULT-1:* During construction, if buried cultural or archaeological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work shall stop in that area and within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find, and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with relevant agencies. These archaeological resources could include buried historic features such as artifact-filled privies, wells, and refuse pits, and artifact deposits, along with concentrations of adobe, stone, or concrete walls or foundations, and concentrations of ceramic, glass, or metal materials. Native American archaeological materials could include obsidian and chert flaked stone tools (such as projectile points and knives), midden (darkened soil created culturally from use and containing heat-affected rock, artifacts, animal bones, or shellfish remains), and/or groundstone implements (such as mortars and pestles).	*Less than Significant*
b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	**Mitigation Measure CULT-1**	***Less than Significant***
Impact CULT-2: The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. *Site:* All	*Mitigation Measure CULT-1:* Please see above.	*Less than Significant*

c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature[†]?	**Mitigation Measure CULT-2**	***Less than Significant***
Impact CULT-3: The project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. *Site:* All	*Mitigation Measure CULT-2:* If buried paleontological resources or unique geologic features are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work shall stop in that area and within 100 feet of the find until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with relevant agencies.	*Less than Significant*
d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	**Mitigation Measure CULT-3**	***Less than Significant***
Impact CULT-3: The project would disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. *Site:* All	*Mitigation Measure CULT-3:* Upon accidental discovery of human remains, disturbance shall stop within the vicinity of the find and within other areas reasonably suspected to contain additional human remains. The Sonoma or Marin County coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours. The NAHC shall subsequently identify the most likely living descendent, who may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for excavation regarding acceptable means of treating or disposing of the remains and any associated grave items. If the NAHC is unable to identify the most likely descendent, the descendent fails to make a recommendation within 24 hours of notification, the landowner rejects the recommendation, or mediation by NAHC fails to yield a mutually agreeable recommendation, the landowner or representative shall rebury the remains and associated items with appropriate dignity on the same property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance	*Less than Significant*

[†] As of December 2018, paleontological resources are no longer considered a Cultural Resources issue and are analyzed in the context of Geology and Soils per Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Although the remainder of this SEIR uses the updated CEQA Guidelines, paleontological resources have been retained in the Cultural Resources chapter of this document for consistency with the 2000 EIR.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES		
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	**Mitigation Measure CULT-1**	***Less than Significant***
Impact TRIBE-1: The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k). *Site:* All	*Mitigation Measure CULT-1:* Please see above.	*Less than Significant*
b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in a resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?	**Mitigation Measures TRIBE-1 through TRIBE-3**	***Less than Significant***
Impact TRIBE-2: The project would cause a substantial adverse change in a resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1	*Mitigation Measure TRIBE-1:* If the design of the proposed project is substantially altered after the conclusion of initial consultation with FIGR, final plans and specifications shall be submitted to FIGR's Tribal Heritage Preservation Officer, or designated representative, prior to construction. FIGR shall be provided reasonable opportunity to review the plans and specifications for potential tribal cultural impacts resulting from project excavation, grading, or mobilization. Based on the outcome of this review, FIGR may amend the list of sites requiring a tribal cultural monitor provided to MERA. *Mitigation Measure TRIBE-2:* A tribal monitor with stop work authority shall be present during project excavation and grading to watch for the appearance of tribal cultural resources at the sites designated by FIGR. Unless modified by an	*Less than Significant*

Site: All‡	updated list from FIGR, monitors will be present at the following 13 sites, which were preliminarily identified as having potential for disturbance of tribal cultural resources: Big Rock Ridge, Mt. Tamalpais, Mt. Barnabe, Point Reyes Hill, Dollar Hill, San Pedro Ridge, Mt. Tiburon, Sonoma Mountain, Stewart Point, Tomales, Coyote Peak, Skyview Terrace Water Tank, and Muir Beach. *Mitigation Measure TRIBE-3:* Contractors and construction personnel involved with any form of ground disturbance at the sites designated as culturally sensitive by FIGR shall be advised of the possibility of encountering subsurface tribal cultural resources. If any such resources are encountered or suspected to have been encountered, work shall be halted within 100 feet of the find until FIGR has been notified and given the opportunity to assess the significance of the find. If the find is determined to be a significant tribal cultural resource, MERA shall consult with FIGR to develop a plan to preserve the resource's significance to the extent feasible.	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?	**Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-9**	***Less than Significant***
Impact BIO-1: The project would have a substantial adverse effect on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. *Site:* Stewart Point	*Mitigation Measure BIO-1*: Within one month prior to commencement of construction, a qualified biologist shall flag the Marin manzanita individual within the Study Area. The qualified biologist shall notify the construction foreman as to the location of the special-status plant and identify the type of flagging used to ensure that contact with this species is avoided by construction crews. Just before construction, orange avoidance fencing shall be temporarily erected around the individual manzanita to keep construction equipment and crews away.	*Less than Significant*

‡Mitigation Measure TRIBE-1 applies uniformly across Next Gen sites. Mitigation Measures TRIBE-2 and TRIBE-3 apply only to sites identified as potentially sensitive for tribal cultural resources by FIGR. These sites currently include Big Rock Ridge, Mt. Tamalpais, Mt. Barnabe, Point Reyes Hill, Dollar Hill, San Pedro Ridge, Mt. Tiburon, Sonoma Mountain, Stewart Point, Tomales, Coyote Peak, Skyview Terrace, and Muir Beach. This list is subject to change upon changes to the project design.

Impact BIO-2: The project would have a substantial adverse effect on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. *Site:* Point Reyes Hill, Dollar Hill, Mt. Tiburon, Tomales, Muir Beach, Mill Valley Water Tank	*Mitigation Measure BIO-2*: Project activities shall, to the extent feasible, occur outside of the nesting season from September 1 – January 31. Where this is infeasible and project activities occur during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no more than 14 days prior to the start of project activities. If nests are identified, a no-disturbance buffer shall be implemented to avoid impacts to nesting birds. The radius of a surrounding buffer will be determined by a qualified biologist and shall range from 25 feet to 500 feet depending on the species and protection status of that species. *Mitigation Measure BIO-3:* No more than 14 days before the start of ground disturbance activities at the Tomales Site, a biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys of the Project Site, including a 50-foot buffer, to determine if American badger dens are present. If American badger dens are determined to be present, the biologist shall monitor them for activity to determine whether the den is active. If the den is determined to be occupied by a female with young, ground disturbance and construction activity shall be avoided within 50 feet of the den until the young have matured and dispersed. If the den is determined to be active, but a female with young are not present, burrow exclusion using passive measures such as one-way doors or equivalent shall be attempted for a minimum of three days to discourage their use prior to any project-related ground disturbance. If the biologist determines that the dens have become inactive as a result of the exclusion methods, the dens shall be excavated by hand to prevent them from being re-occupied during construction. *Mitigation Measure BIO-4:* Work at the Tomales Site shall be avoided during night hours (half an hour before sunrise to half an hour before sunset) when California red-legged frog individuals may be dispersing across the site. In addition, no ground disturbing work shall occur within 24 hours of rain events that generate greater than 0.25 inch of accumulated precipitation or during rain events predicted to accumulate 0.25 inch of precipitation. *Mitigation Measure BIO-5:* A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be performed prior to start of ground disturbance activities at the Tomales Site, regardless of the time of year, as burrowing owls may use the Project Site during the non-nesting season. The survey shall be performed according to the standards set forth by the 2012 CDFW Staff report for Burrowing Owl Mitigation. Occupied burrows shall not be disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless, after consultation with the CDFW, a qualified biologist verifies that either: (1) the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (2)	*Less than Significant*

	that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and capable of independent survival.	
Impact BIO-3: The project would have a substantial adverse effect on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. *Site:* Coyote Peak	*Mitigation Measure BIO-6:* No more than 14 days before the start of ground disturbance activities at the Coyote Peak site, a biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys within 50 feet of the Project Site to determine if American badger dens are present. If American badger dens are determined to be present, the biologist shall monitor them for activity to determine whether the den is active. If the den is determined to be occupied by a female with young, ground disturbance and construction activity shall be avoided within 50 feet of the den until the young have matured and dispersed. If the den is determined to be active, but a female with young is not present, burrow exclusion using passive measures such as one-way doors or equivalent shall be attempted for a minimum of three days to discourage their use prior to any project-related ground disturbance. If the biologist determines that the dens have become inactive as a result of the exclusion methods, the dens shall be excavated by hand to prevent them from being re-occupied during construction. *Mitigation Measure BIO-7*: Work at the Coyote Peak site shall be avoided during night hours (half an hour before sunrise to half an hour before sunset) when California red-legged frog individuals may be dispersing across the Project Site. In addition, no ground disturbing work may occur within 24 hours of rain events that generate greater than 0.25 inch of accumulated precipitation or during rain events predicted to accumulate 0.25 inch of precipitation. Within 48 hours prior to installation of temporary steel grates spanning the top of bank of the ephemeral streams, a qualified biologist shall survey intermittent streams within the Project Site. If California red-legged frog are observed during the survey, work shall not proceed in that area until the qualified biologist verifies that the frogs have left the area on their own and there is no potential for the proposed work activities to result in injury or mortality. In addition, if California red-legged frog are observed in the Project Area during the preconstruction survey, a biological monitor shall be present for the remainder of ground disturbing activities. *Mitigation Measure BIO-8:* Project activities at the Coyote Peak site shall occur to the extent feasible, outside of the nesting season from September 1 – January 31. If this is not possible, and project activities are initiated during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), then a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no more than 14 days prior to the start of project activities. If nests are identified, a no-disturbance buffer shall be implemented to	*Less than Significant*

	avoid impacts to nesting birds. The radius of a surrounding buffer will be determined by a qualified biologist and shall range from 25 feet to 500 feet depending on the species and protection status of that species.	
Impact BIO-3: The project would have a substantial adverse effect on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. *Site:* Mill Valley Water Tank	*Mitigation Measure BIO-9:* Within two weeks prior to commencement of construction, a qualified biologist shall flag the Oakland star-tulip population within the Study Area. The qualified biologist shall notify the construction foreman as to the location of the special-status plant population and identify the type of flagging used to ensure that this populations is properly avoided by construction crews.	*Less than Significant*
b, c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS; or on state or federally protected wetlands?	**Mitigation Measure BIO-7**	***Less than Significant***
Impact BIO-4: The project would have a substantial adverse effect on a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS; or on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). *Site:* Coyote Peak	*Mitigation Measure BIO-7:* Please see above.	*Less than Significant*
e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	**Mitigation Measures BIO-2 through BIO-5**	***Less than Significant***
Impact BIO-3: The project would conflict with a local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources.	*Mitigation Measure BIO-2:* Please see above. *Mitigation Measure BIO-3:* Please see above. *Mitigation Measure BIO-4:* Please see above.	*Less than Significant*

Site: Tomales	*Mitigation Measure BIO-5:* Please see above.	
POTENTIAL HAZARDS		
a) Would the radio frequency exposure exceed established FCC exposure limits for workers or the general public?	**Mitigation Measures RF-1 through RF-3.**	***Less than Significant***
Impact RF-1: Based on SiteSafe measurements and models, as well as the site's layout and signage, SiteSafe concluded that all uncontrolled areas with public access were within the public MPE limit, but that controlled access areas on the rooftop should be noticed. *Site:* Prime Site EOF	*Mitigation Measure RF-1:* MERA shall install exposure warning signs at rooftop entries and selected antenna mounts in the controlled access rooftop area according to SiteSafe's individual report for the Prime Site EOF (pages 10-30 of the SiteSafe Report, which is Appendix D to the SEIR) and the SiteSafe Report's General Safety Recommendations (pages 313-315 of Appendix D to the SEIR). In summary, MERA shall install a NOTICE sign at antennas 11-27 and a CAUTION sign at antennas 28-32. Signage location details can be viewed on pages 19-20 of Appendix D to the SEIR.	*Less than Significant*
Impact RF-2: Based on SiteSafe measurements and models, as well as the site's layout and signage, SiteSafe concluded that all uncontrolled areas with public access were within the public MPE limit, but that controlled access areas on the rooftop should be noticed. *Site:* Civic Center	*Mitigation Measure RF-2:* MERA shall install exposure warning signs at rooftop entries and at identified antenna mounts in the controlled access rooftop area according to SiteSafe's individual report for the Civic Center Site (pages 31-46 of the SiteSafe Report, which is Appendix D to the SEIR) and the SiteSafe Report's General Safety Recommendations (pages 313-315 of Appendix D to the SEIR). In summary, MERA shall install a NOTICE sign at antennas 31-35 and a CAUTION sign at antennas 18-30 and 8-12. Signage location details can be viewed on page 37 of Appendix D to the SEIR.	*Less than Significant*
Impact RF-3: Based on SiteSafe measurements and models, as well as the site's layout and signage, SiteSafe concluded that all uncontrolled areas with public access were within the public MPE limit, but that controlled access areas on top of the water tank near the monopole should be noticed. *Site:* Mt. Tiburon	*Mitigation Measure RF-3:* MERA shall install an exposure warning sign at selected locations in the controlled access rooftop area according to SiteSafe's individual report for the Mt. Tiburon Site (pages 172-183 of the SiteSafe Report, which is Appendix D to the SEIR) and the SiteSafe Report's General Safety Recommendations (pages 313-315 of Appendix D to the SEIR). In Summary, MERA shall install a NOTICE sign at the access of the water tank. Signage location details can be viewed on page 178 of Appendix D to the SEIR.	*Less than Significant*

AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	**Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2.**	***Less than Significant***
Impact AIR-1: The project may conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Site: All	*Mitigation Measure AIR-1*: The Construction Project Manager shall be responsible for following requirements in Mitigation Measure AIR-1 and MERA shall be responsible for ensuring this compliance. • All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas) shall be watered two times per day. • All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. • All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. • All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. • All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. • Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). • All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer‘s specifications, and all equipment will be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. • A publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding any dust complaints shall be posted in or near the project site. The contact person shall respond to complaints and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District‘s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. *Mitigation Measure AIR-2*: The Construction Project Manager shall be responsible for following requirements in Mitigation Measure AIR-2 and MERA shall be responsible for ensuring this compliance. • Emergency power generators shall be equipped with emission control devices.	*Less than Significant*

GEOLOGY AND SOILS		
a-ii) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1**	***Less than Significant***
Impact GEO-1: The project may cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking. *Site*: All	*Mitigation Measure GEO-1*: A design-level geotechnical report shall be prepared for the facilities proposed at each of the communication sites. A qualified geotechnical engineer and engineering geologist shall prepare the document, and this design-level report shall provide criteria for site preparation, pavement, and foundations. Site-specific earthquake forces shall also be identified and incorporated into the design of structures. All structures, including towers and earthworks, shall conform to the applicable earthquake design standard such as the California Building Standards Code.	*Less than Significant*
f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	**Mitigate Measure GEO-2**	***Less than Significant***
Impact GEO-2: The project may destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. *Site:* All	*Mitigation Measure GEO-2:* If buried paleontological resources or unique geologic features are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work shall stop in that area and within 100 feet of the find until a qualified registered geologist or paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate procedures for its treatment or avoidance.	*Less than Significant*
NOISE		
a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	**Mitigation Measure NOISE-1**	***Less than Significant***
Impact NOISE-1: The project may result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in	*Mitigation Measure NOISE-1:*	*Less than Significant*

excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. *Site*: All	1) The Contractor shall comply with local standards regarding noise generation and hours of construction during all phases of the project construction. The Construction Project Manager or designated representative shall provide the Contractor with the applicable restrictions. 2) At sites where the general public would be regularly exposed to the sound of air conditioning units and emergency power generators (Prime Site EOF, Civic Center, Mt. Tiburon, Mill Valley Water Tank, and to some degree Muir Beach), those units and generators shall be equipped with noise reduction features. 3) The Construction Project Manager or designated representative shall verify that all workers on-site are aware of and understand applicable noise restrictions. This will be accomplished by on-site meetings with each contractor and their employees prior to the start of construction. 4) The Construction Project Manager shall verify that project documents specify the use of equipment that meets the requirements of this mitigation measure and shall maintain a written record of compliance.	